HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 5 April 2001

The SPEAKER (Hon. J.K.G. Oswald) took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

YOUNG OFFENDERS (YOUTHS TO BE DEALT WITH AS ADULTS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Young Offenders Act 1993. Read a first time.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Members would have been circulated with a note from me indicating that I would be introducing a substitute bill to the already introduced Statutes Amendment (Age of Young Offenders) Bill. This new bill is the replacement or substitute bill, and the reason for it is that I want to make clear that we are dealing here with very serious offences and also serious repeat offenders. I will canvass the issue of serious offences in a moment but, on advice from Parliamentary Counsel, the view was that it would be easier to introduce a new bill to make clear that we are dealing with serious offences and serious repeat offenders rather than trying to deal with a multitude of acts through the other bill. At the appropriate time I will move to discharge the alternative bill.

I do not believe it is necessary for me to canvass the reasons that were outlined when the other bill was introduced on Thursday 15 March because the intent is still the same. If members wish to refresh their memories as to the arguments put forward, they are still the relevant arguments in relation to this bill because, as I indicated earlier, it is a substitute bill which I believe draws better attention to the key points.

When I refer to major offences I am talking about major indictable offences which, in the main, carry a penalty of at least five years imprisonment—offences such as serious sexual assault, including rape, armed robbery and offences involving very serious bodily injury). That is the category of offence that I am talking about. So people who might think I am talking about people using a four-letter word or something like that have completely missed the thrust of the argument, or perhaps I have not made it clear enough.

The other aspect of the bill is that it addresses those who have been before the Youth Court and have been convicted, and have not got the message. That is the other point. So, we are not talking about young people who are in the family conferencing situation, who have been to the Youth Court and learnt their lesson. We are talking about that small percentage who, literally, thumb their noses at the Youth Court, and the penalties and the way they have been dealt with there as a child. In this bill, we are focusing only on two key aspects and, as I indicated in the introduction to the alternative bill in March, a provision exists in Victoria and Queensland, and has done so for 10 years, to treat 17-year-olds as adults in respect of criminal matters.

In effect, my provision is not as tough as those in Victoria or Queensland, because it is very narrowly defined in regard to the matters that the bill canvasses. If members wish to have a look at the precise definitions and classifications regarding offences they can read the Summary Procedure Act, where it sets out the classifications for minor offences, summary offences, which are a dealt with by a magistrate, and major, indictable offences which are dealt with by the District or Supreme Court. We are dealing with very serious matters here, and I do not believe that many people would regard rape, armed robbery or very serious bodily injury as offences of a child. I do not believe the Youth Court should be used for dealing with those sorts of offences where someone is aged 17. And likewise, if someone who is 17 and has been convicted before in the Youth Court, and keeps appearing in the Youth Court, then it is time to stop pretending that that person is a child and send a very clear message to them and to others that disregarding the judgment of the Youth Court will result in a person being dealt with as an adult.

I do not think I need to say much more. I noticed in the media today, a young person who, I think, is misunderstanding what I am on about. I have great passion for young people. I am very concerned about them. If one thinks about it, this is, in a sense, a compliment to young people, because what I am saying is that if you are 17 you are old enough to know how to behave, particularly when it comes to things like rape and armed robbery. So, I am not in any way putting young people down. It is quite the opposite.

Mr Lewis: I don't think she thought it through.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The member for Hammond said she may not have thought it through. I would be happy to talk to that young person, or any young person. Members would know my commitment to young people when I was Minister for Youth, and that has not changed. I am still saddened to see the waste of young lives where young people get into strife early, and go down a criminal path. I am, at this moment, encouraging the Minister for Education and his department to actively intervene in respect of those young people who have left school early. I am hopeful that the minister and the CEO of his department will respond in a positive way so that we can steer young people away from the possibility of being involved in criminal activity. Most young people do not get involved in criminal activity of any kind, and only a very small percentage end up in the Youth Court.

So, we are talking about what is, in effect, a small group of serious, hard-core offenders. We are not talking about 95 per cent of young people. The remaining percentage who end up in the Youth Court is very small. So, I want people to keep it in perspective. I would like young people to keep it in perspective. The point that we cannot tackle these sorts of issues because someone is under 18, I think, misses the point. I said last month in this place, there is no consistency in respect of what you can do at various ages, and I do not believe there ever will be absolute consistency, but I am sure that most young people would say that, in respect of the serious offences of rape, armed robbery, grievous bodily injury, and so on, they would not support someone being treated as a child if they are 17 years of age, nor would they accept that someone who has been convicted by the Youth Court on previous occasions would, or should, be treated as a child.

With those remarks, I commend the measure to the House and trust that it will get the support of members, because I think it is currently a loophole in our system. I do not want to comment on particular cases, but members would be aware from media reports of some serious incidents in recent times, and this is the sort of measure that could address that sort of behaviour. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (AGE OF YOUNG OFFENDERS) BILL

Orders of the Day, Private Members Bills/Committees/Regulations, No. 3.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I move:

That Order of the Day No. 3 be discharged.

Motion carried.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (PIERCING OF CHILDREN) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 March. Page 1222.)

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I support the bill and commend the honourable member's putting it forward. I share the view of the honourable member that the piercing of children under the age of 16 without parental consent is something that governments should not be encouraging. I do not think that the community at large, and particularly parents, are warm to the idea that their 16, 15 or 14 year old could arrive home one day having, without their knowledge, had some form of body piercing. Parents would want to have a say; parents would want to have an opportunity to counsel their child and to speak with them about it at length to make sure that they understand the long-term implications of having their body pierced.

It may seem like a very good idea to a 14 or 15 year old to have a tattoo, or to have some part of their face or body pierced, but it might not be something that they think is very smart later on, when they are in their 20s or 30s as an adult and they are still living with the mutilation that they experienced at the age of 14 or 15. I must say that I would even extend the scope of the bill. Had I had an opportunity to counsel with the honourable member when he was drafting the bill, I probably would have suggested that he include tattoos within the context of the bill.

I know that, from my own experience as an officer in the army, I quite often had conversations with soldiers who had had tattoos applied when they were very young—perhaps after a few drinks when they were out with their mates. They often expressed the view later, in their 20s and early 30s, that they earnestly wished that they had not had the very prominent tattoo applied at that young age because, as time moved on, it became more of an embarrassment than a decoration, and I am sure that that is also the case with body piercing. Nowadays, young people in some cases are able to, unfortunately, access alcohol and drugs. They can get caught up in the euphoria of a particular moment and do something that they might live to regret.

The honourable member's bill seeks to provide some measures to prevent that occurring. There probably is a need for some form of amendment to the bill. I think that any amendment to the bill ought to address a few issues. In particular, there is probably a need to consult with the body piercing industry about this before it comes into place. