

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 4 April 2000

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald)** took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

PROSTITUTION

Petitions signed by 591 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House strengthen the law in relation to prostitution, were presented by Ms Bedford and Ms Maywald and Messrs Meier and Scalzi.

Petitions received.

SPEED LIMIT

A petition signed by 551 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House support legislation to increase the speed limit on sections of the Stuart, Eyre and Barrier Highways and Hawker to Lyndhurst Road to 130 kilometres per hour, was presented by the Hon. G.M. Gunn.

Petition received.

KOSOVAR REFUGEES

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. J.W. OLSEN**: Later this week, 259 Kosovars currently residing in Australia must return to their country or face deportation. I have taken up the issue with the federal Immigration Minister Philip Ruddock, for I strongly believe that those who want to should at least be able to apply for permanent residency in Australia. I am not asking for any special treatment other than that they be allowed at least to establish their bona fides in an attempt to remain in Australia.

In South Australia there are about 30 Kosovar refugees, including two infants who, I understand, were born in Australia. I would argue that these people have become part of our community. South Australians opened their hearts and their doors to them: they are very much part of the rich multicultural fabric that makes up this great state.

It is important to note that, since the closure of the safe haven at Hampstead barracks, these people have not relied on government assistance to remain in South Australia: they have to a large degree, been self sufficient. In fact, it is my understanding that some of them have gained employment, with the assistance of the Kosovar community, and are making a substantial contribution to our community.

I have on four previous occasions written to the federal minister. Each time he has informed me that, whilst the legislation passed in the Australian parliament does not permit onshore applications for Kosovars for any other forms of visas, he does have the discretion to lift the bar in individual cases where it is in the public interest to do so. All I am asking is that he exercise that discretion, for I strongly believe that we will all benefit from such a decision.

We will be fulfilling our international obligations to assist those people in need, and I would argue that these people can make a lasting and positive contribution to South Australian and Australian society and become part of the great tradition of Australia. What we have become as a nation is due in no small part to those who have made this country their home.

I believe that the Kosovars will also become important members of our Australian community.

Where it can be demonstrated that these people are making a valuable contribution to our society, and where it can be demonstrated that we in turn gain from their remaining in the state, I would argue that they should at the very least be allowed to apply for permanent residency. To that end I have today written again to the federal minister, Mr Ruddock, in a final appeal to allow those who want it the opportunity to apply.

I am not asking that the usual immigration process be waived: once given an opportunity to apply from onshore, the Kosovars' applications would be subject to the appropriate criteria. However, a decision to allow them to apply for permanent residency while still in Australia would, I believe, be the right one.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Resources (Hon. R.G. Kerin)—

Citrus Board of South Australia—Report, 1998-99
Dog Fence Board—Report, 1998-99
Dried Fruits Board—Report, 1998-99
SABOR Ltd—Report, 1998-99

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. Dean Brown)—

Response to the Public Works Committee Reports on—
Adelaide Festival Centre Upgrade
Southern Expressway Stage 2
Corporation By-Laws—
City of Mitcham—Amendment to By-Law No. 7—
Cats
City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters—
By-Law No 1—Permits and Penalties
By-Law No 2—Moveable Signs
By-Law No 3—Council Land
By-Law No 4—Garbage
By-Law No 5—Dogs
By-Law No 6—Lodging Houses
District Council of Le Hunte—By-Law No 1—
Widunna Oval

By the Minister for Government Enterprises (Hon. M.H. Armitage)—

Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act—
Regulations—Charges
Rules of Court—
Workers Compensation Tribunal—Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act—
Rules—Cost of Proceedings

By the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. M.R. Buckby)—

Superannuation Act—Regulations—STA Employees Variations

By the Minister for Environment and Heritage (Hon. I.F. Evans)—

Office for the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity—
Report, 1998-99
Racial Vilification Act—Conciliation of Complaints—
Report,
Witness Protection—Report, 1998-99
Liquor Licensing Act—Regulations—Dry Areas—Hallett Cove

By the Minister for Water Resources (Hon. M.K. Brindal)—

South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board—
Report, 1998-99.

QUESTION TIME

SUBMARINE CORPORATION

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given that the federal cabinet yesterday deferred a decision on the future ownership of the Australian Submarine Corporation, has the Premier, following his discussions on Friday, received any assurances from the Prime Minister that refit and maintenance work for the 30 year life of the submarines will be undertaken at the ASC's Outer Harbor facility regardless of changes to its ownership?

Yesterday, federal cabinet deferred a decision on the future ownership of the ASC which is currently jointly owned by the Federal Government and Sweden's Celsius Tech. It is understood that the defence minister, Mr Moore, put a proposal to cabinet that the government exercise its right to buy out the half share in ASC which Celsius wants to transfer to the German submarine builder HDW. It is understood that Mr Moore is opposed to HDW's involvement in the ASC, even though the company has a full order book and is keen to build submarines or componentry at Outer Harbor in order to supply clients in Asia.

ASC's managing director, Hans Ohff, and unions representing its work force have said that a partnership with HDW has the best potential to regenerate business at Outer Harbor rather than sustaining further job losses at the end of the year after the completion of the sixth, and final, submarine. There are also concerns that if ownership is transferred to Tenex (another option), the builders of Anzac frigates in Melbourne, ongoing refit and maintenance work could be transferred to Western Australia's Tenex facility, given that the Australian Navy has persistently lobbied for all submarine activity to be collocated in Western Australia.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): The question raised by the Leader is an important one in terms of ensuring the longevity of the Australian Submarine Corporation, the retention of the skills base in South Australia that has been developed over the past decade and, importantly, the \$100 million a year contribution to gross state product through the submarine contract and associated subcontracts. The purpose in my meeting with the Prime Minister on Friday was to achieve just that outcome, that is, to ensure that ownership of the Australian Submarine Corporation puts it in the best position to give longevity to its base here in South Australia, that through life support and refit and refurbishment—the major refit and refurbishment of the submarines—would be undertaken in South Australia.

To that end, the House would be aware that we won last year, after the McIntosh review, for the policy decision to be confirmed by the federal cabinet, that in fact through life support, refit and refurbishment of the submarines, that is, the major refits, would be undertaken in South Australia. Last year, I sought a meeting with Malcolm McIntosh. In fact I was the only political leader in the country to seek a meeting with him in relation to the preparation of his report and the recommendations that he was going to make to the Federal Government.

We well understand there are some forces that do not have South Australia's interest at heart. The Leader mentioned that in his question. I want to ensure that further investment and the expansion of the amount of work undertaken is not put at risk through the confusion and difficulties of shared ownership of the Australian Submarine Corporation.

My sole objective has been to give support to Defence Minister Moore to ensure that the shareholding is clarified, to give the option for maximising Australian industry involvement and participation in defence procurement in this country and, as it relates to the submarines, that that base should be here in South Australia. Australia has about four if not five port facilities that are capable of refits and rework. Many countries overseas only have about one or two shipyards capable of that type of facility, so there is competition in Australia.

The reason I cancelled appointments and at short notice sought a meeting with the Prime Minister was simply to stress the importance that the government and South Australia put on maximising that company and its throughput. The Prime Minister indicated to me that a number of outstanding legal questions had to be determined involving the contract that had previously been put in place, that the federal government was working through those, and that a departmental officials committee was tasked with bringing a further report to the federal cabinet. There was a discussion on the matter in the federal cabinet yesterday, and I anticipate clearly that there will be further discussions in relation to that.

As well as speaking to the industry minister last Thursday and the defence minister and the Prime Minister on Friday, I have subsequently spoken to the defence minister and the industry minister, and I can assure the leader that no stone will be left unturned to ensure that the federal cabinet understands the importance of that facility and the investment in that facility to South Australia, its future and, importantly, the work force at Osborne. I was heartened by the Prime Minister's response. Final decisions are yet to be made, but we will continue to press the case for South Australia.

DIRECTION STATEMENTS

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Can the Premier outline to the House his view of the recent series of direction statements released by the opposition?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I happened to read the *Sunday Mail* on Sunday, and I thought, 'There is a direction in these statements. This is something good. This is a new leaf from the opposition. We are actually having a direction for the future.' However, I was sorely disappointed when I read the document. Once again we have the opposition exposed for no credible policies, no ideas and no direction. I say that because the leader talks about a directions statement, exciting new policy initiatives, and he has tagged it 'Directions Statement'. I was actually interested that the tag the leader is using for his policy was the same as the one we released last November, 'Directions for South Australia'.

So, I am somewhat flattered that the Leader of the Opposition, rather than having a new idea or a new policy, has actually named it the same as the Government's strategic directions statement that we released last year. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his support for our policy thrust with the directions statement. However, when we look behind that, it is interesting to note that there is not much substance to it. It is not new: it is really a rebranding of their 1997 policy initiatives. That is the deal.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I welcome the Leader of the Opposition's support for our directions statement, and I trust and hope that it will go on in the future. In the article in question, the leader confirmed his commitment to the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I do not need to remind the House—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN:—that the Minister for Human Services announced a major capital upgrade—

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come back to order. There is just too much audible interjection from the member for Bragg, the member for Hart and others. The honourable Premier.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Leader of the Opposition for interjecting when the chair is on his feet, and I point out to the leader that it is absolutely unacceptable for anyone to interject while the chair is speaking.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I just remind the leader that, having released in the *Sunday Mail* this new policy, about two months ago the Minister for Human Services announced that we would be spending \$37.4 million at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. So much for this new policy direction! Nothing new, no substance, no new ideas; take what the government is doing, rebadge it and put it out again as if they have done some work. I think the leader has been to 110 community meetings.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Yes, they cancelled one or two because I do not think the members turned up to one or two of those meetings last year, if my memory serves me correctly—they went interstate instead of attending the community meeting that they had arranged. If the best you can do after 110 meetings is name your policy after ours and simply rebadge your 1997 campaign policies, then you still have no depth or substance—and continue to be wrong. Remember last week, the leader—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Oh, this is the man 57/42: 57 votes to the member for Kaurna and 42 for the member for Elder, and the member for Hart is left right out—he has none left. The play that is occurring is starting to worry the member for Hart. He has been left out and is it annoying him! It is really annoying him because he thought he was positioning himself, when suddenly it breaks a different way and they are passing him by and he is left in this vacuum. No wonder the member for Hart is getting a little edgy with his comments these days. I return to the claims of the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are far too many interjections.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I make two points: first, the leader said that we are spending only 78¢ in the dollar on health compared with when they were in government. That is wrong: it is \$1.15 compared to when they were in government. More is going into health under a Liberal administration than under the previous Labor government. The member for Hart also said that we were to spend \$200 million on GST—well, he was proved wrong with that yet again. Wrong, wrong, wrong! I mean, we put up with this whingeing, wining, carping, opposing approach, yet time and again their public statements are proved to be wrong.

I also notice that the leader is bringing former Premier Don Dunstan into a lot of the things he does. I make one point to the Leader of the Opposition: you are no Don Dunstan!

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MISSING DOCUMENTS

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Why did the Minister for Tourism deny a freedom of information request by the opposition in February of this year to supply a list of documents stolen from her car in November last year by saying that her office had not compiled any such list, when the Attorney-General has informed parliament that the minister's office was compiling a list in December last year; and will she reveal the list to this House?

In February this year, the minister's adviser and principal freedom of information officer, Simon Birmingham, wrote to the member for Mitchell denying him a freedom of information request for a copy of a list of documents and items stolen from her car by saying that her office had not compiled any such list. However, the Attorney-General in a written reply to an opposition question supplied by the police in December last year said:

Recent contact with the Hon. Joan Hall's office revealed that a full inventory of the property stolen is still being compiled.

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): The members for Lee and Mitchell have consistently been asking a number of questions relating to this issue. They both well know that four of the six cases that were removed from my car that night were returned. I have not seen in the Attorney's statement the detail that the honourable member has just outlined. I will look at the details and bring back a report to the House.

RACING CLUB ASSETS

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing advise the House whether the proposed amendments to the Racing Act in relation to corporatisation of the industry will allow a new corporate entity for the three clubs to sell the assets of a racing club?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I thank the member for Bragg for his question. There has been a lot of media comment over the weekend in relation to this issue following a question from the member for Lee last week and some unfortunate comments in the *Sunday Mail* and on radio over the weekend. The facts are that the proposed legislation in relation to the racing industry that would allow corporatisation of the racing industry does not change the power of the clubs to deal with their own assets. Therefore, the power of selling of assets, whether it be Cheltenham or any other asset owned by a racing club, will rightly remain with that racing club. I want to make absolutely clear that the proposed legislation in relation to corporatisation does not deal with the selling of any racing club asset. The legislation simply sets out a framework for recognising the corporate entities when they are established.

It is interesting to follow this through in relation to how the corporations are being established. In fact, as the member for Lee well knows, it is the thoroughbred industry that over the period of the past six or seven months has designed its own corporate entity. Through the SAJC and the South Australian Racing Clubs Council the thoroughbred industry has gone out and got its own legal advice and established its own set of proposed rules for the corporation.

Mr Wright interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: That is not rubbish; the member for Lee and I know that the SAJC and the South Australian Racing Clubs Council set up a working group to establish their own rules. They have taken their own legal advice and

established their own rules. Those rules have been sent not to one or two thoroughbred clubs but to every thoroughbred club in the state, and all of them have agreed to those rules about corporatisation. We all know that the clubs in this state will not sign off on a set of rules that will give some other corporate entity the power to sell their assets. That defies logic. You have done a great disservice to the racing industry over the weekend in putting out that rumour, because you knew it was wrong all the way along.

The good thing is that the phone rang hot over the weekend from thoroughbred clubs all over the state furious that you put out that rumour, because they know they have been working on the rules for six or seven months and signed off on them at meetings last week. The SAJC and the South Australian Racing Clubs Council representing every country club in South Australia, including Oakbank, are signing off on the rules. I look forward to the vote on corporatisation when we get the legislation before the House.

Let us make clear where the idea of the sale of Cheltenham came from. I refer to the SACHA report that was given to the Racing Industry Development Authority in May 1988. It was the South Australian Thoroughbred Racing Authority back in 1988—

Mr Foley: It didn't exist in 1988!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I find it amazing that the shadow Treasurer does not understand that the South Australian Thoroughbred Racing Authority—

Mr Foley: You said 1988.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Ninety-eight—May 1998. I quote from its report. It states:

If venue rationalisation is constrained by the availability of such funds, SATRA advocates the following course of action: retain Morphettville, Victoria Park and Oakbank and dispose of Cheltenham Park Race Course.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: At the time that was the South Australian Thoroughbred Racing Authority's recommendation to the Racing Industry Development Association. The shadow minister was on radio at the weekend suggesting that the sale of Cheltenham was somehow linked to the TAB sale. I had my officers contact the officers conducting the negotiations in relation to the TAB sale, and not half an hour ago they advised me that the matter has never been raised during the negotiations. It is just another rumour put out by the member for Lee, deliberately trying to misrepresent the position in relation to the racing industry.

The member for Lee's accusation that the corporation has the power to sell club assets is wrong: it does not have that power. On the matter of this somehow being tied up with the TAB sale, the honourable member is wrong again. As I indicated to the parliament last week, his suggestion that the government is keen to sell Cheltenham is wrong. In relation to Dennis Markham's article at the weekend entitled 'Just how right was Mr Wright?' the honourable member is wrong, wrong, wrong.

MISSING DOCUMENTS

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HANNA: When giving evidence to the Auditor-General's inquiry into the Hindmarsh Stadium, how could the minister assure the Auditor-General that all the documents

needed were available to him even though, at that time, the minister maintained that a list of documents allegedly stolen from her car was never compiled?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. The House will remain silent.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: My understanding is that the Auditor-General is still investigating this matter and I seek a ruling as to whether the question is permissible.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair is of the opinion that this matter is not sub judice as it is being dealt with by the Auditor-General. I call the Minister for Tourism. The matter is not sub judice.

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): Mr Speaker, I am sorry, I did not hear what you said earlier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House knows that we are having difficulty with the amplification system and I seek some indulgence so that we can get through Question Time properly. I made a ruling that I do not believe that the matter is sub judice. I call the Minister for Tourism.

The Hon. J. HALL: I find this continual questioning regarding the theft from a car last November quite extraordinary. On each occasion the questions are asked they usually follow some fairly good news as it relates to the hosting of the soccer tournament in Adelaide in September this year. The last time I said that the questions were motivated by malice; I happen to believe that still to be the truth.

Mr Hanna: It's a search for the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Hanna: There's more to come, Joan.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. The chair has been extremely tolerant this afternoon. If members want to stay here for the rest of Question Time I suggest that they remain silent. The member for Colton.

WORKCOVER

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): My question is directed to the Minister for Government Enterprises. How is WorkCover assisting the competitive position of South Australian employers?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE (Minister for Government Enterprises): I thank the member for his very important question about how businesses in South Australia can be more competitive than businesses in other states, and hence how they may be able to employ more South Australians. When the Labor Party was last in government we know only too well that everything it touched turned to dust. It was in that environment that the WorkCover scheme was established to ensure universal coverage of workers' compensation and rehabilitation. The fact is that under the previous government the system simply did not have the funds required to meet its foreseeable demands. Indeed, when the electors voted this government in, WorkCover was faced with an unfunded liability of \$276 million.

This threatened the very integrity of the scheme and, hence, threatened the integrity of the workers who required

the rehabilitation and the help of the scheme. Although we took the hard decisions and worked hard over six years to rebuild the WorkCover scheme, we were not focused only on the financials. There have been a number of safer industry schemes and a range of industry-specific initiatives which the government has introduced through WorkCover, and they have all been aimed at introducing safer workplaces.

Late last year it was a real pleasure to be able to announce that WorkCover had agreed in principle at that stage to offer a rebate to employers with a value of \$25 million. The decision was based on sound financial principles and reflected the fact that for the first time in its history and its existence this scheme had the funds to cover the liabilities. That has been achieved while still maintaining the employers' contribution over the last six years at the target average levy of 2.86 per cent. It is very pleasing to report that, on the basis of the December actuarial report, the WorkCover board has in fact confirmed that up to 50 000 South Australian employers will be able to share in that \$25 million rebate.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out to the cameramen that they will only film members on their feet and not members having conversations around the chamber.

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: I was pointing out that that \$25 million rebate, which has been confirmed today to apply from July, is a rebate of about 7 per cent on the 2000-01 WorkCover levy for a typical South Australian business. What that means for that typical South Australian business is a reduction in business costs, an increased competitiveness in the Australian and the South Australian scene and, hence, the opportunity to employ more people. The rebate from July is on the basis that the WorkCover scheme has now achieved under the Liberal government 104 per cent funding of its liability—not \$276 million of unfunded liability, and not \$276 million of risk to the workers who were injured and who needed the rehabilitation.

I am pleased to report that the next step is that WorkCover is to ensure that sufficient reserves are built up, and when this is achieved the whole annual operating surplus will be fully rebated to employers. It is this side of the House that has a track record of financial competence and it is this side of the House, through measures which it has put in place to ensure the financial stability of WorkCover, that is actually interested in ensuring that the injured workers and the rehabilitation that they need is covered by a fair, comprehensive and fully funded workers compensation scheme.

MISSING DOCUMENTS

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Has the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing given evidence to the Auditor-General's Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium inquiry, and were any of the documents or files stolen from the tourism minister's car documents from his office or departments?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I have not been called to give evidence by the Auditor-General.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN STEEL AND ENERGY

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Hart. I call the member for Stuart.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I direct my question to the Minister for Minerals and Energy. What is the status of the South Australian Steel and Energy project and when will the demonstration plant planned for Whyalla be commissioned? I point out to the minister that this project has benefits for the rest—

Mr Foley: Comment!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You wouldn't know the difference: you do it all the time. I point out that this project has benefits for other parts of South Australia as well as for Whyalla. The honourable member opposite wants to look after the member for Mitchell: he's passed—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member has completed his question.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Minerals and Energy): The honourable member is well aware of the importance of this project to the state, and it is a pity that the member for Hart, who wants to tout himself as a future treasurer or leader, does not take the same interest in important issues. I am sure that people who watch the proceedings of the parliament would rather hear about important state projects than some of the negative carping we have heard from the other side today.

The project about which the honourable member questions me is important. As the member for Giles would be aware (as it also has an impact on her electorate and she certainly wants to hear more about it), this is a project that aims to produce pig iron from coal and iron ore resources located south of Coober Pedy. That project has recently taken another significant step forward. The Premier, the Deputy Premier and I were pleased to meet with the board members of Aurion in Adelaide only a few weeks ago (on 20 March), as they had a board meeting here and were pleased to explain to us more detail about this significant step forward.

The project has now secured funding for the demonstration plant, which they have been aspiring to construct for some time, to be constructed near Whyalla. Aurion Energy holds a 90 per cent stake in this project and plans to commission the plant near Whyalla in July this year. Further, by the end of this year, it plans to complete a feasibility study for a commercial pig iron plant to be located at a site yet to be determined but expected to be in the vicinity of Coober Pedy or Whyalla and, importantly, close to the Adelaide to Darwin rail link.

That is a significant spin-off example of the sorts of projects that will start to be created in South Australia as a result of the initiatives of this government. The demonstration plant is expected to cost about \$16 million to construct, and will create direct employment (initially operating as a demonstration plant) for approximately 20 people. It is important to put on record that the project has been assisted by the federal government via the research and development start grant and also, over a two year process, through \$1 million assistance from this state government.

That assistance is provided because of the long-term benefit opportunity from this project for the commercial plant, about which we hope to have details late this year. It is a plant that will in the long term produce pig iron steel and cogenerate electricity from the iron ore and coal resources south of Coober Pedy and close to Tarcoola and the Alice Springs railway line.

The commercial plant is expected to cost in the vicinity of \$870 million, will employ some 500 people and will

generate a revenue stream of \$400 million a year. That is a significant project and one on which this government has been working for a considerable time. I wish to place on record the government's congratulations to Aurion Energy for the progress that it has made to date and the progress we look forward to this project making in the future.

The results from the demonstration facility near Whyalla will establish engineering and commercial parameters for the design of the commercial plant and for the preparation of the feasibility study for what we expect is to come.

MISSING DOCUMENTS

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): My question is directed to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Were any of the documents or files stolen from the tourism minister's car documents from his office or department?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): I thank the member for the question for the second time. The fact is that the files were transferred across to the Minister for Tourism's office. If any of those documents have been stolen or are missing, that is a matter for the Minister for Tourism.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will come back to order.

STATE ECONOMY

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Can the Premier provide an update of the latest statistics from the Australian Bureau of Statistics relating to the state of the South Australian economy?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): Last Friday the Centre for Economic Studies released a report that had some very good economic indicators for South Australia. In addition, the ABS set of figures underscores the fact that the South Australian economy is indeed robust. In fact, South Australia experienced the strongest growth of all the states in dwelling approvals through the year, with growth in approvals in our state of 67 per cent compared with 22 per cent nationally. The number of ANZ job advertisements in Australia has fallen over each of the last five months in trend terms to be 2.3 per cent below the October 1999 peak. However, the trend level of ANZ job advertisements in South Australia has been rising in recent months to reach a new post recession high; it is up 11.7 per cent compared with a year ago.

The report of the Centre for Economic Studies released last week paints a picture of a growing state economy buoyed by positive economic growth at international scale. This is reflected in greater economic growth as measured by GSP and state final demand, lower trend line unemployment, solid business investment, very strong export performance, registration of cars increasing, dwelling construction up with inflation low, and only moderate growth in wages; in other words, a series of policy settings that has a recipe for a good future for South Australia. That is a very good score card. Population growth is continuing at .5 per cent, and that has been driven by natural increase and overseas migration into South Australia—and, coincidentally, I welcome the federal government's announcement yesterday of an increase in migration; not enough, but at least it is a move in the right direction.

Our employment figures are improving clearly with a downward trend in unemployment figures. Through the year in trend terms there has been strong growth in employment in South Australia.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Peake will remain silent.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Stick with the taxi.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Peake for interjecting after he has been called to order.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: For the benefit of the member for Peake, over the course of the last year we had employment growth in South Australia of 3.2 per cent compared with the Australian average of 2.8 per cent. In South Australia we are outperforming the Australian average in employment growth by .4 per cent. For the member for Peake's benefit, I point out that, under the Leader of the Opposition when he was Minister for Employment—or should I say 'unemployment'—when you left office in 1993, unemployment was 12.4 per cent. We have had something like 20 months of trend employment growth in South Australia, and the fact that we are outperforming the rest of Australia on average terms is a position in which we have not been for decades in this state.

Why are we outperforming other states after decades? It is because a series of policy settings has been put in place. It did not materialise overnight of its own accord. It is a series of policy settings put in place by this government over six to seven years that has brought that about. In fact, we have 675 000 South Australians now employed. That is more than at any time in our history.

We have also seen a very significant increase in exports. Our exports increased by nearly 18 per cent over the previous year, according to the recent ABS figures. That is well ahead of the national average, where there was a decline in export trade. One has only to look at several of the categories: mining is up 86.4 per cent, and total manufacturing is up 23.9 per cent. Spending on consumption and investment is up. State final demand in real trend terms grew by 2 per cent during the December quarter to 1999 and by 6.5 per cent through the year, compared with the national figures of 1.1 and 4.9 per cent respectively. Again, last year we outperformed the national average: South Australia is doing better than the national average.

In addition to that, dwelling commencements were up by nearly 10 per cent in South Australia in the most recent year to September last, whereas they fell by 7 per cent across Australia. This was the highest level in over four years in our state. BIS Schrapnel have forecast an 8 per cent increase in South Australian non-residential building in the current financial year, in contrast to a double digit fall nationally. I do not know whether the member for Peake was listening to that. We are going up by 8 per cent, and nationally they are going down by double digits.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: We are setting a trend line and a direction for our economy, ahead of and distinct from other states. The member for Peake might not like it, because these trends lines are creating employment, growth and a robust economy. The member for Peake's party, when in government, would have given their right arm to have this set of economic figures and forecasts for the next year or two. Retail trade is also growing strongly, up by 4.1 per cent over the previous year.

We are seeing valuation of house properties in the metropolitan area up by 9 per cent and in the country areas up by 8 per cent, and that means that every home owner is 9 per cent and 8 per cent respectively better off today than they were a year ago in valuation and net asset terms. The economic indicators are not only creating employment: they are also creating greater value in the assets owned by South Australians and the most important asset, their own home.

HINDMARSH STADIUM

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Is the Premier aware, or has he been informed, of the nature or content of information and documents given by his former parliamentary secretary, the Hon. Julian Stefani, to the Auditor-General concerning the government's handling of the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium construction contracts and consultancies, and has the Premier now spoken with Mr Stefani, who last week told journalists there was 'a stench of corruption within the government', and that as a result he was considering resigning from the Liberal Party?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): Let us dissect accountability into two parts: accounts and ability. On both counts, you have neither. That is, Mr Speaker, this party when in government could not run accounts, and, secondly, it is clearly demonstrating yet again that it has no ability to run them.

TAFE, YORKE PENINSULA

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MEIER: Can the Minister for Employment and Training provide to this House details of government expenditure on new TAFE facilities on Yorke Peninsula? I also ask the minister to indicate to the House how TAFE training has assisted people gaining employment.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Employment and Training): I thank the honourable member for his question and in so doing acknowledge his long-time commitment to young people in his electorate and in South Australia generally. The House will be aware that the member asked his question at what is the beginning of Youth Week. This morning I was privileged enough to be asked to the member for Elizabeth's electorate, where 400 or 500 young people asked a lot of pertinent questions. I was most impressed by that. I am sorry the member for Elizabeth and the shadow minister for youth could not be there because it was a very worthwhile experience.

A new \$5.15 million TAFE campus was completed in 1998 adjacent to the Kadina Memorial High School on Doswell Terrace. This is a state funded project within a priority capital program to upgrade country campuses to a standard which would be expected of metropolitan campuses. The Minister for Human Services will be pleased to hear that I understand the Victor Harbor campus is at the design phase. The Premier officially opened the Kadina complex on 24 March 2000. The facility contains a joint TAFE local council library, computing suites, video conferencing classrooms, staff administration accommodation and a multipurpose workshop. Again, the council needs to be acknowledged for playing a part in providing what this government increasingly is committed to; that is, a suite of

services that crosses government boundaries and provides a one stop shop for local government, TAFE, education and whatever government services we can provide.

The new TAFE campus replaces an existing site which comprised transportable and shed structures and which were totally inadequate for vocational education and training purposes. The second part of the question touches on the Premier's previous answer about how proud we should be of what we as a government are doing for young people in South Australia, especially in the area of skilling. If members opposite have the chance to travel, I suggest that they go to places such as Ireland, northern England or Glasgow to see—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I believe that some of the members opposite have just had extensive trips and we will be pleased to see their reports when they come in. In all those places where employment has shown a turnaround, it has been because of the upskilling and the reskilling of the work force; and South Australia has and is following that example. Economic success in the future will demand increasing flexibility and responsiveness to meet emerging needs. New ways of doing things will be required. The Premier repeatedly has told this House that it is the skilling of our work force to which we are directed.

In answer to the interjections that the member for Peake makes, the results of the TAFE graduate destination survey indicated—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Peake.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I am sorry, sir, I just wanted them to hear the answer. The TAFE graduate destination survey indicates that just under 81 per cent of South Australian TAFE graduates from 1998 were employed in May 1999.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Peake can ignore the answers, but the fact is that I thought, if he was a member dedicated to his electorate, he would applaud 81 per cent of TAFE graduates getting a job. I thought that was an important fact. He might not think so, but I do. This compared with a national average—and this is what the Premier was saying—of 72.8 per cent. We can go through another page of figures, all of which show that South Australia is leading the field in Australia in this endeavour. I will not do so because the members opposite have a short attention span.

ELECTRICITY, INTERCONNECTOR

Mr FOLEY (Hart): My question is directed to the Premier. Why did the government fail to support the ATCO proposal to upgrade the Victorian interconnector; and what level of government support did they request?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg will come to order.

Mr FOLEY: The Premier told ABC TV news last night that the government did not support the ATCO proposal because 'they wanted the government and the taxpayers to guarantee them'.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): We have consistently said that, if the private sector wishes upon its own initiative to take the risk and build an interconnector, we will encourage and assist them, but we will not give a blank cheque to any private sector company on the taxpayers of South Australia. That is the sort of thing that the member for Hart's

party did when it was in government, and we are not about to repeat its financial mismanagement of South Australia. We will insure and assist any private sector company that wants to put in interconnectors where it takes the risk. However, I repeat, because the member for Hart seems to be quite selective in what he hears, that we will not give a blank cheque to any private sector company. We will not underwrite its shareholders, as you used to do in government. We are prudent in our approach and we will continue to be so.

PARKS AND WILDLIFE FESTIVAL

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Minister for Environment and Heritage inform the House of the success of the fourth annual parks and wildlife festival at the weekend and indicate whether or not he has any updated information on the role South Australian volunteers are playing in our parks?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): At the weekend I had the pleasure of attending the fourth parks and wildlife festival in the Belair park in my electorate. It was an outstanding success and a fantastic day. We estimate that between 12 000 and 15 000 people attended what was the fourth festival. The first one took place in 1997, and I am sure that the member for Heysen will be pleased to hear that something that started in 1997 with 3 000 people attending has built to 5 000 in 1998, 7 000 last year and close to 15 000 people over the weekend. It was a great opportunity for South Australians to go to the park and celebrate their involvement in South Australia's national parks and wildlife. It was a great credit to all the volunteer groups that were there, displaying their activities and the amount of work they do in the parks throughout South Australia. There are now well over 100 friends groups within the South Australian parks system. Last year they contributed the equivalent of 48 000 days of work, estimated to involve about \$6.2 million worth of time, or the equivalent of about 204 staff. That is a sensational effort on the part of the volunteers.

The important thing about the day is that it is a way of bringing the community closer to the environment through the parks. The government has announced a \$30 million parks agenda and we are about halfway through that. That is not just about investing in the physical infrastructure, such as the roads and the visitors' centre, although that is an important part of it. Those who have been to Kangaroo Island would have seen there a significant improvement in the facilities, particularly the roads. It is also about investing in wildlife programs. At the weekend I took the opportunity to do the walk for wildlife with my family. It was about a 3 or 4 kilometre walk, with stops every kilometre or so which explained certain aspects of the environment to those who undertook the walk. Last year about 1 000 people undertook the walk, although I am not sure of the number involved this year. Certainly it is a great way to educate people, especially the young, about the environmental and wildlife programs available through the various community groups in South Australia.

Through the parks agenda we also have programs such as those dealing with the biodiversity of our flora and fauna; Ark on Eyre, in which I know the member for Flinders has an interest; and also the bounceback program in the Flinders Ranges. These are all about revegetating and looking after our threatened species, whether they be flora or fauna. All in all, it was a great day. I encourage everyone to go next year. They brought it forward from June to April to get better weather

and as a result got a huge crowd. I pay tribute to the great work of all the officers, rangers and staff of the national parks who were there on the day and who did all the lead-up and follow-up work. It was a fantastic effort, and the community certainly appreciated it. I also thank all the volunteers who were involved.

MARANANGA CONSTRUCTION

Ms HURLEY (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Has the Minister for Tourism met with residents, winemakers and tourism operators about BRL Hardy's plans, now approved by the council, to construct a one hectare, 9 000 tonne capacity colorbond building at Marananga; and does she share the concern of hundreds of local residents who have signed a petition protesting at the detrimental impact that the construction of this building could have on the Barossa's most famous landscape in the vicinity of Seppeltsfield Road?

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): Why am I not surprised to be asked such a question from the opposition? Members opposite really do loathe and detest anything that smacks of a development of any sort that provides jobs for South Australians. I am sure that the honourable member is well aware that it is a council decision, and the deputy leader would well know that the Kapunda and Light District Council is the relevant council. Over many years, BRL Hardy has had some fantastic investments in this state, and what it has been doing in the wine industry should be complimented: it should not be bucketed by the opposition.

BRL Hardy's investments in many wine regions in this state are extraordinarily valuable. I refer particularly to its function centre and cellar door sales facility at Padthaway, which fits into the environment brilliantly. It has provided a great fillip of employment and investment in the South-East. Members would also be well aware of the new development at Banrock Station. I find it quite incomprehensible that the deputy leader should be making snide remarks about activities in this state which are not only helping investment and the creation of jobs but also are greatly assisting the tourism industry, which, much to her chagrin, the deputy leader would have to acknowledge is absolutely booming.

CONVENTIONS AND CONFERENCES

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Tourism outline to the House the importance of the conventions and conferences market to our state's overall tourism industry? Will the minister also explain what steps the government is taking to capitalise fully on this market and the success of the government's strategies regarding this market? I had the good fortune to attend recently an ACTA function at which Glenn Cooper, chairman of the Adelaide Convention and Tourism Authority, referred to the potential to generate significant growth in local economic activity through the conventions market. Given the importance to my electorate of the high numbers of visiting convention delegates who visit the Adelaide hills, I would appreciate the minister's informing the House what steps are being taken to ensure the growth of this very important market.

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): I place on record my appreciation for the very extraordinary amount of work that the member for Heysen does in convening the Hills Marketing Tourism Committee and the work that is being achieved in a very cooperative manner throughout the hills to increase visitation in the hills, as well as increasing great

concentration, focus and cooperation with the local councils in the area.

The House might be interested to know, although some members on the opposite side may not, that approximately 12 years ago Australia as a whole drew convention business to the value of \$450 million. That figure has changed so dramatically that, I suspect, the House could be interested to know that the current statistics from the Bureau of Tourism Research indicate that the MICE industry (and I know all members are aware that 'MICE' stands for Meetings Incentives Conventions and Exhibitions) is currently worth \$540 million annually to our state. It is quite extraordinary, if one looks at the figures from 1992-93, that the MICE industry was then estimated to be worth \$235 million to South Australia.

In the last six to seven years that has more than doubled. As we know, it has added to what is now a booming tourism industry, and it is a very important component. ACTA—and I am sure members know that is the Adelaide Convention and Tourism Authority—has been enormously successful in raising the profile of Adelaide and South Australia with its huge success in its bid wins for conferences and conventions. In 1997 and 1999 it secured 42 bid wins, which has had an estimated impact of around \$100 million, provided 56 000 delegates and actually accounted for 247 000 bed nights. The very strong role that is played by ACTA in winning bids for South Australia ought to be congratulated, because it is really doing great things in terms of our general tourism industry.

My colleague reminds me that at the moment one cannot get a bed in Adelaide for this weekend (perhaps we might talk about that tomorrow), but the spin-offs from the success of conventions and conferences in this state are enormous, because they cut across so much of the hospitality industry. ACTA has estimated, for example, that \$1 in every \$10 that is spent locally by each conference delegate is actually directed towards conference expenses; the remainder goes into a whole lot of other activities such as accommodation, shopping, restaurants, entertainment and transport. It has also been estimated that every national delegate who attends a conference spends about \$1 000 when they come to visit, and they usually spend one night before or after the convention they attend.

Interestingly, the international delegates who attend these conferences spend even more. We acknowledge that that is because we are a long haul destination, so they want to get their money's worth when they visit. But it is estimated that international delegates spend \$3 000 when they come to South Australia and usually spend three nights before or after the conference for which they have registered. As it relates to the question from the member for Heysen, it is very important to know that it is not just the city of Adelaide that receives the benefits from these amazing conferences. Right through the regions, people take advantage of being in such a unique state. I think that is pretty exciting.

Mr Speaker, you might be interested to know that the South-East, for example, is getting a growing reputation for hosting successful events and conferences. Last year, the estimate was \$3.5 million just from the conference and convention market. Some amazing conferences have been booked over the next 10 years, and I am sure that some of them would be of great interest to the House. For example, the 22nd International Symposium and Exhibition on Ballistics (that sounds fairly interesting) in the year 2004 is estimated to have 500 delegates and an economic impact of nearly \$1.5 million.

There are a number of conventions that have been booked from now to the year 2010, some of which are contributing up to \$.5 million and some up to around \$3 million. I am sure that there are many that would be of interest to the House; for example, in the year 2007 there are 1 200 delegates coming here. The estimated economic benefit is \$3.5 million, and that is the South-East Asian and Western Pacific Meeting of Pharmacologists. Some of this information is information that I suspect we should all be very proud of. It would be very appropriate for the House to acknowledge the amazing role that ACTA has played in securing so many of these bids. I am very happy to provide further information if any members are interested.

LIQUOR LICENSING ACT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I table a ministerial statement made by the Hon. K.T. Griffin in another place on the operation of section 97 of the Liquor Licensing Act.

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I table a ministerial statement made by the Hon. K.T. Griffin in another place on the National Rifle Association of America.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

The SPEAKER: The question before the chair is that the House note grievances.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Today I wish to speak on recent developments with respect to BHP's long products operations in Whyalla. Those developments are for the most part positive for local jobs and for the people of Whyalla, because for Labor the main issue is jobs and job security. The member for Giles (Lyn Breuer) and I were involved from the very early stage in negotiations with the company, the Whyalla council and the work force in the terms and conditions of BHP's divestment from its long products operations. I would like to pay tribute to the member for Giles and to Geoff Buckland, secretary of the Whyalla-Woomera branch of the Australian Workers Union, for their tireless efforts in seeking and now achieving a good outcome for jobs in Whyalla.

Because the sell down of BHP's long products requires changes to the two indenture acts, it is vital to pursue those changes on a bipartisan basis. Very early in the piece I offered bipartisan support for changes to the act which would be helpful for jobs and for Whyalla, and that offer stands today. This February I met in Melbourne with BHP representatives, including Mr Bernard Carrasco and David Goodwin. I emphasised the opposition's preference for a public float of the company rather than a trade sale as the option most likely to secure jobs and a continuation of steel manufacturing in Whyalla. On the day following our visit the company confirmed its intention to sell down its operations by means of a public float.

Later in the month I was pleased to meet with Bob Every, who now heads the separate long products operations, and

Leo Sellick, the manager of the Whyalla plant. At that time we were able to pursue important further issues with the company. We raised the issue of changes to the indenture, and the company appreciated Labor's pledge of bipartisanship. With Lyn Breuer we also talked about the issues of some donation of unused industrial land to the Whyalla community, efforts at environmental improvement and a contribution through payment of council rates.

I am pleased that BHP has come to the party in terms of the donation of land that could be used as an industrial park or enterprise zone, and I will have more to say about that at a later stage. That contribution is around 700 hectares. It is also pleasing that BHP has donated further land that will add to the local conservation park and that steel-making operations will operate under the full jurisdiction of the Environment Protection Agency. Finally, the steel works will pay council rates for the first time that will grow to \$550 000 by 2007. Knowing BHP to be mindful of the contribution of the community to the company over many decades, I hope that consideration will also be given to provide some further help.

One possibility would be to assist the enhancement of the Whyalla campus of the University of South Australia as a key recipient of any such assistance. Any assistance needs to be directed at finding long-term solutions to Whyalla's far too high unemployment and diversifying its economy. But it is not only BHP that has responsibilities to the people of Whyalla: the state and commonwealth also have responsibilities, and that is why Labor believes the state government should use the opportunity provided by BHP's donation of land for an industrial park to give back the status of Whyalla as an enterprise zone with a series of tax and other concessions which Labor gave it in 1993 but which the Liberal government took away from it the following year in 1994.

The opposition will be pressing this point in the debate on the bill while having regard to the need to deal with and pass the bill expeditiously. So, I can signify in advance that Labor will support the changes to the indenture bill. I again put on record my appreciation for the efforts of all concerned, including BHP, Lyn Breuer, Geoff Buckland and his unions. By working together in this bipartisan way we can make this a positive, new start for the people of Whyalla.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): On Sunday I had the privilege of attending and opening the campus fair organised by the four Aberfoyle Park primary schools located on the one campus. We have two private schools and two government schools: Nativity and Pilgrim; and Spence and Heysen. Those four schools work together in a way which is outstanding. It is still of interest to people not only from within Australia but, indeed, from other countries to see how private and public schools work cooperatively and share resources in an exciting initiative.

Recently, I had the privilege of attending the SRC induction at Reynella East High School, and I must commend the principal, Peter Mitchell, who has reinvigorated that high school. I was most impressed with the school assembly, including the presentation by some of the visiting overseas students. We often overlook the contribution of exchange students coming to our schools. In this case we had a young lass from Brazil and a young lad from the Netherlands.

Reynella East is the second of the two high schools in my electorate. It is not second in importance, but there are two high schools, the other being Aberfoyle Park High. I am delighted that we have those schools in our community and both of them are eagerly sought after by people enrolling their

secondary school children. Recently, along with the member for Waite (who, like me, is a patron), I had the privilege of attending the Mitcham City Band's ninety-ninth AGM, and we were both very pleased to hear the recital before the actual AGM.

During that meeting, the thought occurred to me that in this state we could do more to promote and showcase brass bands. I realise that in the Barossa for many years there has been an outstanding brass band festival, but I believe that it would be possible in this state to organise something on a much grander scale. That is in no way a reflection on what is done in the Barossa or elsewhere, but we could organise a much larger brass band festival in this state.

One of the encouraging things about the Mitcham City Band is that it now also has a junior band. It is to the credit of the people involved that you can see these young people as well as older people putting in hours and hours of community service entertaining the citizens, whether they be senior citizens or others, and participating in community activities. I say well done to the Mitcham City Band, and I am sure that the member for Waite, like me, is looking forward to their centenary next year.

The issue that probably gets the most attention in my electorate, certainly when I put out a questionnaire or newsletter, is that of roads. I had an enormous response to a recent newsletter and, as a result, have been sending off many letters to the Minister for Transport, for which I make no apology. Many years ago, the then minister (Hon. Frank Blevins) said that I wrote six letters a day about roads. That was a slight exaggeration: it is probably six a week!

The upshot is that the minister, to her credit, has agreed to fund a large new roundabout at a cost of \$250 000 on Happy Valley Drive at a troublesome junction with Manning Road, where visibility is not good and where you have a high speed road meeting a low speed road. I commend the minister for providing that money. The work is due to start in about June or July, with a completion date of September this year. So, I say well done to the minister.

I also send many letters to the City of Onkaparinga, to the Chief Executive Jeff Tate, and I commend him and his council for their prompt response to my requests.

Finally, I acknowledge the start of Youth Week. As minister, I was pleased to inaugurate that, and also to give rise to National Youth Week and to the Youth Parliament. I am delighted that the current minister is actively supporting those initiatives, which I think will gain in strength in years to come and provide a way of showcasing our excellent young people in a positive way. I am delighted to see that those activities are being continued and look forward to being at the Youth Parliament launch later today.

Ms BREUER (Giles): Today I speak on behalf of the people of Whyalla in relation to the divestment of the Long Products Division by BHP and to the changes to the Indenture Act. In February it became obvious to me that this Indenture Act was about to be changed, with very little consultation with the Whyalla community, the chief stakeholders. I contacted the Whyalla council, the Whyalla Economic Development Board and the Whyalla Trades and Labor Council, so that we could look at the changes necessary to ensure that Whyalla got the best deal possible.

It is in everyone's interests, including those of BHP, the government and the opposition, that this new act be passed in a bipartisan manner with minimum fuss. However, the people of Whyalla felt very strongly that these changes

should be for the benefit of Whyalla and that the new act should reflect this. We were somewhat concerned that there had not been extensive consultation with our community, the chief stakeholder in this whole business.

We believe that the act must reflect current community expectations. Continued jobs for the workers were most important in this sale process, while everything else could be put on the table and negotiated. The present Indenture Act, written over 40 years ago, with impacts on our community, was written for a fledgling steel industry. We now have a mature industry and it was an opportune time to change the legislation with substantial amendments. However, no-one, except to some extent BHP, seemed to be consulting with us.

David Knox from the Whyalla City Council and Phil Tyler from the Whyalla Economic Development Board had some discussions with Peter Lockett from the Department of Industry and Trade, and there were some friendly discussions with BHP on invitation with community members, but it appeared that we were being ignored in the whole process. I invited the council, the WEDB and the UTLC to join me, and we met and decided to take some action on this.

I believe that the turning point was 24 February, when I travelled to Melbourne with the Leader of the Opposition (Mike Rann) and we met with David Goodwin and Bernard Carasco from BHP, both of whom subsequently were appointed as senior officers to the new company. I was able to press Whyalla's point of view and I believe that they listened to us.

I believe in giving credit where credit is due, and I am happy to give the Premier and Peter Lockett from DIT credit in this, but I am still very concerned that Whyalla was ignored in the process until BHP realised the folly of ignoring the major stakeholder, the city of Whyalla. In 1978 BHP employed some 6 200 people in Whyalla, whereas presently it employs some 1 400 people; so job retention was essential in the new company. I believe that we have received a very good deal from this new act and this agreement, but I put the Premier on notice that I will be discussing further incentives for our city.

I want to thank the Leader of the Opposition for his frequent visits to Whyalla since the sale process was announced. He met with unions, with council and with the Whyalla Economic Development Board and was particularly consistent in making sure he was there with us and discussing these issues. There are two individuals in BHP I particularly want to thank: Leo Selleck, the CEO of BHP Long Products in Whyalla, who has been very consultative and excellent in this process (I believe that he has the confidence of the people in Whyalla that he will do the best for our community); and David Goodwin, who will be part of the new company.

I believe that he is here today. He has certainly contributed and consulted greatly with our community. There has been a lot of confusion and hurt in the community and we have not really known where we were going, but those two people have steered the process, along with Sid Wilson, who assisted Leo Selleck. I also want to thank David Knox and Eddie Hughes (Deputy Mayor of Whyalla) for their professional, cautious input with no populist vote seeking in the whole process.

Phil Tyler, the CEO of the Whyalla Economic Development Board, I want to thank for his considered political judgments. Geoff Buckland and the union movement were participants in the whole process and able to give their input without making outrageous demands. I believe that Whyalla owes a great debt to these people, and more than they will

ever know. I want to thank them for my town's and particularly for my daughter's future. I am very happy with the float, with the deal, with the Indenture Act and with the new company. It is great for the future of Whyalla.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): It is disturbing to hear even more disturbing details about the Labor Party's preselection woes. We know about the bitter, faction-racked disputes over the preselections in Ross Smith with Mr Ralph Clarke—

Mr Atkinson: There is no Ross Smith.

Mr VENNING:—and in Price with Mr Murray De Laine. Incidentally, I place on the record that we wish Mr De Laine a speedy recovery from his ill-health. The factional brawling continues. In the country electorate of Stuart, long-time Labor supporter and candidate Mr Ben Browne has also run into factional trouble. Letters have been appearing in the country newspapers—and we know country Labor listens. I am wondering whether they are reading. Two letters have appeared in the *Transcontinental*. One letter last week, headed 'What is ALP up to?', stated:

Two candidates are seeking preselection in Stuart: Ben Browne from Spalding, who has lived in the electorate all his life, and Justin Jarvis, who has recently moved into the electorate from Adelaide. Ben ran for Stuart at the last state election, achieving an 8 per cent swing to Labor, almost unseating Liberal veteran Graham Gunn. He should get another go. Ben Browne is a third generation farmer, rural South Australia is his heartland. He has a common touch to understanding the issues within regional South Australia: a hard day's work hasn't come out of a university textbook.

Does this make Ben not sanitised enough to be acceptable to the chardonnay socialists of the ALP? During Ben's political involvement he has always stood up for regional South Australia and a fair go for all. ALP members eligible to vote in the forthcoming postal ballot, I have a question for you: 'Who can best represent the constituency of Stuart?' Apparently Ben hasn't the so-called 'numbers' within the party. Of course the wishes of local party members will be respected, but when the party calls for volunteers on election day some may not be available.

Still country Labor listens. I know Ben Browne. Long before I came here, he stood against me—

An honourable member: He is a good man.

Mr VENNING: He is a good man. He stood against me in 1993. He is a good honest campaigner; he is a nice chap and certainly a character, and a Labor farmer—which is fairly rare. So, there are no troubles with that. Who is Justin Jarvis? Is he the person who signed up all the Aboriginals at Coober Pedy to the Labor Party without their knowledge? It is interesting. Is Mr Browne in trouble because he is a mate of Ralph Clarke? When Ralph went into hiding last year, I knew where he was: he was at Spalding with Ben Browne. So, will Ben Browne be struck down by the same sword that could smite Ralph? It is interesting. Labor never learns: we remember when Mr Ted Connelly defeated the endorsed Labor candidate in Port Pirie. Why do they choose candidates against their own, that is, people who have served them well from the grass roots and who live in the electorate? I cannot understand why they are doing that.

Finally, I note the visit on the weekend to the Barossa Valley by the Ulysses Motor Cycle Club, of which I am a member and whose badge I proudly wear. This is the first time the annual general meeting of the Ulysses Club has been held in South Australia. It had a positive impact on the region, and I congratulate all involved. Normally, when you have 4 000 bikies in town you can count on a bit of trouble, but I must say there was none. Members of the Ulysses club over 40 years of age get a silver membership, and those over 50 get a gold membership.

Ms Key interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I still have a sissy bar on the Harley and I volunteer to take the member for a ride if she wishes. The tent city on the oval was absolutely marvellous. The whole oval under canvas was massive. I was there at 6 o'clock on Friday night, and 3 700 bikes were in by then. The standard of the bikes and clothing, as well as of the people, is a credit to the members of the club, and I am proud to be a member.

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): On Thursday 30 March, in reply to a question from the member for Hartley, the Minister for Local Government said, amongst other things:

The Local Government (Elections) Act also provides for penalties to be applied to those guilty of an offence under the act. The member for Elizabeth and her colleagues ought to be aware of section 57 of this act which deals with violence, intimidation and bribery.

I heard part of the minister's statement and took a point of order objecting to the implication in the statement and asked her to withdraw it. Mr Speaker, the upshot was that because you did not hear clearly what was said you did not uphold my point of order. On reading the *Hansard* report of the minister's answer, it is clear that what the minister said was untrue, highly offensive and to me a breach of standing order 125, which does not permit statements of that nature to be made in answer to a question.

Like all members of parliament, I am not unduly sensitive. Give and take is an essential part of the job. However, the minister's statement implying that I had somehow been involved in behaviour that required her to caution me about section 57 of the act, which relates to violence, intimidation and bribery, went beyond give and take and ought not be allowed to stand. If this highly offensive way of abusing another member is allowed to stand, then it will be open for any member to copy the minister's tactic, that is, to publicly draw to the attention of another member provisions of sections of acts in a way which will imply that the member has engaged in behaviour that may attract penalties under those acts. Such actions by members in the future would obviously be undesirable but I believe inevitable. Mr Speaker, I am requesting that you have another look at the minister's statement with a view to its being withdrawn, not just because it is highly offensive but also because it creates a most undesirable precedent.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair listened very carefully to the honourable member's opening remarks, and the chair does not totally agree with her assessment in the form of words she used and her interpretation of the proceedings last Wednesday. I think if she re-examines them, the honourable member will see that she has put another interpretation to them. I am happy to have further discussions with the honourable member in relation to those words so that she feels more comfortable about where we are going in this debate, but in future all these rulings involve one-off issues and will be treated as such. However, the honourable member has made her point, and I am sure the House is well aware of it.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Today I wish to bring to the attention of the House the success of multiculturalism not only under this government but also in the long term as a result of the bipartisan approach taken by both sides of politics—indeed, the three sides of the politics, as the Democrats would say.

On 27 March I was privileged to represent the Premier at the launch of the Multicultural Youth 'Speak Out' proceedings report by the Hon. Trish Worth, the member for Adelaide. I commend Mr Michael Schulz, President of the Multicultural Communities Council, Jodie Schluter, Chairperson of Multicultural Youth, and all the committees involved in the production of that report.

I also refer to a function which was held last Sunday evening in my electorate by the Australian Druze Community at Janet Street, Glynde, which is in the heart of my electorate. Indeed, I used to walk past it as I went on my way to St Joseph's School at Hectorville. So, I have known of the Druze community for a long time. I commend the Australian Druze Community for holding the fifth annual graduation celebration of the young Druze professionals, both graduates and students who completed year 12. It was the fifth annual graduation celebration, and the shadow minister for education, Trish White, was present, as were many representatives from the education community. I would like to congratulate Mr Fouad Abou-Hamdan, President of the Australian Druze Community, and the Druze Community in general for having such an evening to acknowledge the importance of education.

Some members might ask what this has to do with the success of multiculturalism. I think it is very much evident that the success of multiculturalism can only be measured by the effect it has on young Australians from diverse backgrounds. For multiculturalism to succeed, our youth, the next generation, must not only see themselves as Australian citizens but also be able to retain and be proud of their culture, traditions, language and all the things that enrich our diverse community. That is very much evident in the Druze Community.

The Druze Community is an example of the importance of faith. I do not think we can have true multiculturalism without giving legitimacy to the diversity of faiths that are in our community. As I said, I found the evening, as I have the other evenings, most enjoyable and a very important statement of the importance of education. I was pleased to represent the Hon. Malcolm Buckby on this occasion.

Mr Richard Hamood, the MC, must be congratulated on the success of the evening, as must the speakers, Professor Kym Adey, Pro Vice Chancellor, Access and Learning Support, the University of South Australia; Ms Virginia Battye, Director, Torrens Valley Institute of TAFE, and the speakers from the Druze Community, Mr Maximum Najjar (travel and tourism), Mrs Rima Al Atrash Najjar, (psychology), Mr Samir Madi (information technology) and the students who received certificates.

Time expired.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

WATER RESOURCES (WATER ALLOCATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Water Resources) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Water Resources Act 1997. Read a first time.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: 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.

In August 1999, the Select Committee on Water Allocations in the South East tabled its report.

The Select Committee investigated community views on water allocation and found that two clearly polarised views existed. One view advocates the allocation of water 'on demand', with the capability to transfer water allocations on a permanent or temporary basis. The other view advocates that water allocation must be related to landholding, which has become commonly referred to as pro rata.

The Select Committee considered that the 'on demand' system did not allocate the resource fairly nor did it ensure that water is available to meet the needs of future generations.

The Select Committee found that many people within the South East believe that they have a right to the water located under their land and that their right to the water resource should not diminish when that water resource is prescribed. They also believe that past land values in the South East were influenced by the ability to freely access the groundwater resource, and that they consequently paid a premium for their land.

Conversely, numerous people suggested an 'on demand' system is most effective in encouraging development and investment in the South East as it allows water to be available for persons who are able and are prepared to develop the resource.

As a result of these findings and with a view to establishing a total market based approach to foster the most productive use of available water, the Select Committee recommended the allocation of all the remaining unallocated water on a pro rata basis. The allocations will be levied and it is hoped that this will provide sufficient incentive for those who do not want to, or cannot, use the water, to transfer their licensed water allocation, either through sale or lease.

The Government supported the Select Committee's recommendations, with one exception and agreed to implement the recommendations, starting with the allocation of the remaining unallocated water in the five prescribed wells areas in the South East on a pro rata basis.

On 3 August 1999, the *Water Resources Act 1997* was amended to give the Minister authority to vary the existing South East water allocation plans and to freeze any further consideration of applications for water in the five prescribed wells areas in the South East until the Minister has varied the plans. That amendment gave the Minister the ability to vary the existing plans to provide a policy framework for the pro rata roll out. The freezing of further consideration of applications for water maximised the amount of water that will be available for the pro rata allocations and allows time for the pro rata allocation process to be undertaken.

The Select Committee recommended that the pro rata allocations be held with no requirement for the water to be developed, and to be transferable within the constraints of resource sustainability. It also recommended that before such an allocation could be used in any particular location, it would need to satisfy a hydrogeological assessment. This proposed further amendment, the *Water Resources (Water Allocations) Amendment Bill 2000*, will enable the issuing of the pro rata allocations in the way that the Select Committee intended.

The *Water Resources (Water Allocations) Amendment Bill 2000* will amend the *Water Resources Act 1997* by varying the provisions for water allocations to provide for two types of water allocations, namely water (taking) allocations and water (holding) allocations. The pro rata allocations will be issued as water (holding) allocations unless the applicant specifically requests a water (taking) allocation, in which case there will be specific requirements to be met before such a water (taking) licensed allocation can be issued.

Both types of allocations will be levied, but to provide flexibility for how such levies are set, an amendment has been included that provides the opportunity for different levies to be set for water (taking) allocations and water (holding) allocations from the one resource.

The freeze on water allocations came into effect on 3 August 1999, some eight months ago. There has been a halt on development opportunities while the pro rata process is being implemented. It is now time to finalise the pro rata allocations and to issue the licences. The variations to the existing water allocation plans need to be finalised so that the pro rata allocations have a policy base. The variations to the plans cannot be finalised until this Bill is passed.

Approval of this Bill will allow the pro rata allocation period to be completed as soon as possible, following which any water not allocated through the pro rata process will be available for allocation subject to the policies in the water allocation plans as varied.

I am aware that some members believe that other amendments should be made to the *Water Resources Act 1997* at this time. However, the time needed to draft and debate additional amendments will significantly delay the pro rata allocation of water, and also hold up the opportunities for a number of proposed developments in the South East.

In summary, this Bill will provide the amendments to the *Water Resources Act 1997* that are necessary to enable the pro rata allocation of water in the South East to be undertaken.

I commend this Bill to honourable members.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts definitions of 'water (holding) allocation' and 'water (taking) allocation' and makes other consequential changes to the interpretive provision of the principal Act.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 29—Licences

This clause amends section 29 of the principal Act to accommodate the two kinds of water allocation that can be endorsed on licences.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 33—Method of fixing water (taking) allocations

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 33 of the principal Act.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 34—Allocation of water

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 34 of the principal Act.

Clause 6: Insertion of s. 35A and 35B

This clause inserts new sections 35A and 35B. Section 35A provides for water (holding) allocations. A water (holding) allocation preserves a part of the available water in a water resource for the holder of the licence on which the allocation is for the time being endorsed. Water cannot be taken pursuant to a water (holding) allocation but the licensee can request that the Minister convert the allocation to a water (taking) allocation at any time—see subsection (7).

A water (holding) allocation can only be endorsed on a licence if the relevant water allocation plan provides for the endorsement of such allocations.

Section 35B enable a water allocation plan to provide for preference to be given to certain landowners in the allocation of unallocated water from its water resource.

Clauses 7 and 8:

These clauses make consequential changes to section 36 and 37 respectively of the principal Act.

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 120—Interpretation

This clause amends section 120 of the principal Act. Division 1 of Part 8 of the principal Act provides for a levy based on the right to take water or on the quantity of water actually taken. Subsection (2) inserted by this clause provides that a licence endorsed with a water (holding) allocation will be taken to confer the right to take water for the purposes of that Division thereby enabling the imposition of the levy in respect of that allocation. The other two subsections inserted by this clause are consequential.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 122—Declaration of levies by the Minister

This clause amends section 122 of the principal Act to enable different levies to be imposed in respect of water (taking) allocations and water (holding) allocations.

Mr FOLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

DISTRICT COURT (ADMINISTRATIVE AND DISCIPLINARY DIVISION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second reading.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): 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 aims to simplify and clarify the procedural law relating to administrative appeals.

At present, there are many statutes which create appeals against administrative decisions to the District Court in its Administrative

and Disciplinary Division. The appeals cover a wide range of decisions made by government which affect the lives of ordinary people. Examples include appeals against the refusal of a licence to engage in a particular occupation (such as a licence to be a second-hand vehicle dealer, travel agent, or land agent), against decisions under the *Freedom of Information Act* about the release of information by government agencies, decisions of the Guardianship Board about the care of incapacitated persons, or decisions by councils requiring rectification of premises or control of health hazards.

The purpose of these appeals is to permit a person, who is affected by a decision of government about his or her affairs, to have the decision reviewed by the Court. The Government does not propose any change to this fundamental purpose, nor to the substance of the appeal intended, but seeks to amend the legislation creating such appeals to make the nature of the appeal as clear as possible to the users of the process and to the Court.

Because these appeals have been created statute by statute over several decades, the wording which defines the nature and scope of the appeal in each case can vary considerably from one Act to another, even though the substance of the Court's inquiry is intended to be the same. The variations in wording create a problem. To determine the nature of the appeal created by a statute, the Court must engage in an exercise of statutory interpretation. If different words are used, even though the differences are only slight, the Court must determine whether there is a reason for the difference such that a different meaning should be assigned. This can add to the complexity and difficulty of these appeals, and hence to the cost in time and money, without adding any real benefit to the parties.

The reality is that it is the same appeal which is intended. What is intended is a review of the administrative decision, with a discretion to receive new evidence and a broad power to decide differently. The small differences of wording tend to obscure this. It is this problem which the Bill addresses.

The solution which is proposed by the Bill is to add provisions to the *District Court Act 1991* which will apply generally to all such appeals. These provisions make clear the nature of the appeal which is intended, and the powers of the Court in dealing with it. They will apply to all appeals to the District Court in its Administrative and Disciplinary Division, regardless of which statute gives rise to the particular appeal. Only special and different features of a particular appeal need to be set out in the Act creating the appeal. In this way, there is no need for complex exercises of statutory interpretation and for the development of a body of case law about each particular appeal.

For this reason, the Bill amends the *District Court Act* and also amends each particular Act creating an administrative appeal to the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the Court. In each case, where a matter is dealt with in the general provision in the *District Court Act*, reference to that matter is deleted from the particular Act.

The appeal to be provided in the *District Court Act*, as amended by this Bill, does not fall exactly into any of the three categories of appeal in the strict sense, appeal *de novo* or rehearing. In many of the Acts creating these appeals, it is called a 'fresh hearing' or, sometimes, a 'review'. The Bill does not adopt this terminology but sets out directly the powers of the Court. The Court is to examine the decision in the light of the evidence and material presented to the original decision-maker.

The Court is not limited to consideration of whether the original decision was correct, at the time when it was made, on the evidence then available. The Court may receive new evidence and may substitute its own decision in place of the original decision.

However, the Court must give due weight to the original decision and must not depart from it unless satisfied that there are cogent reasons to do so. This is to ensure that parties present their evidence or submissions fully and properly to the original decision-maker, and do not simply rely on the right of appeal to sort things out. It is also to ensure that the expertise of the original decision-maker and the policy framework in which the original decision was made is not devalued. The Court will not proceed as if the original decision had never been made. The original decision will be the starting point, but the Court is free to depart from it if proper reasons exist.

There are, of course, some matters which will necessarily and properly vary from one Act to another. Examples are the persons entitled to appeal, the time limit for appeal, and the time within which written reasons for decision must be supplied. These are dealt with by the particular Act creating the appeal. However, in some cases, the new *District Court Act* provisions will provide a general rule, to which the statute creating a particular appeal may provide an exception. For example, the Bill provides that, normally, the original

decision does not cease to operate because an appeal is lodged but continues to have effect pending the appeal. However, there will be some particular cases where it is desirable that the decision be stayed on the lodgement of an appeal, and the particular Act in that case may provide accordingly.

The Bill is of a technical nature. It does not seek to change or cut down the right to appeal against certain administrative decisions. Its aim is to remove minor differences in wording in the statutes creating these appeals, which have arisen for historical reasons, but which, if not corrected, could perhaps cause technical difficulty for litigants and waste time and resources both for parties and the Court.

In addition to its main purpose, the Bill also makes minor technical amendments to the Act. For the avoidance of doubt, it makes clear that proceedings in the Administrative and Disciplinary Division, and in the Criminal Injuries Compensation Division, are civil proceedings and, in particular, that the Court has a power to award costs in disciplinary proceedings. This undoes the effect of a recent decision holding that the Court has no such power in disciplinary proceedings. However, costs in disciplinary proceedings, like those in administrative appeals, are only to be awarded where the interests of justice so require. They do not simply follow the event.

The Bill also makes clear that, although the Court is to sit with assessors wherever the specific Act so requires, assessors need not be used for certain technical aspects of the litigation. For example, assessors need not be used in determining questions of costs, in entering orders by consent of the parties or for any part of the proceedings concerned only with questions of law. No benefit is gained by using assessors in these situations as it is unlikely that they would be able to assist the Court in such matters.

Also, it will be noticed that the Bill makes a minor alteration to the requirement for the use of assessors in appeals from the Guardianship Board. It can sometimes happen that these appeals, which concern the liberty and medical treatment of persons under disability, need to be heard urgently. Because assessors are often health professionals at work in the field, they are not always available at very short notice. At present, there is no power for the Court to proceed without assessors in urgent cases when they are unavailable. The Bill provides for that power. This is not, however, intended to detract for the general principle that assessors are to be used for such appeals.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

Clause 2: Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 8—Civil jurisdiction

The proposed amendment makes it clear that all proceedings before the District Court (the Court), other than in its Criminal Division, are to be regarded as civil proceedings, although this does not affect any special rule as to the conduct of proceedings for a contempt of the Court.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 20—The Court, how constituted

This clause proposes to strike out subsection (3) which provides that if an Act conferring a statutory jurisdiction on the Court in its Administrative and Disciplinary Division (the ADD) provides that the ADD is to be constituted of a Magistrate, the ADD will, in exercising that jurisdiction, be constituted of a Magistrate. This provision is not required.

Further amendments proposed will ensure that even when the ADD is otherwise required to sit with assessors, it is not required to sit with them for the purposes of dealing with preliminary, interlocutory or procedural matters, for determining questions of costs or entering consent orders, or for a part of proceedings relating only to questions of law.

Clause 5: Insertion of Division heading in Part 6

The heading 'DIVISION 1—GENERAL' is to be inserted immediately after the heading to Part 6 of the principal Act.

Clause 6: Insertion of new Division

The following new Division is to be inserted in Part 6 of the principal Act after section 42:

DIVISION 2—ADMINISTRATIVE AND DISCIPLINARY DIVISION

SUBDIVISION 1—PRELIMINARY

42A. Interpretation

New section 42A provides that, in this new Division, Court means the Court sitting in its Administrative and Disciplinary Division.

SUBDIVISION 2—ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS

42B. Application of Subdivision and interpretation

New section 42B provides that new Subdivision 2 applies in relation to the appellate jurisdiction conferred on the ADD by the provisions of some other Act (the special Act) subject to the provisions of the special Act.

The following additional terms are defined for the purposes of this new Division:

- decision;
- original decision-maker.

42C. Extension of time to appeal

New section 42C provides that the ADD may, in its discretion, extend the time fixed by the special Act for instituting an appeal, even if the time for instituting the appeal has ended.

42D. Stay of operation of decision appealed against

New section 42D provides that the making of an appeal against a decision does not affect the operation of the decision or prevent the taking of action to implement the decision.

However, the ADD (on application) or the original decision-maker (on application or at its own initiative) may make an order staying or varying the operation or implementation of the whole or a part of a decision appealed against pending the determination of the appeal, if the special Act does not provide that the decision must not be stayed or varied pending the determination of an appeal and the ADD, or the original decision-maker, is satisfied that it is just and reasonable in the circumstances to make the order.

Such an order is subject to any conditions specified in the order and may be varied or revoked by the Court or the original decision-maker (as the case may be) by further order.

42E. Conduct of appeal

New section 42E provides that the ADD must, on an appeal, examine the decision of the original decision-maker on the evidence or material that was before the original decision-maker. The ADD may, however, allow further evidence or material to be presented to it.

An appeal is to be fairly informal and thus, on an appeal, the ADD is not bound by the rules of evidence and must act according to equity, good conscience and the substantial merits of the case without regard to technicalities and legal forms.

42F. Decision on appeal

The ADD may, on an appeal, do one or more of the following:

- affirm the decision appealed against;
- rescind the decision and substitute a decision that the ADD considers appropriate;
- remit matters to the original decision-maker for consideration or further consideration in accordance with any directions or recommendations of the ADD.

42G. Costs and ancillary orders, etc., on appeals

The ADD may make any ancillary or consequential order that the ADD considers appropriate, except that no order for costs is to be made unless the ADD considers it to be necessary in the interests of justice.

SUBDIVISION 3—DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS

42H. Costs and ancillary orders, etc., in disciplinary proceedings
This clause mirrors new section 42G except that it applies in relation to disciplinary proceedings before the ADD.

Clause 7: Repeal of s. 52

Section 52 of the principal Act is rendered obsolete by new Division 2 of Part 6.

Clause 8: Related amendments

Schedule 1 contains related amendments to other Acts, while Schedule 2 contains related amendments to statutory instruments (in this case, regulations) made under other Acts.

SCHEDULE 1: Related Amendments to Acts

Schedule 1 contains related amendments to a number of Acts that confer jurisdiction on the ADD (ie special Acts, as defined in new Part 6 Division 2 of the principal Act) that are consequential on the proposed amendments to the principal Act.

The proposed amendments to the *District Court Act 1991* provide for the following general principles in relation to administrative appeals to be heard by the ADD:

- the period within which an appeal must be instituted may be extended by the ADD;
- the staying of the operation of a decision appealed against;
- the conduct of an appeal;
- the powers of the ADD in an appeal, including the making of orders as to costs.

Each of those general principles is, however, subject to the provisions of the relevant special Act. It is proposed to amend each

of the special Acts to remove any of the provisions now to be inserted by the amendments into the principal Act. If the special Act contains a provision dealing with the staying of the operation of a decision being appealed against, or costs of the parties in an appeal, different from the general provision inserted into the principal Act, those provisions are to be retained in the special Act.

SCHEDULE 2: Related Amendments to Statutory Instruments

This Schedule contains amendments to 2 sets of regulations, in line with the amendments in Schedule 1.

Ms STEVENS secured the adjournment of the debate.

**TOBACCO PRODUCTS REGULATION
(EVIDENCE OF AGE) AMENDMENT BILL**

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 March. Page 664.)

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): The opposition supports this simple amendment enabling vendors of non-tobacco products which can be smoked to be able to require proof of age when in doubt, in the same way as vendors of tobacco products are able to do so. The bill is quite straight forward. It follows the private member's bill of the member for Torrens which successfully moved through this House and the other place last year. In her bill, the member for Torrens highlighted the need to prevent the sale to minors of herbal cigarettes and the intention of her bill was to prohibit the sale to minors of non-tobacco products designed for smoking.

In this bill, we are providing that proprietors who sell these products are able to require proof of age. I would like to ask the minister to answer a number of questions as to the whole issue of requiring proof of age. Will the minister also want to check on these proprietors by sending young people in and testing whether or not these proprietors do in fact obey the law?

As the House knows, last June the minister was reported in the press on this matter, and he followed it up in the House when he referred to the use of young people under the age of 18 going into shops and attempting to purchase cigarettes. Does the minister intend to do this also in relation to the herbal cigarettes? I would also like to ask the minister some questions about how the use of children to catch out cigarette sellers is going. First of all, how many young people have been used so far in this exercise; what ages have they been; what specific training did they receive; and how much are they paid for doing this? I also understand that the proprietors who are visited in this way are followed up afterwards by letter.

I know of at least one instance involving someone who was followed up and was upset about what happened to them because they believed that the assumptions made were incorrect. I think those people were caught out in supplying a cigarette to someone under the age of 18. However, on writing to them, the South Australian Health Commission apparently got some of the details wrong and they were concerned about that. I have also heard about a case where the person concerned did the right thing and did not supply cigarettes to the minor, so they received a letter essentially congratulating them on doing the right thing. At the time that the minister was proposing to do this, I noted the following questions asked by the Hon. Carmel Zollo in the other place of the Hon. K.T. Griffin:

1. Has the Attorney-General received advice on the legal consequences of this proposed activity, and does he accept that this kind of activity could be entrapment?

2. Will retailers trapped by these methods be subject to prosecution and fines?

3. Does this plan indicate that the government is admitting to having failed to stem cigarette sales to young people?

4. What training will these children receive? How will they be selected, and how much will they be paid?

I checked with the Hon. Carmel Zollo earlier today and, to date—even though this was asked on 2 June 1999—she has not received an answer from the Attorney. I am not sure whether the minister would be able to pass on our desire to have that answer from him. We certainly are interested in having that information, as I am also in hearing the answers to the questions I have asked.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I thank the honourable member for her contribution to the debate and the support of this amendment. The amendment relates very specifically to the proof of age concerning herbal cigarettes: it does not deal with proof of age for any other area of the tobacco legislation. The questions the honourable member has asked are completely out of order because they do not relate at all to this bill. I do not wish to be difficult on this. Let me assure the honourable member that a question was asked by the Hon. R.R. Roberts in the upper house I think last week, and an answer to that question is being prepared and largely answers the questions that the honourable member has asked. So, if the honourable member is willing to wait, when the answer is formally answered in the upper house, I think she will find the answers to her own questions.

In a nutshell, four people were involved, two young women and two young men. They were involved in two compliance tests. The answer will give the honourable member the age range, which was 14½ to 16 years, but I will give that detailed information in reply to the formal question on notice. I certainly would indicate to the honourable member that no-one has been prosecuted under this means. It has been used as a means of identifying those retailers who appear to be selling cigarettes to minors without even bothering to ask the age of the people to whom they are selling cigarettes. I saw a letter somewhere (I think to the editor in a newspaper) claiming that these people were making false statements about their age and not showing proof. However, I dispute that. These people have all been trained, they are all under adult supervision, they know the procedure and they are required to answer accurately any of the questions asked of them.

Out of the hundreds of places they have visited that is the only time that that accusation has been made and I would have to say that I do not believe the accusation. It may have been that there was a misunderstanding between the two parties, but I do not believe that the young people involved incorrectly gave their age. They are trained, and apparently on all other occasions they have given their correct age when it has been sought. In fact, in the city the majority of the people did ask and there were no difficulties at all. I am sure that, if these people had been giving wrong or false answers, it would have been mentioned by some other retailer, but I stress the fact that it has not been raised by any other retailer at all. Therefore, I do not believe the accusation that has been made.

In terms of the other information sought, the preliminary answer at least that has been prepared for the Hon. Ron Roberts in another place answers those questions and the

honourable member will be able to get the information when it is formally provided in that House.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

Mrs GERAGHTY: When children are being used to establish that those selling tobacco products are complying with the laws relating to the sale of cigarettes or tobacco products to minors, does that also include the sale of herbal cigarettes?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I think I am right in understanding what the honourable member is asking; that is, when the compliance test is put and we have minors asking retailers for specific cigarettes, are they asking for herbal cigarettes? The answer is no; they have not up until now because it has not been a requirement.

Mrs GERAGHTY: From now on it will be?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: We have not had the legal position to do so. This provision will at least allow that issue to be tested. Up until now we have not been able to test it because, when it came to herbal cigarettes, there was no power to ask for the age of the person concerned.

Ms STEVENS: What sort of procedures will be put in place to inform proprietors of their obligations? Following that, will you be using other young people to test that with these proprietors as well, just as you have with the others?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: First, let me reiterate that we have used the compliance tests on two pilot or trial bases to see how it went. We indicated at the time that there would be no prosecutions, so no-one can accuse us of entrapment in obtaining a prosecution, because no-one has been prosecuted. We have used this compliance testing in a constructive way to write to congratulate those retailers who had done the right thing and reinforce the fact that they had done the right thing.

We have not prosecuted those who had not done the right thing. Rather, we have written to them pointing out that it would appear that they had broken the law; that at this stage we would not take it any further; but that we certainly ask that in future they comply with the legislation and ask for proof of age. That is exactly what I pointed out in June last year: I said that we could go out on an educational program. The first thing we did was send letters to the retailers, and we ran a public campaign highlighting to cigarette retailers what their obligations were. Then we said we would go out and test but that there would be no prosecutions from those tests.

Where we head now is yet to be decided. All I can indicate is that it is extremely difficult to obtain prosecutions unless you have adequate proof. I know members have asked the question in the past, and I suspect that some have not sat down and looked at the detail of how difficult it is to obtain that proof. We have yet to make decisions about what we do in the future; all I indicate here is that so far compliance testing without prosecutions has worked very effectively. Certainly, one or two have written to me in an angry manner but, after all, they are the ones who apparently have broken the law. They should not be angry: they should simply wish to comply with the law. Given that we have not prosecuted them but given them a warning, I should have thought it was even more appropriate that they now be grateful for that fact and make sure that in future they ask for proof of age.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I want to place on record my appreciation of the professionalism of the tobacco control unit; it is a great credit to you and your department. I understand it has considerable respect, not just from people

who are anti-smoking but also from the industry itself and indeed nationally. It is an area where the government deserves some credit. I was concerned, as was the shadow minister, about this sort of entrapment by employing young people as agents to go into delicatessens.

My own local deli in Norwood got a visit in January this year, when a young fellow came in trying to purchase cigarettes. Fortunately, because they are outstanding proprietors and run very much a family deli, they said 'No.' They were a little concerned about the process, but they were also pleased to receive a letter from the tobacco control unit congratulating them on observing the law. I can see that you are trying to make this an educative function. If it goes further than that, some changes to the law might be needed because, if there was a prosecution, a smart lawyer could talk about entrapment or aiding and abetting a felony. So, there might have to be some changes to the law to provide protection for the young person involved, the tobacco control unit or your department. I want to place on record my support for the professionalism of the unit.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I appreciate the leader's comments, because this is a very difficult area. Some people have tried to criticise the department for using young people out there as part of this compliance testing. I think the unit has done it in a responsible manner. We have done it over a six month period, in two bursts—one last year and one this year—in the city and in the country. It has given us a very good feel for how wide the problem is.

Ms Stevens: How wide is it?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have given some figures already but, from my recollection, about 70 per cent of the retailers in the metropolitan area comply, and there is only about 35 per cent compliance in the country. So, can you see that there is a big problem, particularly in the country. I appreciate that the leader has raised the point that amendments to the legislation may be needed, because as currently drafted the legislation makes it almost impossible for us ever to successfully prosecute someone for selling to a minor. Therefore, we are finding it very difficult indeed. We have had lengthy discussions and debate on this. As far as possible we have taken the responsible stance with the present legislation, but how much further we can go is a matter for very fine legal judgment here. Some advice we have received would suggest that we should look at amending the legislation.

None of us in this House would want to see a law which this parliament has introduced, which is effectively being widely breached throughout the community and which is unenforceable. Currently that is almost where we stand. We are therefore looking at where we might go and whether it does require some amendment to the legislation. In the meantime, I stress to the House that we will not use minors for anything other than a voluntary compliance test; and prosecutions will not be involved as a result of that.

Ms STEVENS: The minister has said it is almost impossible to obtain a conviction. What must you do now under current provisions to be able to prosecute someone?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: You must be able to produce the proof. That means secret microphones, videotaping and things like that if you are to be successful. We do not wish to be the FBI or the CIA, and I do not think that should be necessary. We therefore need better techniques that we can use to allow us to go out and secure a successful prosecution. Equally, I stress that we are really asking the retailers to do the right thing. We will continue to push that educational role

very strongly indeed, because I think that is the right approach. Ultimately, however, it is a law passed by this parliament and we need to be able to make sure that the law can be administered.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Signs are displayed in shops that sell tobacco products which clearly warn that the sale of tobacco products to minors is an offence. Obviously, I am hoping that similar signs will have to be displayed relating to herbal cigarette products.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That is my understanding. I will check on that, but my understanding is that signs will have to be prepared pointing out that it is illegal to sell herbal cigarettes to people who are under age.

Ms KEY: Has the minister consulted with the Australian Retailers Association, previously known as the Retail Traders Association, and sought their assistance? If so, what has been their reaction?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Yes, we have. In fact, we consulted with both the Retail Traders Association (now the Australian Retailers Association) and the Small Business Retailers Association, I think it is called (Max Baldock's group). Both associations were part of the original campaign. Before we even announced this proposal we sat down and talked to both associations and received their support and advice. To date both associations have been very supportive of the program that we have put in place.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HEALTH PROFESSIONALS (SPECIAL EVENTS EXEMPTION) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 March. Page 665.)

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): The opposition supports this bill. We accept its necessity. The purpose of the bill is to allow visiting health professionals to provide health care services in the state in connection with special events without becoming registered under state law. We understand that, as part of the memorandum of understanding with SOCOG and the commonwealth, South Australia is required to provide for the registration of overseas health professionals, specifically medical practitioners, associated with the Olympic Games and, more particularly, those associated with the Olympic team that will be visiting South Australia during September 2000.

We understand that New South Wales and Tasmania already have legislation in place and that the bill before this House is modelled on the New South Wales act. We see the sense in making special arrangements because, of course, the present situation is that visiting health professionals must apply for and obtain temporary registration from the relevant registration authority. For events as large as the Olympic Games, and having so many people visiting from overseas, this requirement would lead to a significant administrative burden on the registration authorities. This legislation seems to be a sensible way of proceeding.

I note that, within the bill, visiting health professionals will be strictly limited to providing services to visiting participants with whom they are travelling. The minister will make an order declaring a special event if he or she believes that it will involve significant numbers of participants from another country. We have noted that the bill will allow

visiting health professionals to possess, supply and administer drugs under the Commonwealth Therapeutic Good Act, 1989. We also note that practitioners will not be able to restock drugs or write prescriptions unless specifically authorised by the minister. The opposition supports the bill.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I appreciate the opposition's support for this bill. It is a commonsense approach and is part of the hosting of the Olympic Games. The legislation will allow overseas trained doctors who are travelling with sporting teams to visit Australia to provide the necessary advice, medication and pharmaceuticals, etc., that those team members might require during their stay in Australia. It is far more appropriate that doctors treat their own team members rather than imposing on foreign team members our own doctors who may, among other things, experience the sort of problems one might have with language and understanding.

Also, drugs in sport is a key issue and the last thing one would want is an Australian doctor administering a drug that was legal in medical terms but illegal in terms of sport and participation in the Olympic Games. It is far better that the responsibility be with the visiting teams and their own visiting medical specialists. I appreciate the opposition's support.

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

NATIONAL TAX REFORM (STATE PROVISIONS) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 29 March. Page 668.)

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I thank all members for rushing down to hear my contribution. I will ensure that it lives up to their expectations. I will try to be as informative as I am entertaining. This bill is a substantial piece of legislation. This legislation is the result of the successful passage of the Howard-Liberal government's GST legislation and the consequences that flow from that for the states. The Labor Party at a national level and in each state campaigned vigorously against the GST, as is well documented, during the last federal election campaign. The reality, though, is that we were unsuccessful in defeating the GST at the national level.

It should be acknowledged, though, that the majority of Australians voted against the GST but, as are the quirks of our electoral system, that was not sufficient to gain government for Labor as the coalition government was unfortunately re-elected. With respect to the GST, the state treasurers and state leaders, together with the federal Treasurer and, no doubt, the Prime Minister, bunkered down for some time to negotiate a commonwealth-state financial agreement, the details of which are part of a deal which comprise a schedule in this bill. It is a very interesting document. In a moment I will talk some more about the inter-governmental agreement on the reforms of commonwealth-state financial relations.

I want to say from the outset that the opposition will support this bill. For that, we have no choice. It is not my wish to support the bill. In a perfect world—and had there been the opportunity—we would have opposed the bill. The

reality is that this is an agreement signed off between commonwealth and state governments to which the states had little choice but to agree, given that so much of our funding, of course, comes from the federal government and that the federal government does have state governments in a very vulnerable position when it comes to negotiating commonwealth-state financial relations. It would be both counterproductive and a futile exercise for the Labor Party in South Australia to attempt to amend, deal or reject this legislation as we would have liked to do had we been in a position to do so. As I have said, we are not, so we will be voting for and supporting this legislation reluctantly.

As I speak I look at members opposite and see the member for Colton who, if he chooses to run at the next election, will have to deal with the GST as an electoral issue. The member for MacKillop, who, having recently joined the Liberal Party, is a bit like someone running down to the docks as the *Titanic* is leaving its berth, yelling out, 'Hang on, wait for me', will have to explain to the country electorate of MacKillop, when he gets an aggressive campaign from the National Party and from Independents, why he is such a keen supporter of this GST. Indeed, the minister himself—

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for MacKillop says that he will be delighted to campaign on the GST in his electorate of MacKillop. I notice that the member for Hartley is in the gallery. Of course, since the Minister for Education referred to the ALP candidate for Hartley, Mr Quentin Black, as the heir apparent, I can assure the member for Hartley that Quentin will be campaigning vigorously on this and many other issues. I wonder how many members opposite have actually bothered to read the intergovernmental agreement between the states and the commonwealth that was agreed to by this government. I suspect very few, if any, have read this document. I have, and it is an interesting document. The only piece of the legislation that gives me any comfort, I suppose, is that horizontal fiscal equalisation is now a part of commonwealth legislation, something more than we had before; but that is about all you can get from it.

This document is very suspect in terms of security of finances between the commonwealth and the states. The commonwealth, incidentally, says that we will be cash positive in terms of new income from the GST in the year 2007. Well, that does not hold much for this government. The next government will not have the benefit of that, and just maybe the government after that will receive extra money. From the very day that John Olsen signed up for this I said that he was being hoodwinked and conned by John Howard into supporting it, and ultimately he will see this become reality.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: I urge the member for Hartley to speak of nothing he knows nothing about. Trust me. You just sit there and wait away the next 18 months when you go into electoral oblivion and back to the chalkboard.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: It is a very noble profession, and that is where you are heading. So, I hope you find it noble. Section 5 of the commonwealth-state financial reform package has the following statement—and if anyone believes the federal government they should be concerned when they hear this paragraph:

The commonwealth will continue to provide special purpose payments—

for members opposite who have no clue what that is, that is the tied grants we get from the commonwealth—

to the states and territories and has no intention of cutting aggregate SPPs as part of the reform process set out in this agreement, consistent with the objective of the state and territory governments being financially better off under the new arrangement.

That is a pretty rock solid guarantee—‘has no intention’: that is what John Howard is saying. Instead of putting in, ‘We will not; we guarantee; we promise’, it merely says ‘has no intention’, which is a very lukewarm commitment to not cutting back in commonwealth SPPs if and when we reach a stage where revenue to the states exceeds what has been the norm for the states. Clearly, if the states ultimately find themselves in a revenue positive position from the GST, anyone in this chamber who thinks the commonwealth will let us keep this is deluding themselves. They will cut back tied grants. They will cut back what grants are possible to make sure that, if there is any windfall from the GST, the states do not collect it—the commonwealth does.

It is suggested that the begging bowl trip to Canberra, as a fixture in the yearly calendar of political events, will no longer occur. Again, that is a furphy. Apparently, the state Treasurers will meet—if I am ever fortunate enough to be in that position—

Mr Williams: Wishful thinking.

Mr FOLEY: I tell you what, mate, I would rather be in my position coming into the next election. The margin in Port Adelaide is about 25 per cent. From what I am hearing from Rory and others about the campaigns that will be under way down in the South-East, I think you had better get ready to go back to the farm.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: As I said, Joe, I would sit there and say nothing—honestly. I was saying that the state Treasurers, whoever they may be, will meet on an annual basis to deal with issues—

Mr Condous: I wouldn't imagine you picking a marginal seat.

Mr FOLEY: You're right on that one, Steve.

Mr Condous: You know where your bread is buttered.

Mr FOLEY: Yes. I stood for the seat that I was born in and the seat I live in. I do not live in the eastern suburbs and represent a seat in the western suburbs. I do not live up in the snobby part of town and represent the punters in the western suburbs. I was born and live proudly in the electorate I represent. As I was saying, the state Treasurers will meet on an annual basis to deal with issues resulting from the commonwealth-state financial agreement. Clearly, the issues on which states cannot get agreement with the commonwealth will then be dealt with at the heads of government annual meeting. So, instead of one begging bowl trip to Canberra per year we will have two begging bowl trips to Canberra just to complicate matters.

I refer to various aspects of this bill. The FID will be abolished from 1 July 2001 as will stamp duty on listed securities. Debits tax will be eliminated in 2005. We will ask more questions in committee about a number of other issues with which this bill deals: payroll tax and how the GST is calculated, issues relating to the requirement for councils to pay GST on property, and ways in which we will get around section 114 of the Constitution. As I said, we will support those measures; we have no choice.

Much has been said about the states not being worse off under the GST. As I highlighted in this parliament last week, it has been reported in the media that up to \$200 million

could be the cost of implementation. The Premier says that is a nonsense figure, that it is a lot less than that. I suspect that government itself is having great difficulty in calculating what that figure will be, but if what is coming out of the big agencies of human services and education is right, compliance costs are significant.

We are talking in the tens of millions of dollars, so whether it be \$100 million, \$150 million or whatever it is at the end of the day, it is money that will make the state worse off because we are not being compensated for it. It is money that is not provided for in the budget. I know of no provision in the budget for it, so it is a further significant financial pressure on the budget that has not been provided for.

Given that the government has already spent more than it will raise or have financial benefit from in terms of the budget bottom line from the sale of ETSA and given also that it is considering changes to the emergency services levy, this budget is in tatters. It has no capacity to withstand a significant hit by the implementation costs of the GST. That is a significant financial impost on the state budget and one for which this state and all states will pay very dearly.

The GST is turning into a nightmare for small business. Members opposite laugh. Members opposite say that it is not a nightmare for small business. Well may they laugh, because that clearly shows that they have not been talking to small business in their electorate.

Mr Williams: We are small business!

Mr FOLEY: The member for Mackillop is a sucker for this government because it sucked him in to rejoining it, to getting in his little life raft, paddling out to the *Titanic* and hitching a ride.

Ms Key interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: As my colleague says, he threw himself at the Liberal Party, and it stuck him up behind a pillar and whacked him in a corner next to the member for Hartley, the holder of the most marginal seat in this parliament, someone shortly for oblivion when it comes to electoral success. Perhaps that is what that little area is at the back: perhaps that is where the government parks members prior to their losing their seats in parliament.

It is neat: after the next election (when they are on this side), members opposite will not have to worry about that back row. It could well be an internal management mechanism that the Whip has devised to deal with—

Mr Conlon: The Deputy Speaker will be the Leader of the Opposition. He'll be the only one left!

Mr FOLEY: Indeed, assuming that he can withstand an onslaught from the Democrats in the seat of Waite, or whatever it is called. However, I am being sidetracked by the hapless member for MacKillop who, as I said, is a sucker with this government. The GST will cause this state government much political harm but, ultimately, will hurt a lot of small business people. We lament the fact that the state government will be up for potentially tens or hundreds of millions in costs, whatever that figure may be, but so will small business.

If members opposite have not been into their local bakery, delicatessen or local store and discussed this issue with local business, they really have not been doing their job. I was in Hartley the other day talking to small business people with our candidate Quentin Black, and many businesses in that electorate are very concerned about the impost of the GST. They are quite critical of the local member for his decision to support the GST and for his lack of interest in their affairs.

It is fortunate that the electorate of Hartley has someone like Quentin Black, the Labor candidate. At least someone is taking the concerns of the businesses and the residents of Hartley to people who can make a difference.

Mr Williams: This is the alternative Treasurer of South Australia!

Mr FOLEY: That's it. I don't know who the alternative member for Mackillop is, but I know it won't be you! As I have been indicating, there are some significant issues in this bill that we will go through in committee. I want on the record that this commonwealth-state financial agreement is a product of this Liberal Government and of the federal Liberal Government and not an agreement from which I take any comfort. It is an agreement that I know will cause me difficulty when I am the Treasurer of South Australia. It is something that this government has signed up for that I will have to deal with.

But I warn members opposite that, if I find in the next term of government (should I be the Treasurer) that this agreement cost this state, they will hear about it every day in this parliament. Those few who will be left in opposition will be reminded daily of the financial straitjacket to which they have committed this state when it comes to our financial future. I give that warning: members will have it ringing in their ears day after day, week after week, parliamentary session after parliamentary session if this document becomes the financial straitjacket that I fear it will be on this state. This is their document and their agreement; they signed up for it; and they will wear the political consequences, be they in government or, more likely, a rump in opposition.

I conclude by saying that one amendment will be moved by the opposition. It has been circulated and I hope that all members give it due consideration. It is an amendment to do something that the cowards in the Liberal government in Canberra were not prepared to do; that is, put the GST on the docket: to put the GST right in front of consumers when they have to pay this painful tax. This amendment will require this government not to retreat as cowards as their federal colleagues did, but to place the GST component on any government invoice, government docket or government bill to which a GST is applied. Should it be found to be required on school fees, it will appear on the school fee invoice as it goes out, so that every parent of every child in the school system in this state will know what this state government did when it signed up with its federal colleagues to put a further 10 per cent impost on the cost of sending their kids to school.

The hapless member for Light, himself facing electoral oblivion, has been unable to confirm in this parliament whether schools will have to pay the GST. Fancy a Minister for Education, someone who professes to have some financial background, still being unable to tell this parliament—and here he goes, checking with his mate the member for Gordon whether he will support it—whether or not families will need to pay a 10 per cent GST on their school fees. He does not even have a response from the federal government.

We are not going to let this be a government of cowards, and I say to the member for Gordon, as well as to the member for Chaffey and the other independent-minded members of the Liberal Party (the growing number that there is) that they should think very carefully about this. Do they want there to be openness when it comes to the GST in their electorates? Do they want to play a small but important role in ensuring that families in their electorates understand what the federal government has done when it comes to the GST?

Again I make this statement: if members opposite defeat this amendment today they are cowards, because they will be wanting their constituency to be hoodwinked over the GST, and they want to hope that the government can sneak back into office (both federally and at state level) by hiding the GST as much as they can. Members opposite should stand up for their electorates. I challenge the member for Hartley to stand up for the good people of his electorate, to walk across the floor and not stand with this incompetent government. He should not stand with the cowards on the government benches who will want to hide the GST.

I throw out that challenge, and if the member for Hartley wants again to put the Liberal Party before the people of Hartley, as he is doing with school closures in his electorate, let him do so, and the people of Hartley will soon hear about it. It will be in their letter boxes within days of this vote, and it will be yet another indication that the member for Hartley puts the Liberal Party before the electors of Hartley. I would have thought that even the Minister himself (the member for Light) would actually put the people of Light ahead of the Liberal Party, but given he is the minister responsible for this bill that is perhaps unlikely.

It is an interesting moment in the life of this parliament as we go beyond the two year mark of this government's existence. The member for Bragg was saying today and the member for Schubert the other day—indeed many members opposite—'We have two years to go. This government will stretch out its constitutional right to go 4½ years.' Good luck to you if you want to play that game because I will be in the media every single day beyond the four years reminding the electors how much the pension will be for the member for Light, the member for Davenport and the member for Unley—in fact, all the ministers. I will remind them that they are clinging to their offices because they want to increase their parliamentary pensions bit by bit, day by day, week by week. I throw in that warning. Trust me: if members opposite want to go beyond four years, I will take great delight in calculating the pension entitlements for each minister who is facing defeat as they hang on, simply to improve their pension. I make that point, but I hope members opposite are not that foolish. I give you that prediction, should you be that foolish, that I will be making the point that it is because of the greed of ministers who want to improve their pensions that they are going beyond four years.

This GST bill will add to this government's unpopularity. You have signed up for it; it is your document; it is your creation. Members opposite will wear the long term consequences of it. Unfortunately, the state of South Australia may well wear a greater financial consequence because of the deal for which you have signed them up. With those few words, I indicate that reluctantly, sadly, and with great disappointment, the opposition will be forced into supporting this legislation against its will but, given it is a fait accompli, it has no choice.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I put on the record the genuine disappointment I have that the would be alternative Treasurer for South Australia could stand in this place and make a speech, on such an important financial matter as this bill, which had absolutely no substance in it whatsoever, not a skerrick of substance. I sincerely hope that honourable member never ever becomes the Treasurer of South Australia—and I feel fairly confident that will not come to pass because it would be a great pity.

I listened to the diatribe that issued forth from the benches opposite. The honourable member used the term 'the economic straitjacket' that might be left to future governments. If that is the quality of the person that the opposition would have running the Treasury of this state one can understand why we have been saddled with the economic straitjacket under which this state has suffered for the past seven or eight years. It is an absolute disgrace. The shadow treasurer suggested that the GST would be bad for South Australia. His lack of understanding is mind boggling to say the least. He lacks understanding of the economic basis of South Australia. We have been saddled with a disproportionate amount of wholesale sales tax in South Australia for many years.

Paul Keating in 1985 suggested option C; he saw the beauty of a GST; he saw what it could do for Australia's financial future but he got rolled by the union bosses and the unions just as this mob here would get rolled on a daily basis. That is nothing new. We understand where their bosses are. Paul Keating was one of the few people who had vision but he did not have the guts to carry it through. South Australia is paying a disproportionate amount of tax because we are saddled with a wholesale sales tax. Our state economy is based on manufacturing and the production of goods which are subject to wholesale sales tax to a greater proportion than the economies of other states. Western Australia, which has been going ahead at a much greater rate than any other state in Australia, has not had the burden of wholesale sales tax on a large proportion of its economy. Queensland is based more on providing services than is South Australia and most of the other states, and its economy has been going along well in recent times.

Anyone with any knowledge of economics and the effect of the GST on state economies would realise that South Australia would be one of the big winners out of the GST. I am more than happy to stand up and nail my flag to the pole of the GST. The would be alternative Treasurer pretended that he has some affiliation with small business. What a joke! I can tell the would be alternative Treasurer that I have come from a background of small business—

Mr Foley: I am the alternative Treasurer.

Mr WILLIAMS: The would be. I come from small business and I understand small business. I also understand what Labor Party governments have done and will do in the future to small business. As a result of its scare campaign in the community the opposition is trying to scare small business. I know people in small business are rather anxious but I say to those people that, once they have cut through the rubbish that is coming from the Labor Party in this State and the eastern states and at the federal level, they will find the GST will be introduced and be a bit like the millennium bug. We got up on 2 January and 3 January and thought, 'What was all that about?' In mid July we will say, 'What was all that about?' We will realise that Labor governments or would be governments got it wrong yet again.

I remind the House that, if we are talking about economic straitjackets, we should get beyond the hypocrisy of those on the other side. If there was ever an economic straitjacket put on the backs of the people of South Australia it was done as a result of those people and the economic thinking which emanates from the would be alternative Treasurer.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): I was sitting in my room listening to the political whack that we were getting from the member for Hart and I felt quite upset about one

particular issue. I have always thought that the arrogance of threat is arrogance at its absolute peak and at its worst, particularly when a member comes in here and says, 'If you do not do what we want you to do, I will get out there and talk about pensions.'

It ought to be put on the public record that one of the members who is grizzling about the effect of our pensions at the moment happens to be the member for Hart. He and I had a discussion the other day about pensions and benefits. If we are going to have a go at each other and make threats about each other let us all play a fair and reasonable game. Let us not run around outside this place and talk about how badly off we all will be and then come in this place and put on the public record a threat of what we will do.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: You cannot have your cake and eat it too. I know that you are all bluster and you love threatening people, because you are a perfect example of small men. The smaller you get, the bigger your mouth. I know, because I have been through all this. There is probably nobody more qualified in this House to talk about threats and what actually happens. I know better than anyone the way that the member for Hart works. There is no-one better equipped in this House to stand up and talk about this.

One of the things I will say, and will continue to say: do not come in here and pretend to be the perfect, honest straight little man in this House and then go outside and want us, and me in particular, to work to get certain things to happen for the benefit of individuals. I am very happy to work—

Mr Foley: Put it on the record.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am putting it on the record now.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I am not making any threats. I am purely and simply saying that, if we all want to play this game, I am very happy to do so, and I am very happy to be part of your game, because I have been through your nonsense before.

Let us talk a little about something that I know a lot about, and that is small business. One of the great pluses of members on this side of the House is that we have actually been there and done it and we do not have big mouths. We do not shoot off our mouths in this place when we do not know anything about a matter. At least the member for taxi drivers over there has some idea, but he is probably the only one on that side who knows anything about small business. You cannot come in and waltz around in this place and say, 'I have the answers'. In the long run this tax will be the best single thing for business in this state. In particular, it will be the best thing for small business.

I know that there will be difficulties in the short term, and I know that with the politics in the short term it will be very easy to stir. I remember L-A-W law and all this stuff about what the Labor Party was going to do. They would not know how to lie straight in bed. They put it all in law and did not carry it out. We see the arrogance of the Labor member opposite who comes in here and talks about what he will do when he gets into government. He has not even got past the stage of his apprenticeship. We have two years to go, and we could even take longer if we wanted to. The reality of when we go to the polls is our decision, and being on this side of the House it is our privilege to be in that position.

There will be difficulties with the GST, as everybody knows. I expect the opposition to exploit the situation to its maximum, but we on this side will knock them down every

time they mislead. When they are on the straight and narrow, I will support them, but when they get off to the side, be assured that they will get it from us every single time.

I happen to be in a small business group where there will be big advantages for the consumer. What the member for Hart would not know, because he has probably never had the opportunity to understand the whole business of cosmetics in this community, is that the third biggest purchase by any woman in the community is cosmetics. Who in the family purchases most of the goods? In most cases the woman spends 90 per cent of the family's disposable income, and I will deal specifically here with goods purchased in pharmacies, the tax on those goods dropping from 35 to 10 per cent. Some 27 per cent of those goods, right across the board, will be subject to a reduction in tax from 35 to 10 per cent, and that will be very significant for the community.

There are two sides to every story, but I am getting sick and tired of the arrogance of the member for Hart, who comes in here, bounces everybody, and says, 'I'm the only person who knows what's going on.' The only message I will give the member for Hart is that he must remember that, when you are in government and you talk about 'I', you are done; whereas, when you talk in terms of 'We will do it', you have a chance. I encourage the member for Hart to keep saying, 'I will be the Treasurer.'

Mr Foley: What happened to you?

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: We will talk about that one day before I get out of parliament.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (Peake): Obviously the member for Bragg has just announced his resignation from parliament, talking about leaving parliament already. I want to talk about the remarks of the disgraced member for MacKillop, who has betrayed his electorate by becoming a member of the Liberal Party. He has sold them out. He was the unshakeable, fiercely independent and independent minded member, but when he is put under the blow torch (as the member for Elder said), he can stand up to anything but pressure. A bit of pressure is put on him and he folds. Not only is he now part of the Liberal Party machinery, he is out there defending their tax.

This tax will be an unmitigated disaster. The Liberal Party claims to be the party for small business. They all come in here and say that we have forgotten the small business owner. The fact is that this new tax starts on 1 July, and only one-third of businesses have applied for their ABN number. It will be a disaster. It will affect retail sales, housing approvals, building and renovations. It will affect basically every cash transaction that goes on in this country in the next three years before there is some sort of certainty.

It is amazing that members of the party for small business, the party for removing red tape and freeing up small business—because small business is held down by red tape—are the ones introducing the biggest amount of red tape for small business in Australian history. It is amazing that a farmer would be defending the GST and saying, 'I believe there should be a tax on spending. There should be a tax a food.' What a disgrace! The member for MacKillop, who I believe is a sheep grazer, wants there to be a tax on cooked lamb products. Well done! What a great advocate for his industry. What a great advocate for farmers. What about all those poultry farmers out there who will have a tax imposed on their cooked products? I say to the party for small business, 'Well done!'

We are talking about the changes that have to be made to small businesses with the introduction of the new tax regime.

I cannot believe that the party for small business has been blindfolded and taken to the line by John Howard. I cannot believe that you have all rolled over for him to scratch your belly on this tax. Let us talk about the so-called hidden wholesale sales tax, the hidden 22.5 per cent. If we want open and honest government, how about showing on the receipt the cost of the item plus tax—as happens in the United States with every cash purchase you make in any retail store? I am not asking for much. The whole idea that John Howard and the Liberal Party ran with at the last election was that there were all these hidden taxes and items.

The Hon. M.R. Buckby interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: In the United States, it does now. In the United States, all sales tax—

The Hon. M.R. Buckby: Here!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It does not happen here. We are going to challenge the government to be an open and honest government rather than the secret government it has been in the last four years. We will ask you to support our amendment to show that every South Australian knows how much tax they are paying on every item.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): This bill gives effect to the agreement reached between the Howard government and the states on commonwealth-state financial relationships following the passage of the goods and services tax legislation with the support of the Australian Democrats, and let no-one ever let them get away with their day of infamy in Canberra, when we saw Meg Lees move politically to the right at the speed of light. She has proved once and for all that there are no alternatives to the Liberals except Labor.

I found it somewhat bizarre to hear the cabinet secretary or whatever he is in his latest incarnation—they could not make him a senior cabinet minister, and he would not cop being a junior minister, so he is the cabinet secretary in there but no-one is taking any notice—talking about small business and the GST. Let me assure the House that I have spent weeks visiting small business in the community. I have been talking to small business in the electorate of the member for Hartley. One after another they complained about the compliance cost of the GST. They said that they are given \$200 to help fix the system in time for 1 July. It is costing them \$5 000 for new computer systems and it is costing them to go to accountants and seminars.

If the Premier, the former Deputy Premier and the member for Hartley, who apparently was a huge supporter of the GST, believe that the GST is helping small business, it shows members how disconnected they are from their own electorates. Go out there, Joe, and talk to small business in your electorate. Go and talk to some of your relatives. Go and speak to small business and they will tell you in no uncertain terms that, come September, there will be a cash flow crisis when the first GST payments are called in. It is not just about the \$5 000 for the new computer system or the impost in terms of doing the training courses, attending the seminars and employing lawyers and accountants: it is also about the time cost.

I spoke with Max Baldock, the President of the Small Retailers Association in this state, when I was in the south campaigning against the member for the EST, Mr Broken-shire, and let me tell members what he said. He estimates that complying with the GST is costing a small family business, on average, an extra seven hours a week in terms of administration. If Graham Ingerson, John Olsen or Joe Scalzi think

this is such a great deal for small business, then they have never asked them. I want to put that on the record now. If they believe that small business is happy with the emergency services tax or the GST, then they have to be joking. Go and talk to people in the electorate of Hartley and they will tell you in no uncertain terms and in the most colourful language about the impact on their small business. They want to create a few jobs and make a few dollars but they are being frustrated and strangled by administration.

The opposition is under no illusions that it must support this tawdry piece of legislation. We have to support it because it enables the state to have orderly financial relations with the commonwealth. However, let us not forget that this bill is a feature of an unfair tax. The GST is a regressive package and its main adverse impact falls upon people on low and middle incomes but with great benefits—that is more money—for very high income individuals and big businesses. It is an attempt to change the tax mix away from a reasonably progressive scale of income tax—that is, the more you earn the more you pay—to taxing people regardless of whether they are rich or poor for the goods and services they consume. They are taxed at the same rate, regardless of whether they are essentials or luxury items.

They told us that the inflammatory impact of the GST would be no more than 1.9 per cent, but this is now known to be totally untrue. The government told us that no-one would be worse off, but that is also totally untrue. Every way you look at it the GST is inequitable. The GST is inescapably unfair: it is a tax on the consumption of goods and services. It increases the costs of those goods and services and people on low and middle incomes spend a higher proportion of their earnings on essential goods and services. The GST is not just bad for families, it is a compliance cost disaster, as I have said, for small business.

One of the things that needs to be taken into account is the impact of compliance costs on small business. Too often the debate has been about tax levels, WorkCover, or what have you, but it is the compliance costs of dealing with regulations that are impacting very harshly on small business in this state.

As with the sale of ETSA, the GST was supposed to be a windfall for South Australia and, as with the sale of ETSA, the GST is in fact a disaster. There is no windfall—and now even the Premier and the Treasurer are admitting it. Remember the time of the signing ceremony: we had a few compliant journalists reporting that the GST was to be a great, huge financial win for South Australia. Taxes would be cut, meaning extra money for South Australia. Of course, that has now been reneged upon, and it will continue to be reneged upon over the years.

We know that the budget may have to find as much as \$100 million for each of the next two years just to fund implementation. It is hard to pick which of the two, the Premier or the Prime Minister, were the less credible when they both gave rock solid guarantees that no state would be worse off. That is what the Premier said: no state would be worse off. His deal, when he signed with all the cameras around him, was supposed to bring massive benefits to South Australia. Now we have a situation where we have seen the Premier and the Treasurer sign off on a deal that has severely compromised the short, middle-term and long-term interests of South Australia.

How are the various government departments and agencies supposedly able to meet these costs, costs that could be as high as \$35 million, we are told, in the human services portfolio? What of education? What services will be cut

because the Premier apparently has no clout with his Liberal colleagues in Canberra? We were treated to the spectacle of the Minister for Education telling us that he did not know whether the GST would be payable on school fees. He had written to the federal Treasurer in May of last year, but such is his weight in Canberra that, even though it was in May 1999, he still has not received a reply. We do not know to what extent the GST will apply on school fees.

We have learnt that this government does not yet have a full and comprehensive list of all the state government charges and services to which the GST will apply. There is only three months to go to the introduction of the goods and services tax. What we do know is that the Olsen government is using the GST to take more money from the long-suffering South Australian taxpayer. This government is not content with increasing taxes by 46 per cent since it came to power or lifting stamp duty by nearly 50 per cent over two budgets, but it is now levying stamp duty on the GST itself and on the GST and insurance premiums combined. The GST could apply to a range of state government services and charges such as admission to national parks, school fees, tickets to the zoo, displays in museums and galleries where admission is charged, some local government charges, some court charges, some maps and publications, as well as to various licences, including marriage licences.

The emergency services minister has been threatening councils and insurance companies to disclose the real amount of the emergency services tax. The challenge for the Olsen government, if it is fair dinkum, is now to support Labor's amendment which will ensure truth in pricing when it comes to the GST on state government charges. Here we have the state government saying on the emergency services tax that, if the councils are honest, they have to declare the savings; and they must declare where the EST applies and does not apply. The same philosophical truth should apply to the state government on the GST. Follow the lead of the Victorian government, the Bracks government, and insist on supporting legislation that will make it transparent and obvious that there is truth in pricing.

If people pay their bills, their government charges and their licence fees, they have a right to know what component of their bill is the GST, and that is why the shadow Treasurer is introducing an amendment to this legislation. Some retailers have indicated that they will detail the GST so that customers can easily see how much the retailer is charging them. We believe the state government should do the same.

Where state government charges are hit by the GST this would force the government to declare the fact and itemise the amount. It is basically a challenge to this government to practise what it preaches to others. It is also a matter of basic honesty. I must say that the government's record, from water privatisation to the sell-off of ETSA, to the cutting of basic services, does not give any of us much hope that it will be honest and transparent this time, but that is what is being done in Victoria under the Bracks government. Therefore, I strongly urge members opposite, whether they be Independents, would-be Independents or dissident Liberals: if you are fair dinkum about this legislation, then have the courage of your conviction to support an amendment that simply gives people the right to know when they are paying their state government charges and bills what component of that is the GST. The member for Hartley seems to find it funny. He is the one who came into this parliament strongly advocating support for the GST.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We've got the quote, Joe; it will be sent out to every small business and family in your electorate.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I do not wish to hold up the House at length. A lot has been said about the GST, and it is sad that whenever we have any sort of reform it becomes a slanging match. In 1985 I was a year 12 economics teacher, and I remember quite clearly that 'option (c)', a broad based consumption tax of 12.5 per cent, was proposed by the then federal Treasurer, Paul Keating. If we look at taxation in Australia we see that we are not the highest taxed country in the world per head or as a percentage of GDP. Countries such as the Scandinavian countries, Germany and the UK pay a higher tax rate as a percentage of GDP than we do. What is wrong with our tax system is that different groups pay a disproportionate level of tax, and one of the most disproportionate is the pay-as-you-earn taxpayer. The members opposite through the trade union movement represent many of the workers and, I believe, often represent them well. (I am not a union basher, as I happen to be a member of a union). I would have thought that, if they looked at it seriously, they would know that this country needs tax reform. When the GST was proposed by the then Treasurer Paul Keating it was 12.5 per cent; now it is 10 per cent.

There have been many arguments about how compliance with the GST will affect businesses and so on and I agree; there will be some difficulty in its implementation. There will be difficulties, and we will not see the benefits overnight. With any reform you will never see the benefits overnight; you have to have time to implement the tax and adjust. I believe that the groups that are affected have to be compensated, and the federal government has done that. The Leader of the Opposition talked about the inflation rate. Will he blame the federal and state governments for the increase in oil prices that has lifted up the inflation rate? Let us be honest when we discuss issues such as this. Let us look at the overall percentage of tax that this country pays on the gross domestic product and look at the various forms of taxation which hurt different industries.

I believe that, if we are honest about it and try to come up with something which is better for the well-being of this country, it should be supported by both sides of parliament and not used for political point scoring about the difficulty in the implementation stage, because there will be difficulties. I support tax reform, which will be good for this country, which will ultimately put every Australian in a position where they can have a future and which will encourage people to work harder, because at the moment, with the level of pay-as-you-earn tax that people pay, there is disincentive to work harder. I am not saying that the system that will be implemented will be perfect, because no system is perfect, but I can tell you that the present system is far from being perfect. Instead of the members opposite attacking the reforms, they should come up with a solution and try to implement the much needed reforms that their Paul Keating wanted to introduce as option (c), the 12.5 per cent tax, in 1985. The taxation reforms that are needed in this country are long overdue. I am glad they are taking place, and I hope that their implementation will be a lot smoother than the members opposite would have us believe it to be.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I thank the member for Hartley for his half baked lecture on economics. It was as irrelevant as it was inaccurate, but if the honourable member would like

to be given a briefing on how fuel pricing works I suggest that many country members in South Australia would be delighted to do that for him. Why I say it is irrelevant is that another tier of government took a tax proposal to the public of Australia and it was successful. Whatever we thought about it before the event, we know that one of the tenets of democracy is that you respect the majority view. Let us not have a debate on that: let us come back to focusing on the implementation. To that end I will speak briefly about two matters. One is the propensity for us to have a tax on a tax. There are many examples where this will occur, and I am disappointed that to date I have not had a response to correspondence that I have forwarded to the Premier in relation to one specific example where, if you run a laundry for example and as part of the of your business you rent your product, and your return per month for that product is more than \$2 000, you pay a 1.8 per cent rental tax. But now that \$2 000 will conclude GST, so now you will be paying a tax on a tax. There are many other examples and I do not want to waste the time of the House in exploring them. I would like to explore how the state government intends to deal with this problem of a tax on a tax because it said that it would not allow that to happen. As I said, there are many examples.

The other matter I want to speak to briefly relates to the amendment proposed by the shadow treasurer, which has a great deal of merit. The shadow treasurer is proposing that where part of an account attracts GST that is identified. It is my understanding that that will happen so, to that end, the amendment may be irrelevant. If I am convinced that that will happen anyway, and if the shadow treasurer is convinced that that will happen, we will be happy to accede to the government in that regard.

The second part of the shadow treasurer's amendment indicates that, on all other accounts that totally attract GST, GST is included. Of course, any account that anyone receives will include GST unless it is identified that it is a part GST. One would expect every South Australian to understand that an account received from the government includes GST automatically unless it identifies that in part it includes GST. Again, as much as I support the intent of the shadow treasurer's amendment, the point is that, over time, all South Australians will understand that, unless it states otherwise, every account from the government will include GST anyway. Therefore, the only question will be: do we need to tell people a second time and, if so, what will be the cost of that? When dealing with this amendment in committee I will certainly explore that aspect further.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank all members for their contributions. Members must remember that this is a major change to taxation reform in Australia. I find it interesting that the opposition's position to this legislation is similar, I guess, to what Prime Minister Keating did to the former GST proposal introduced by John Hewson. When the opposition talks about this tax reform measure it always states that 10 per cent will be added to everything that currently exists. It conveniently overlooks the fact that retail sales taxes and wholesale sales taxes already apply on a large range of goods available in our community, many of which attract some 22 per cent retail sales tax.

The opposition completely overlooks the fact that that sales tax will be abolished, so the price of some goods will very likely be reduced, even with compliance costs taken into account. Members opposite completely overlook that side of

the equation, of course, because it is convenient for them to build up the community angst against the GST by implying that 10 per cent will be added to the price that people now pay. That is simply not true in every instance, even though the opposition would have us believe that. Also, it is convenient for the opposition to overlook the fact that, when the GST is introduced, there will be income tax cuts for all Australians in recognition of the increased cost of goods.

The federal government has indicated that a reduction in income tax will become available, as well as an increase in social security benefits and pensions to all recipients across Australia. It is all well and good to argue that everything will cost 10 per cent more (or imply that that is the case) but one should not completely overlook the fact that pensions will increase and that the cost of many goods will be reduced. The opposition's argument completely overlooks those facts because it suits members opposite. This tax will deliver changes to our taxation system. It picks up those people who currently deal in the black economy. In many cases this measure will detect whether someone has purchased goods and paid cash for them. I do not say that every instance will be detected.

Mr Koutsantonis: It won't.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: It won't, and no-one has said that it will. However, it will pick up a great deal because, at the moment, where someone pays GST on a particular item I imagine that, in terms of an input tax credit, they will want to get it back. It is a tax that goes far deeper than what the opposition is saying in terms of its benefits to the community. The member for Hart indicated that he will let us know if this government is worse off. I assure the member for Hart that every state government signed up to the same agreement, whether they be Labor or Liberal, in terms of benefits to the state. By the year 2006-07 South Australia will be much better off than under the old system.

In the meantime the federal government has assured state governments that they will not suffer, and that agreement applies to every state government. I am advised that there is no difference between the agreement with South Australia and the agreements with other state governments in Australia. Again, I thank members for their contribution to this debate.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 and 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Mr FOLEY: What is the estimated cost of implementation of the GST across government?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Our advice at this stage is that it will cost about \$46 million.

Mr FOLEY: Is that \$46 million total or per annum?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I am advised that that is the initial one-off cost of implementing the GST.

Mr FOLEY: Is the minister saying that there will be no additional cost in any government agency?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The \$46 million is the initial compliance cost. There will be recurrent compliance costs that government pays out on a recurrent basis. We do not have an estimate or a ballpark figure of those costs at this stage but, obviously, they will be significantly less than the \$46 million.

Mr McEWEN: When does the state government believe that there will be a positive impact in terms of state receipts as an outcome of the GST?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The estimates so far are that, by 2006-07, the state will be in a credit situation, in terms of comparison; we will be much better off.

Mr McEWEN: Given that advice, why has there been two years of slippage? Earlier on, when the Premier spoke about the merits of the GST, it was stated that 2004-05 would be the first time it showed a positive impact on state receipts.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The changes that the Democrats in Canberra inflicted on the Howard government with respect to GST cost the commonwealth government some \$2 billion. The slippage from 2004-05 to 2006-07 occurred as a result of those changes by the Democrats.

Clause passed.

Clause 4 passed.

New clause 4A.

Mr FOLEY: I move:

After clause 4—Insert:

PART 4A

GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTS

GST component to be separately identified in government accounts

4A.(1) If a government account includes a GST component, the amount of that component must be specified, and identified as the GST component, in the account.

(2) In this section—

'government account' means an account for payment issued to the person required or expected to make the payment by a department, administrative unit, agency or instrumentality of the government or the state (including a school council constituted under the Education Act 1972);

'GST component' means an amount to offset or reimburse a liability to GST or a liability under Part 3 of this Act.

I indicated before, in a somewhat robust debate on the GST, that I wanted the government to put on any government invoice, charge or receipt a printed statement highlighting the GST. I used some colourful language in relation to the federal Liberal government being cowardly in its decision to hide the GST from the people South Australia. I want to give members of this House the opportunity to put that on the record. I note that the member for Bragg was most upset with part of my contribution where I referred to parliamentary pensions, and I certainly respect his right to be so aggrieved. I simply point members back to a tactic employed by the then Leader of the Opposition on 7 October 1993 as one instance—and I am sure there are many others—when he talked about the then Labor government going beyond its four years in parliament. The then Leader of the Opposition said:

Labor will never learn its lesson: Labor cheats; Labor misleads; Labor misrepresents; and Labor tells lies. . . While Labor ministers stay in office to allow the superannuation cash register to tick up thousands more dollars for them they are, at the same time, deliberately leaving. . .

I make the point that in politics what goes around comes around. I have no doubt that many people will scour my statements. I simply wanted to reinforce to this current government the very same tactic that it employed in 1993 when there was some suggestion that the then Labor government might have gone beyond four years. I am simply returning the compliment and doing nothing more than Dean Brown himself did.

In terms of my proposed new clause, the opposition wants to make it very clear that on government invoices, be they a ticket into the zoo or a school fee notice, the impost of the GST should be clearly marked: we should make it very clear that the 10 per cent GST component is on that invoice. In answer to the member for Gordon, I am not convinced—not that I have heard the government's response—that the current process will allow that to happen. I simply want a little

openness and honesty: I want the government to be up front by printing the GST on government invoices.

Mr McEWEN: I have some questions on this proposed new clause. I am not ready, yet, to put it to a vote. There are already some questions, though, as part of the introduction of the member for Hart's proposed new clause. I am wondering whether the minister wants to address those questions before he answers my questions. I thought we were pausing for the minister to respond to the questions: I did not realise we were pausing so that the acting chairman could put the question.

As I suggested earlier, I can see two issues within the member for Hart's proposed new clause. First, anyone who pays a government account, part of which attracts GST, will need to know in dollar and cents terms how much that is as part of gaining a tax credit. For example, in paying a registration fee on a vehicle which is part of my business, I will also pay compulsory third party insurance, stamp duty, the emergency services levy and GST. On which of the components of my motor registration account will GST apply? If it is to apply to all components, how do we address the other issue that I raised with the minister in my second reading contribution, namely, will we now have a tax on a tax? Or, will we say that a levy is not a tax and therefore we will pay GST on the levy? How will all this be framed within an account which identifies that clearly to me, because I need that within 28 days to forward, in turn, my credits and debits in relation to my business and the impact GST has on it?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I am advised that with regard to car registration only compulsory third party insurance will attract the GST, and that will be shown on your registration notice. So the GST will not apply to the registration cost or the emergency services levy.

Mr McEWEN: So, it will not apply to the stamp duty payable on car registration, either? Would the same apply for, say, school fees? Would some parts of school fees accounts attract the GST and some not? The account must quite clearly specify not only which components of the account attract the GST but also a dollar amount on that account.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: We are still awaiting taxation office confirmation of just exactly what is in and what is out. That was raised at MCEETYA with federal minister Kemp by all education ministers. We are all in the same position. I can tell the honourable member this much: for instance, if included in the school fees is the cost of a school excursion for the purpose of biology or something like that which is related to a particular subject and for which the excursion is to increase the knowledge of students in that subject, a tax is not applicable. Where a student purchases, rents or leases an item—either from the school or from Target, for instance—a goods and services tax is applicable. So, if there are items within the school materials and services fee which the student is purchasing, renting or leasing (and the best example I can give you is the rental or hire of a musical instrument by a student), our advice at this stage is that, yes, it would attract the tax. We are still awaiting further advice, as I have said consistently, from the taxation office. We raised that with minister Kemp—as did all ministers—last Friday in terms of the length of time that we have had to wait for that advice, and he assures us that he similarly is pressing the taxation office to get that advice as quickly as possible.

Mr McEWEN: You now pose a dilemma. I believe that you are supporting the member for Hart's amendment, because you are saying that the same thing will happen anyway. My only problem is that the member for Hart's

amendment ensures that it happens, but you say that you think on your best advice that it will happen. If I want to make sure that it happens (and I understand from you that you also wish it to happen), it would seem that at this stage the best action I can take to achieve the objective I share with you, minister, is to support the amendment. My understanding of what you are saying is that it does not really matter at this stage what the government determines is in or out. The important part is that what is in will be identified on the account, and the dollar amount of the GST that is attracted by the part of the account that is in for GST will be identified on the account, and that is what the amendment is asking for.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Under the GST legislation, persons or businesses that produce goods and services can request that a tax invoice be supplied by a supplier within 28 days. The GST will not be required to be shown separately on any such invoice if all the items on the invoice are fully subject to GST. The member for Gordon said earlier that in time people will know that a GST is added on, and that is correct. If it applies to the whole amount of the invoice, then a person can assume that one-eleventh of the amount the person pays is the GST amount.

If it does not apply on the whole amount, as the member for Gordon raised in terms of the registration of a car (where it applies only on the compulsory third party element of the registration), then it must be shown what part of that bill attracts the tax. The tax invoice will need to identify which charges are subject to GST and show that GST amount separately. The registration of a vehicle is a classic example of where it does not apply to the stamp duty, to the emergency services levy or to the registration amount but it does apply to the compulsory third party fee, so that the amount of GST applicable to that CTP will show on the registration docket.

If it does not apply to the whole of the bill, it will be shown. If it does apply to the whole of the bill, then consumers can assume that one-eleventh of the amount of the bill is GST.

Mrs MAYWALD: I think that the minister has just introduced another area of confusion to this equation. We have three types of accounts here: an account where GST is applicable to all components; an account where part GST is applicable; and an account where perhaps no GST may be applicable. The minister is saying that the government's obligation will be to identify GST where part GST is applicable but that in the other two instances there will not be a requirement, so how will a business operator know whether GST is not applicable at all or whether it is applicable on the whole bill, to determine whether it has to establish that the one-eleventh charge is a GST input cost to the business, if there is no way of identifying between the two bills where all GST is applicable and no GST is applicable?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Let us take a health bill, for instance, for which GST does not apply. It would be commonsense for the payer of the bill to ask the agency they are dealing with whether there is any GST in the bill and, if it did not apply to that bill, they would immediately get the answer that no GST is applicable.

Mrs MAYWALD: In paying every bill as a business rather than a patient for a health account, does that mean that, when we receive a bill from every agency, we need to ring them to ask whether or not GST is applicable if it is not on the bill? If that is the case, how many extra staff will be needed to handle the calls?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Businesses will want to claim the input tax credits, so obviously they will be notified in terms of the amount of GST that is payable in terms of a business, because if GST is applicable they will want to claim those credits. They will not have to ring up but, if the honourable member is talking about health accounts, they are basically personal accounts that we are dealing with in that sort of situation where GST does not apply. If you are dealing with other accounts, it is a matter of, because they will need to claim the tax credits, they will be advised.

Mr FOLEY: A simple question: somebody buying a ticket to go into the zoo—will they pay 10 per cent GST on an entrance ticket to the zoo?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: Yes.

Mr FOLEY: I hope that the Independent members heard that. When they go to the zoo, people will have to pay a 10 per cent—

Mr WILLIAMS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Chairman. Are we debating the member's amendment? The point of order is that we are debating the member's amendment and he is asking the minister questions about his own amendment.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Hamilton-Smith): It is a debate. I do not uphold the point of order. The member for Hart may proceed and ask whatever questions he wishes.

Mr FOLEY: What has the government picked up in him? What has it got in the member for MacKillop? No wonder he has been put behind the pillar!

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Hart will ask his question.

Mr FOLEY: I say to the members for Chaffey and Gordon that we will pay 10 per cent GST on a ticket to the zoo. Will there be a notice on that ticket that says 'Plus 10 per cent GST equals \$1', or whatever it may be?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: No, there will not be. It will be similar to when you buy an *Advertiser* or a *Sunday Mail* from the newsagent and it costs you \$1:40; there will not be anything on the bottom of the page which says that you will be paying 14¢ in GST.

Mr FOLEY: That is my point. I used the zoo ticket as an analogy because it is an easy one to identify the point I am making. I accept that the minister does not have responsibility for the private economy, but the point we want to make is that we do not want the state government to hide behind the cowardice of the federal government in not allowing the GST to appear on dockets which, as we know, appears in most if not all countries that have a value-added tax; you get it on your invoice.

This government wants to hide it. If you cannot find it on a ticket to the zoo, you will not find it on a school fees account, and you will not find it on a raft of other government charges. I urge all members—and I say to the member for Hammond that I think this is a good amendment—to let us have some transparency in the GST. It does not affect the application of it. It does not affect the commonwealth/state financial relations. It just means that when ordinary South Australians pay the GST it is identified where it is appropriate on the government invoice.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: The honourable member's amendment will force a cost of compliance on the government that is not going to be forced on private industry. He has just said that, if you buy a ticket from the zoo, private industry is not required to ensure that that is shown on the bill, but he is asking the state government to take up that extra compliance to ensure that people know what is on the bill.

Well, that compliance will cost the government money. It is not there for the private sector; it will cost the government additional money, and that is why we are not supporting this amendment.

Mr WILLIAMS: I am interested to know how the member for Hart got to ask three questions on his own amendment. I would have thought that if you put up an amendment you would know what the amendment was about and you would not have to ask three questions. I am not quite sure what is going on.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: It is your amendment. I am pleased that you brought me back on track and used that phrase about 'narrow focus', because that is the point in my speaking against this amendment. If you listen, you might learn something. You have spent half of this afternoon demonstrating to this parliament that you know very little about what is going on. You have demonstrated that you are unable to think of two things—

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I ask the member for MacKillop to address his remarks through the Chair.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Acting Chairman. The point I wish to make is that the opposition is running an agenda. It picks out selective points and tries to run the effect that the GST will have on selected points without looking at the whole picture. The whole picture is that there will be losses and costs and benefits. The opposition is not willing to look at the benefits; it wants to concentrate on the costs. That is exactly what this amendment does. This amendment picks on government accounts only, because some of them will be subject to GST. Currently, no wholesale sales tax is paid on these because they are services and, as we know, no wholesale sales tax is paid on services.

If the opposition was truthful about its intention to be honest and open, it would suggest that this measure be applied right across the board to all purchases and sales. The reason it will not do that is that it knows full well that there are a lot of benefits in the GST. A great number of the goods that people in the community purchase will be cheaper. The opposition is trying to suggest that we should individually label where the price goes up but it would not entertain any suggestion that we actually label goods where the price goes down, because that does not suit its agenda. This amendment is nothing more than a political stunt, as the move in Victoria is nothing more than a political stunt. It does nothing to help people understand the tax system. It does nothing to help the new tax system and its introduction. I sincerely hope that the committee will reject the amendment.

Mr LEWIS: It strikes me that where the rubber hits the road in the argument is that there are three categories of invoices being sent out by government. I am grateful to a number of members, particularly the member for Gordon, for the understanding I have at the present time, but I am seeking from the minister his acknowledgment that my understanding is correct. There are three categories of invoices. In the first instance there will be those goods and services provided by government which are exempt from GST, which do not contain any GST. There is a second category which attracts some GST on the goods and services which are the subject of the invoice and in those circumstances currently the legislation requires that to be disclosed, namely, the component which attracts the GST and the amount of the GST so attracted. That must show on the invoice. So far, I am with it.

The point of departure in my head relates to the third category, that is, where a GST is applicable on the whole of the amount such that, if the bill were to be \$100 without a GST and the whole of the amount attracted a GST of \$10, an additional amount would be placed on the bill and the invoice would be sent out under the legislation as it stands not indicating that there was any GST as a component in that invoice. So, bookkeepers in medium and larger businesses and small business operators who do their own books and who were not astute would not know that 10 per cent of the bill was, in fact, GST. Their problem would be that they could not claim that back immediately on their tax return, as they are entitled to because it is a business expense that relates to the tax that is deductible from their GST return when they are required to submit it. In my opinion, that is not proper.

I seek from the minister a clear-cut statement that regarding this third category of invoice the member for Hart, the member for Gordon and I are mistaken, that the member for Hart's amendment is redundant, and that the GST will be shown on such an invoice. Either it is shown or it is not shown as a requirement in law—not what will happen because we are nice people. To hell with that—I have had enough to do with public servants even before I became a member of parliament to know that they bloody well will not do it unless they have to. Their job is to con the minister into producing legislation that makes their job and their administration as easy as possible and to put the burden of responsibility onto the poor sod, the citizen, who is trying to operate a business and make a quid.

An honourable member: Yes, minister!

Mr LEWIS: To hell with 'Yes, minister'. My commitment from day one upon arrival here was to ensure that the complexities of government were simplified and that the exigencies and plethora of paperwork were, as far as possible, reduced. It strikes me that what the member for Hart says and the advice that I have received from discussion with the member for Gordon and the member for Chaffey is correct: that in that third category, the government account, all of which is subject to a GST, is not in law required to show that that is so. If that is the case, I support the amendment.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I move:

That the committee have leave to sit again on the next day of sitting.

Motion carried.

Mr FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Acting Speaker. What has just happened—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: No, that is not the agreement. We agreed to deal with this bill now.

An honourable member: It should have been on motion.

Mr FOLEY: No. That was the agreement with the Deputy Premier. You're not going home on this one.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! Does the member for Hart have a point of order?

Mr FOLEY: My point of order is that I understood that the Labor opposition had entered into an agreement with the Deputy Premier to complete this bill over the course of the next 30 minutes. I understand that you are talking about adjourning this bill until tomorrow because you have confusion about this amendment.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will take his seat. It is not a point of order. I do not uphold the point of order.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I move:

That the sitting of the House be extended beyond 6 p.m.

Mr FOLEY: Hang on. On a point of order—

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hart will take his seat. I have put the question.

Motion carried.

GOODS SECURITIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

MISSING DOCUMENTS

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J. HALL: After another round of Labor muckraking this afternoon, it is time once again to set the record straight on the circumstances surrounding the theft from my car late last year. The member for Lee has sought to imply that either police were misled or misleading information was supplied to the member for Mitchell in response to an FOI request about the existence of a list of missing documents. This is not true, and it is a clear misinterpretation of the facts.

The facts are, as I have consistently outlined, that six bags were stolen from my own car on the evening of 8 November 1999. Four of these bags were recovered from two separate locations in Stirling the following morning. The contents of the recovered bags were checked by my office and all official documents marked out to me the previous day were found to still be in these bags. The only items that remain unrecovered are personal effects and copies of papers such as media clippings and general reading material.

My office did advise police in December that details of the property stolen were being compiled. After checking personal receipts, I was seeking to provide more specific information on the personal effects that remain missing. This information has since been provided. I consider it to be personal information provided to police that outlines what items—and I stress that they are personal items—remain missing. Details of these personal items were not covered within the opposition's FOI request, and should remain personal. I again reiterate: there is no list of missing documents, because no official government documents are missing.

I also wish to make clear that the transfer of official documents to me by the Minister for Recreation and Sport was solely in relation to a transfer of responsibility for the staging of the Olympic football tournament. The opposition has continually tried to cloud issues surrounding this break-in and the facts. In a news release of 21 December 1999, the member for Spence stated:

The FOI documents also indicate that the thief entered Mrs Hall's car by a rear window and that there was no damage. I want to know from Mrs Hall whether she accidentally left the window open or a door unlocked.

Yet in information that was contained in the Attorney-General's comments, which the opposition has conveniently

or deliberately overlooked, the Attorney states that police have advised as follows:

The rear left side window of the vehicle had been manipulated to bypass the lock. The rubber surrounding on the window had been displaced.

Having failed on this rather grubby and malicious tactic, the Labor Party is now trying a new one. It will not work because the facts speak for themselves.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

The House divided on the motion:

AYES (17)

Armitage, M. H.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Buckby, M. R. (teller)	Condous, S. G.
Evans, I. F.	Gunn, G. M.
Hall, J. L.	Ingerson, G. A.
Kerin, R. G.	Kotz, D. C.
Lewis, I. P.	Matthew, W. A.
Meier, E. J.	Olsen, J. W.
Venning, I. H.	Williams, M. R.
Wotton, D. C.	

NOES (18)

Atkinson, M. J.	Bedford, F. E.
Breuer, L. R.	Ciccarello, V.
Clarke, R. D.	Conlon, P. F.
Foley, K. O. (teller)	Geraghty, R. K.
Hanna, K.	Hill, J. D.
Hurley, A. K.	Koutsantonis, T.
Maywald, K. A.	McEwen, R. J.
Rann, M. D.	Snelling, J. J.
White, P. L.	Wright, M. J.

PAIR(S)

Brindal, M. K.	De Laine, M. R.
Brown, D. C.	Key, S. W.
Penfold, E. M.	Rankine, J. M.
Scalzi, G.	Stevens, L.
Such, R. B.	Thompson, M. G.

Majority of 1 for the Noes.

Motion thus negatived.

[Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.]

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The House will remain silent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order—member for Stuart and member for Hart!

FIRST HOME OWNER GRANT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 29 March. Page 695.)

Mr FOLEY (Hart): I will speak on this bill and highlight the incompetence of the Deputy Premier of this state to manage the business of this House.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I rise on a point of order, Sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The honourable member has cast an improper reflection on the Deputy Premier, which is contrary to standing orders. I ask that it be withdrawn without qualification.

Mr FOLEY: I will not withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Hart. Let us be quite clear: I will not stand here this evening and be shouted down by anyone in this chamber—anybody, and be warned. We will have some sanity in this chamber this evening. In respect of the point of order, the Deputy Premier is in the chamber and, if he was aggrieved, he had the opportunity to rise in his place: he did not. The member for Hart.

Mr FOLEY: I repeat: the Deputy Premier has incompetently handled the business of government tonight. The Independents understand what we were promised at 6 o'clock. At 6 o'clock we were promised that we would deal with this bill.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the member for Hart is gilding the lily to some extent. He knows what happened before, and I cannot be responsible for his behaviour.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. I ask the honourable member to return to the bill before the House.

Mr FOLEY: I will return to this bill because it is consequential to the financial agreement between the states and the commonwealth. As the member for Gordon and the member for Chaffey are acknowledging right now, we understood that this bill would be brought on after dinner. That is what the Deputy Premier told the member for Gordon, the member for Chaffey and me. He discovered that this bill had been adjourned only when the minister responsible for this bill in this House asked the Clerk, Deputy Premier, lift your game as leader of government business, because you cannot—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: No, the Deputy Premier has not handled government business properly.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the honourable member to return to the bill now before the House.

Mr FOLEY: This state government knew before the dinner adjournment that it had lost the support of the House.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, and the matter of relevance, the discussion generally by the honourable member is quite irrelevant.

The SPEAKER: The chair has twice requested the member for Hart to return to the bill. I ask him to return to the bill before the House.

Mr FOLEY: This debate is relevant because this bill we are now debating is consequential on the previous bill. It is the first home owners grant scheme that is a flow-on—

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: If members opposite want to play games in this parliament, go right ahead.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order. Before calling on the minister, I ask members to respect the standing orders and work towards them, otherwise we will not get through the night without people getting an early minute.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: In the rules of debate, order normally depends on all remarks being addressed through the chair, rather than confrontationally across the chamber. I ask you to rule on that matter, Sir.

The SPEAKER: I certainly rule in favour of that point of order. Everyone knows that remarks are addressed through

the chair. To ensure discipline of debate I ask members to observe standing orders this evening.

Mr FOLEY: I will come back to the point that the first home owners grant scheme, under the bill with which we are now dealing, is a \$7 000 financial grant to first home owners. That was a decision of commonwealth and state finance ministers, which is a consequence of the bill that this government adjourned before the dinner break. The government did not tell anyone that it was being adjourned. The Deputy Premier knew full well, because he told the member for Gordon and the member for Chaffey that the bill would be dealt with at 7.30. If we have a Deputy Premier who has the job of managing government business, it should be managed effectively. If the government was adjourning that bill prior to the dinner break it should not have told us something different. I am not the only one making that allegation: the two independent members are of the same opinion. So was the Deputy Premier, until he stumbled in here and the Minister for Education had to point it out to him, after asking the clerk where we were at. What a shabby way to run government business—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member has been asked to come back to the bill: I ask the member to get to the substance of the bill

Mr FOLEY: I will, but the Labor opposition in this state will not be treated like mugs by this government. We will not allow abuse of process—because this government is sitting on a knife's edge. The opinion polls have this government at 42.5 per cent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, you will also remain silent. I do not want to start warning people to the stage of naming. If the honourable member wants to take part in the debate, I suggest that he get on with the debate.

Mr FOLEY: This government is sitting on 42.5 per cent, and if you think you are going to play games—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member is now starting to blatantly flout the chair. I suggest that he come back to the substance of the bill.

Mr FOLEY: The substance of the bill is this: it is about the GST. This is about the impact—

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr FOLEY: But I tell you what, I will be in this parliament after the next election and you will not be, because you, sunshine, are history.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the Minister for Police: he will be silent as well.

Mr FOLEY: The \$7 000 first home owners grant is a scheme put in place by the commonwealth government as a result of the financial agreement between the state and the commonwealth governments. How can we debate this bill now when we are not debating the previous bill? If the Deputy Premier had any idea how to run this House he would have adjourned this bill until tomorrow, because this is a consequential bill flowing from the first bill. Because the Deputy Premier has no idea how government business should be managed in this House, we are dealing with a bill that should have been dealt with after the national tax agreement bill. At least in the member for Bragg we have someone who

understands parliamentary process, and we could have had the business of the House handled properly. Honestly, we all think that Rob Kerin is a lovely bloke; of course he is. But when you are Leader of the House you have to get your act together, and this government has absolutely abused parliamentary process tonight. This government, sir, of which you are a part, has chosen tonight to play panic politics. The government knows that we had in principle support, indicated by the member for Gordon, the member for Chaffey and the member for Hammond that they would support our amendment—

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Sir, I rise on a point of order. There is a clear inference from what the member for Hart is saying that the government, in some form or other, has misled the House by having the bill changed. The bill was clearly before the House, and people voted on it. If the member does not understand that—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It is the clear inference from what he had to say.

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

Mr FOLEY: I will respond to that, sir. I have been misled, the member for Gordon has been misled and the member for Chaffey has been misled. The frightening thing for those on the government benches is that the Deputy Premier misled himself, because at 7.33 tonight he thought that we were dealing with the national taxation bill. He had no clue that it had been adjourned. This is mickey mouse politics and a mickey mouse parliament when a deputy leader cannot manage the process of government.

Members opposite knew that we had the votes to pass this bill, and because they have lost control of their parliament and their House they have abused parliamentary process. This government stands condemned as a government that is so scared of this parliament that it would not allow a vote tonight. I accuse this government of deceit. I accuse this government of—

Mr SCALZI: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. My hearing is quite normal. I am concerned about the level of noise and about being shouted at from across the chamber.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The member for Hart has made his point to the chamber fairly succinctly, and I ask him to return to the substance of the bill.

Mr FOLEY: I will come back to the \$7 000 first home owners grant, but why do we not have some control of the member for Mawson. Look at him losing control. The member for Mawson knows that he will lose his seat in parliament, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! That's enough.

Mr FOLEY: You are a pathetic man.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: No. We will watch your government disintegrate over the next 18 months.

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Hart! I issue a caution to the member for Hart: if you shout me down once more I will name you on the spot.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I draw your attention to standing order 119—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I draw your attention to standing order 119: 'Reflections Upon Votes of the House'.

The House has voted to adjourn the matter to which the member for Hart is referring. The standing order provides:

A member may not reflect upon a vote of the House except for the purpose of moving that the vote be rescinded.

I ask you to rule that the member for Hart either move in that way or move on with the debate.

The SPEAKER: The only comment I will make is that I have already asked the honourable member to return to the substance of the bill. I adhere to that directive.

Mr FOLEY: This is a tactic by the government to stifle the process of this parliament. This government is incapable of running this House and incapable of doing what is right. If members opposite think they can conduct themselves in this manner over the next 18 months, we look forward to the next election when their day of reckoning will come and the pathetic member for Mawson will get what he deserves at the next election, namely, a swift kick out of his seat.

It is very difficult to deal with this bill now, because we have not passed the first piece of legislation. We will attempt to deal with it. I do not know where the Deputy Premier has gone: it is obviously all too much for him; he has wandered off into the aether somewhere. I am not sure who is controlling this House, but members opposite are a pathetic excuse for a government. No-one on the other side of the House has any idea how to run parliamentary business, except, I might add, the member for Bragg and it would appear, at least, the Clerk of the House. As for the Deputy Premier, 'incompetence' can be the only word to describe him.

Under this piece of legislation, people will receive a \$7 000 grant from the commonwealth government for the purchase of their first home. They, their spouse or partner cannot have had an interest previously in a residential property. It is quite restrictive in how it applies. It is a flat rate. We are advised that it is based on approximately a \$140 000 home and land value here in South Australia. It seems somewhat questionable as to how home owners in New South Wales and Victoria will get on in terms of obtaining adequate compensation. As I said, regrettably, we will support the previous bill that has yet to pass this House; to do otherwise would be silly; it would be a nonsense. First home owners at least deserve the opportunity to get hold of a \$7 000 cash grant, and I will ask a few questions about that in Committee. I look forward to debate tomorrow on the other piece of legislation. We as an opposition look forward to exposing and putting this government under the microscope for the very shabby way it has handled this matter. The member for Bragg and others can smirk about their tactics tonight; they've won this one. Observers watching this House know exactly what has happened tonight. Mr Speaker, the government of which you are a member has played games tonight.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. It has never happened in this House that a member has blatantly impugned the impartiality of the chair. Mr Speaker, he accused you, in your role as Speaker, as being a government member, and I do not believe that is correct.

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair listened very carefully. The member for Hart probably cut across years of convention in many Westminster parliaments in the way he addressed the chair this evening. He can examine the record tomorrow and, if he feels justified, he may wish to make a future reference to the form of words he used this evening.

Mr FOLEY: I have absolutely no intention of doing that, sir. What fact is wrong when I mentioned the Speaker as

being a part of the government? He is the Liberal member for Morphet, and he is the chair. I am not casting aspersions or reflecting on the chair; I am stating a fact. The Speaker of the House votes with you every time, so do not try to tell me that the Speaker of parliament sits there as an independent. That is a nonsense. The point does not involve the Speaker; it is about the Deputy Premier and the deceit with which the opposition has been treated tonight. Members opposite can smirk and have a few laughs about it, as they have the numbers. However, they only just have the numbers. Mr Speaker, what we saw tonight is the grubby tactics the government will stoop to when they realise the government's business is taken out of their hands. For a brief moment today, they lost control of the parliament. Control was in the hands of the opposition and independent parties. We had a vote that took the business out of the government's hands tonight, but they used grubby tactics to play games tonight and, for that, they should be condemned. The member for Stuart can grumble, be gruff and shake his head as much as he likes—

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: Because you're not telling the truth, as usual.

Mr FOLEY: I will make no issue of that other than to say this: if you want to talk about truth, ask your Deputy Premier what he told me and the members for Gordon and Chaffey at 6.8 tonight, what he told us at 7.32 and what we found out to be the case at 7.33. Maybe 'deceit' is the wrong word; maybe it is just massive incompetence; maybe it is that the Deputy Premier is not up to the job of being manager of government business.

The SPEAKER: Order! I ask the member to come back to the bill, to his original contribution.

Mr FOLEY: I will conclude on this sir, and I will look forward to the committee stage of this legislation. Sir, tonight I ask you not to reflect on what you may be sensitive about—the words that I have used tonight. As Speaker of this House you, Mr Speaker, like all of us on this side of the House, should be concerned about the new lows, the depths to which this parliament has shrunk tonight. It is the lowest of all lows when the charade that was played tonight was allowed to occur, and I am sure that you, as the Speaker of this Chamber, would not be particularly happy about it. It has occurred, and that is not your fault, Mr Speaker. It is the fault of the Deputy Premier, his incompetence, and this government's deceit.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): As I have been in the House most of this evening, it is incumbent on me to reply to some of the matters raised. I am one of the parents of and have raised four children. Over the years, I have taught my children what I consider to be a very important lesson—never try to make yourself look bigger by attempting to make other people look smaller. That is the spectacle that we have witnessed in this place tonight. The would be treasurer of this state came into this place and made his grubby little accusations, even though he was in the House when the vote was put but, through his own incompetence, he did not know what was happening. He is now trying to put the blame on everybody else but himself, where the blame surely lies.

The incompetence of that man and his hypocrisy in trying to blame the Deputy Premier for his own failings in this House tonight is absolutely outstanding. Some very important bills are being processed through this parliament over the latter part of today and this evening, and the would-be treasurer of this state has not addressed one issue of substance on either of the bills we have addressed with regard to the

GST. All he has tried to do is cover up his own incompetence, when he was here in this very chamber—and I witnessed it with my own eyes—when the vote was put from the chair and he had no idea of what was happening.

Mr McEwen interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: I inform the member for Gordon that I was sitting here and did happen to know what was going on, and I did happen to know—

Mr CONLON: I rise on a point of order, sir. During his contribution the member for Hart was frequently called back to the point by you, sir, for discussing this issue. I wonder whether the Liberal member for Mackillop will also be called back to order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair endeavours to get some balance into this chamber. The member for MacKillop is in fact straying from the debate and the chair will bring him back to the debate. As that has been raised as a point of order, I have to uphold that point of order and ask the member to return to the substance of the debate.

Mr WILLIAMS: Thank you for your guidance, sir. I just felt that the House deserved to have in *Hansard* an answer to the absurd and ludicrous accusations made by the opposition. I conclude my remarks there.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Water Resources): I welcome the contribution of the last member. I listened carefully to what the member for Hart was apparently trying to say amongst all the histrionics, which I gather were intended more for the media than for this chamber. The member for Hart contended that for some reason the government should not be debating bill No. 49, which is currently before us, before bill No. 48. While they both deal with taxation reform issues that will arise because of the GST, the two are totally independent.

How this House deals with matters before it and the order in which the business of the House proceeds is totally at the discretion of this House. There is no failing in the government's bringing on bill No. 49 before bill No. 48 or before whatever bill it likes. This bill stands on its own.

Mr Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elder will come to order.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Hart can at best be excused for ignorance, for not understanding the House's ability to deal with its own business in whatever manner it chooses. If that is losing control of the House, I do not know what the member for Hart thinks that he will do if this state is ever in the most unfortunate position of seeing people like him controlling it.

Tonight at dinner time we launched the Youth Parliament and you, Sir, saw the calibre of young people who will be taking part in that Youth Parliament. I wish them good fortune and speed in entering this chamber, because I am quite sure that, having seen the member for Hart tonight, they will be sure that they can lift the standard considerably.

The SPEAKER: I ask the minister to come back to the substance of the bill.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Ross Smith can talk about ponderous! The bill before the House for a \$7 000 grant for first home owners is important because it is an attempt to remediate some of the less beneficial effects of the GST on people who are seeking to buy their first home. About the only allusion that the member for Hart made to the substance of the bill was that \$7 000, which is a fixed sum,

seems to be predicated on a home that we think will cost about \$140 000. That, as the member for Hart briefly alluded to, is not a substantial amount for a home and land package. It will buy home and land packages in areas to the north, to the extreme north, and to the extreme south of the city of Adelaide but, as the member for Hart points out, it will not do a lot of good for first home owners who are looking for something more substantial. It will be a part relief and a part relief only.

While I, with the government, will support this bill, as the member for Unley I can say that I do not think many home owners in Unley will benefit much from this measure. I would that it were slightly more generous than it is, but I do grant that this is the extent to which the government considers it can go, and the government is to be applauded for at least making the effort.

In making the effort on this bill, this government is not playing to its own constituency so much as it is playing to decency and a fair go for battlers and young people who seek only to buy a first home. This is not about looking after people in the eastern suburbs: this is about looking after young people establishing their first home. It is a very important social justice bill, and all we have got from the opposition is claptrap, diatribe, not worrying about the substance of the bill, but some sort of petty and puerile attack on the Deputy Premier. I will stand here with my colleagues and we will debate the substance of bills; we will stick up for the battlers, because very few people opposite are capable of doing so.

Mr CONLON (Elder): I want to address a few short remarks to this bill which, as the shadow treasurer pointed out, is a proposal to allow to new home buyers some compensation for the cost of the introduction of the GST. Let us not kid ourselves into thinking that this is some act of generosity. This is merely some compensation for the cascading costs that will be imposed on the long suffering people of Australia under the GST regime.

I might just make a couple of comments on the contribution of the member for Unley, who suggested that it was all part of some wise course to debate it this way. We actually know why this bill is being debated before the other one, why we are dealing with the tail before we deal with the dog. It is because they are quietly confident they can actually keep their miscreants on their side of the House with this bill and they do not think they can with the previous bill. That is what it is all about. That is the long and the short of it. It has nothing to do with re-ordering government business. They are terribly frightened that they cannot keep their wandering people on their side of the House on the other bill, but they are a little confident about this one, so we will do this one first.

It is no more than that, is it? The member for Gordon nods. We know what it is about. The member for Unley can stand up and pontificate, but we know what it is all about. I will make a few other short remarks about this bill before we proceed. I am so glad that the new Liberal member for MacKillop has decided to wander off and have a chat over there because it removes the temptation to answer some of the nonsense that we heard from him on this matter. I do see that he is coming back. He always has been very keen to hear everything I say.

The new Liberal member for MacKillop was prepared to defend it. I guess having made the decision that he has made he did have to defend this government. He is like the bloke

who saw the *Titanic* pulling out of port and raced for the gangplank before it left.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I rise on a point of order. It is irrelevant; it has nothing to do with the bill.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not uphold the point of order, because I think the point has been made quite clear by the chair. I expect members to come back to the substance of the bill and stay there.

Mr CONLON: It was not my joke before. It must take on the form of a self-evident truth of the joke if so many of us have noted it about the member for MacKillop. It is just a shame he himself could not notice it but, then again, it is pretty much what we would expect from Mitch.

One of the things that concerns me about the bill before the House tonight is not that it offers some compensation—I think inadequate compensation. As the shadow minister for housing I dread to see what will happen to housing and housing starts after the introduction of the GST. The experience in New Zealand was a dramatic slump in the housing industry after a rush of new approvals before the introduction of the GST and it does seem we are going through something similar in South Australia and in Australia.

I do have some concerns about what will happen, but I have other concerns about this bill. It is a requirement for the state to administer the payment of \$7 000 to new home owners and it will include a national database. We will have to know whether people have had the benefit of the scheme in other states. As I understand it, the fund may amount to as much as \$63 million. If we are to be giving out \$7 000 lots of \$63 million it will be an expensive process, because I understand that no allowance has been made to the state for the costs of running the scheme. The money is coming from the commonwealth but there is none for the state running it.

We already know privately and publicly that the government will have terrible difficulties balancing its budget as a result of the introduction of the GST and as a result of some of its own incompetencies and flagrant misuse of public funds—but we will leave that for another day. It is disturbing that we will be saddled with the cost of running this scheme with no compensation for the state. The treasurer suggests we may be looking at something like \$50 million (our sources say \$100 million) in costs in implementing the GST, making a further hole in the budget. I am sure the shadow treasurer will have some pertinent questions to ask in that regard.

In conclusion—because it would be nice to finish with this and get onto the main bill at some point—we welcome the introduction of the scheme. We do not think it is a generous matter: it is merely some compensation for the cascading costs of the GST.

The Hon. M.K. Brindal interjecting:

Mr CONLON: I thank the member for Unley for congratulating me on my contribution but I would ask him to do it after I finish rather than while I am doing it. But, then again, the honourable member has never put me off my stride in two years in this place so I will not worry about him tonight. The opposition supports offering some compensation to first home owners with those reservations and concerns that I have expressed in addressing the bill.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I am somewhat surprised that I rise to address this bill. Although I do support the bill, I must say that I do it with some surprise. I compliment the member for MacKillop, who has a fine ear for the nuances of the House and who is destined therefore for a meteoric rise through the Liberal ranks.

Members interjecting:

Mr McEWEN: Mr Speaker, as you well know, one lemming is enough. As much as the member for Hart did protest too much, it is worth—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr McEWEN: You know Hamlet, do you? It is worth observing that both the Deputy Premier and minister responsible for the business also thought that on resuming debate after the dinner break we were to be dealing with the national tax reform bill. So I was not the only member. We all believed that we were dealing with the national tax reform bill.

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr McEWEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for protecting me from the member for Bragg. I do support this bill. It is appropriate that some benefit be made to first home buyers to compensate in a one-off manner for the impact of the GST. I compliment the government on this initiative.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

Mr FOLEY: I will use this opportunity to ask some questions. I point out the hypocrisy of the government. I got an absolute tongue lashing from the government for pointing out what I consider to be the mistakes of the Deputy Premier. The member for Gordon said exactly the same thing and everyone sat there quietly.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I rise on a point of order, Mr Chairman. The honourable member should ask a question of the minister and keep to the subject that is before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN: I was about to remind the member for Hart of that. Does the member for Hart have a question?

Mr FOLEY: Yes, Mr Chairman. As I lead into my question, I will quickly refer, if I may, to the member for Newland, now the junior minister for what I am not too sure. She is getting a bit chirpy over there. I think she should worry more about the job which clearly she is not doing.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: What did you say? At least you have got a job.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: The member for Bragg has given me some sound advice. I will not use the pronoun 'I'. There are some things that Ingo says that I learn from. Regarding the cost of implementation, as the member for Elder alluded, 'Thank you, Mr Costello, you have given us \$63 million to administer, but of course you have not given us with that any reimbursement for the cost of administration.' What will be the cost of administration of the scheme?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I am advised that the implementation cost is \$650 000 and the ongoing cost will be \$310 000.

Mr FOLEY: So, that is \$650 000 up front and \$310 000 recurrent. Those are interesting figures. The minister is saying that the establishment cost of this scheme is about \$650 000—

The Hon. M.R. Buckby interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: That is the implementation cost, and the recurrent cost is about half that figure. As the minister said earlier today, the up-front cost for the GST across government is \$46 million, so it might be fair for me to say that the

recurrent cost is \$25 million. That gives us an indication of the magnitude of the GST. My mathematics puts that at nearly \$150 million in two years, which is close to what I said the other day. Of that—

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

Mr FOLEY: Well, I am not sure what \$150 million would do to your budget bottom line! Regarding the national registry, what will the state have to do to ensure that an applicant has not already been given a loan in another state? Will that be Revenue SA's responsibility or that of the banks? Who will have to check that?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I am advised that both the financial institution that is dealing with a first home owner and Revenue SA will have the ability to access the national database to ascertain whether, for instance, an interstate person or couple, or indeed any couple, has accessed this scheme previously.

Mr FOLEY: Whose liability is it if a mistake is made? There are a lot of mortgage originators around now and all sorts of people making home loans available. If the state makes an error, will we have to cop that or will that be provided for by the commonwealth?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: I am advised that, if the financial institution steps anywhere outside its delegated authority, it is the one that will wear the liability.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 to 46) and title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Deputy Premier): I move:

That the House do now adjourn.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): On Friday of last week I was very pleased that the Treasurer and Minister for Industry and Trade visited my electorate from 12.30 p.m. until about 9 p.m. Quite a lot was accomplished in that short period of time. In the first instance, the Minister for Industry and Trade was able to visit the Port Wakefield abattoir. For those members who are not aware, the abattoir was established two or three years ago as a pig processing abattoir. It has been a wonderful addition to the electorate and the Mid North area in general.

Members would be aware that about two years ago pig prices reached rock bottom and it was a very difficult time for the pig industry. Unfortunately, some producers went to the wall. It looked as though the pig industry would not recover for quite some time. But there has been a turnaround, perhaps not as dramatic as we would have liked, but at least pork producers at present are making some money. One of the critical factors in our prices dropping as low as they did was the fact that we relied almost entirely on local domestic consumption. Therefore, we have to expand our opportunities for pork and we have to look to the export market.

The Port Wakefield abattoir has for the last 18 months to two years been working on accreditation to get Australian Quarantine Inspection Service (AQIS) authorisation to be an export abattoir. All being well, that should occur within the next few months. In fact, it has passed the critical stages. It has achieved the appropriate standards that are necessary. What that will do is first give South Australian producers the opportunity to send to a local pig abattoir and have their product exported. Therefore, if our local price does go down—if, say, in the case of Canadian imports there is a glut

on the local market—we can export so much of our product. In fact, according to some of the pig abattoirs that have export licences interstate, it appears that we have a fairly good reputation already in overseas markets.

Interestingly, at present any pig producers who want to have their pig meat exported have to send the pigs interstate, so this will save a significant amount on transport. The Port Wakefield abattoir has recently been taken over by a new company called Primo. I was very pleased that the project manager for Primo Smallgoods, Mr Wally Goddard, came over from Sydney for the meeting with the Treasurer. Mr Goddard made it very clear that there will be a significant expansion of the Port Wakefield abattoir this year.

In the first instance, they will be implementing a new killing process and also some additional freezing space and, in the second instance, they will be establishing a boning section at the abattoir, and therefore increasing the work force from the current 43 to in excess of 70 employees. I look forward to that occurring. It was great to see the enthusiasm with which Primo management are looking forward to it as well. I also acknowledge that Mr Mark Viney, the site manager, was at the meeting. Mr Viney has been at the pig abattoir since its commencement and has an excellent understanding of the way in which the pig line operates.

Whilst this was the second occasion I had to tour through the pig line and see it operating, I would like to compliment all the employees because it seemed to me that they were very efficient at their work, and management confirmed that. The other thing was that the cleanliness of the abattoir had to be seen to be fully appreciated. The cleanliness of the abattoir today compared with abattoirs in the past is quite remarkable, and therefore it is not surprising that the Port Wakefield abattoir has received AQIS accreditation to be able to proceed towards being an export abattoir.

The third possibility that may occur at the Port Wakefield abattoir is for a lamb line to be established as well. If that occurs, it is highly likely that the work force will increase to approximately 150 employees. It needs to be appreciated that a business that started two or three years ago with 30 employees will progress to 70 employees by the end of this year and may well progress to 150 employees within the next 18 months. Certainly the one possible obstacle is that it may be difficult to find sufficient skilled labour to operate an abattoir of this size. That shows that we need to put maximum effort into our training. It was mentioned that currently many of the people at Port Wakefield are undertaking TAFE courses, and in fact TAFE lecturers attend at the abattoir to assist with training in many areas. It is a growing industry and one that I look forward to following. Certainly the Treasurer and Minister for Industry and Trade are pleased to see it.

We could use the analogy of comparing the Port Wakefield abattoir with what our car industry used to be like when we made cars only for the domestic market and now General Motors-Holden exports so many of its cars, which leads to better quality cars, more cars being made and more employment; and, in the longer term, it will lead to cheaper cars because the more you produce the more your total overhead costs decrease. Again, that is a real positive for South Australia, and the pig abattoir is following suit in that respect.

The other area at which the Treasurer looked during his visit last Friday was the Bowmans' site. Currently Bowmans is an area that has a large SACBH complex—again opened about 18 months or two years ago—and it has a huge grain storage area. The good thing is that Great Southern Rail

(GSR) has put a spur line into the SACBH facilities, making it an efficient operation. The grain can be loaded straight onto the rail road grain trucks and, at this stage, carted to Port Adelaide. One can well imagine the time when the Adelaide-Alice Springs-Darwin rail link is completed and the option is available for SACBH (and any other company) to rail road its goods straight to Darwin, if that is a better prospect.

One of the interesting things was that this year two of the very large storage sheds were fully occupied with canola, and it shows that canola as a product in South Australia is increasing considerably. It was a little disappointing that this year the price dropped somewhat, but I believe that in the longer term canola looks as though it will also be a reasonably stable commodity. The thing about Bowmans is that it is ideally placed on the rail link between Adelaide and the Mid North and eventually through to Alice Springs, and it is sufficiently removed from most areas that a large amount of land is available, and other industries will be encouraged to set up there. I think that we will find new industries setting up there in due course. Certainly a lot of discussions are occurring at present. To all those involved in the visit, particularly the members of the Port Wakefield abattoir, also the people from of the SACBH, the members of the district council, in particular the CEO, Mr Phil Barry, and the Mayor, Mr James Maitland, I give very sincere thanks for making their time available during the Minister for Industry and Trade's visit. I am very heartened by the way the Wakefield plains area continues to expand in industries related to the agricultural sector. I hope that will prove to be the case in future years.

Time expired.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): In the District Court last week Judge Sulan handed down sentence on Sabrina Agius. Sabrina Agius had been convicted of robbery with violence. It was agreed that she had assaulted an elderly lady of 70 years, who had been withdrawing money from an automatic teller. Sabrina Agius had assaulted this lady with a view to removing \$400 in cash from her hands. At the point when this happened, Mr Lewis, a young man, intervened as a good Samaritan, to protect the elderly lady. In the course of struggling with Sabrina Agius, Mr Lewis suffered a heart attack, which damaged him severely, with the result that he will be an invalid for the rest of his life.

The maximum penalty for robbery with violence is life imprisonment. I think that, by setting a maximum penalty of life imprisonment for robbery with violence, parliament is trying to indicate to the courts that it regards a conviction of robbery with violence as a serious matter. The suspension of a sentence of imprisonment upon conviction for robbery with violence is something that the court should not do lightly, given that parliament has set that maximum penalty. Judge Sulan sentenced Sabrina Agius for a term of imprisonment of a little over two years with a non-parole period of a little over one year, but he suspended her sentence of imprisonment on her entering into a \$100 good behaviour bond. That was reported on the front page of the *Advertiser*, and I gather that, at least leaving aside the headline, there is no judicial quibbling with the substance of the *Advertiser's* report on that case.

It is quite natural that hundreds of people in Adelaide should have expressed an opinion about the suspension of the sentence on Sabrina Agius, either by writing letters to the *Advertiser* or by participating in discussion of the case on talk-back radio. I regard discussion of cases in our courts

after the verdict has been handed down as entirely healthy. But my view is not shared by the Attorney-General (Hon. T. Griffin), because in another place today the Hon. K.T. Griffin suggested that anyone who discussed the Sabrina Agius case may be acting improperly until such time as the appeal period on her sentence has expired. I believe that that is a misconception of the way public discussion ought to occur on cases in South Australia. I think the Attorney-General is being much too finicky in his approach to this matter.

There is a legitimate public concern with sentencing. Sentencing is not a matter owned by the judges. If, under the separation of powers doctrine, sentencing were exclusively a matter for the judges, parliament would not be in a position to set maximum sentences, but parliament does set maximum sentences and expects judges to operate within the perimeter set by parliament. Indeed, in a number of offences parliament fixes the penalty.

In all the debate about mandatory sentencing it has gone unnoticed that South Australia itself has mandatory sentencing already. It imposes a mandatory head sentence of life imprisonment upon a conviction for murder. South Australia has a mandatory sentence of 10 years licence suspension on a second and subsequent offence of causing death by dangerous driving; and more recently, in 1992, parliament set a minimum mandatory sentence of three months imprisonment for a second or subsequent offence of illegal use of a motor vehicle. South Australia already has mandatory minimum sentencing and I have heard no suggestion that the United Nations will compel the commonwealth parliament to intervene to abolish those mandatory minimum sentences in South Australia.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: It is none of its business.

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Stuart interjects—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON:—that it is none of the United Nations' business, and the member for Elder interjects that it is not the issue per se.

Mr Conlon: It is not mandatory sentencing per se that is the issue.

Mr ATKINSON: I am glad that the member for Elder says that it is not mandatory sentencing per se that is the issue. I would hope, if I may paraphrase the member for Elder, that he is concerned about a discriminatory impact on certain minorities as a result of mandatory minimum sentencing, and he is quite legitimately concerned about the impact of mandatory minimum sentencing on juveniles, as was the United Nations committee, which included representatives from Pakistan, Russia and China. In the aftermath of the Sabrina Agius case I was pleased to speak on two occasions on radio 5AA about the sentence and on radio 5DN I spoke twice about the sentence, because I do not support mandatory minimum—

Mr Clarke: Did you speak on the ABC?

Mr ATKINSON: No, I did not speak on the ABC; I did not think anyone would be listening in the Adelaide metropolitan area, apart from other politicians. I spoke on those radio stations about sentencing because I do not believe in mandatory minimum sentencing except in very unusual circumstances. But I do, unlike the Attorney, believe in guideline sentencing, which we already have in New South Wales and which the Attorney-General, ignorantly, because he does not do any reading on these issues, refers to as grid sentencing. There is a world of difference between guideline sentencing and grid sentencing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr ATKINSON: Guideline sentencing is already the law in New South Wales. It involves the Supreme Court, or the Court of Appeal, taking a test case on sentencing—let us say, for instance, causing death by dangerous driving—and indicating to the lower court judges and to the public at large what it believes the ordinary sentence ought to be for an offence in ordinary circumstances, giving the public some idea of what its ordinary sentence will be, and then listing what the aggravating and mitigating circumstances will be in any particular case, thereby binding the lower courts and giving them guidance. That is not what happens in South Australia at the moment—although it was the Labor govern-

ment with Chris Sumner as Attorney-General, that introduced the ability for the Crown to appeal sentences where they were manifestly inadequate. Who opposed that reform? It was the Hon. K.T. Griffin.

Guideline sentencing is a good idea, and Labor will introduce it when it is elected after the next state election. It is not hard to win the law and order debate in this state, because you only have to bid very modestly to beat the Hon. K.T. Griffin.

Motion carried.

At 8.31 p.m. the House adjourned until Wednesday 5 April at 2 p.m.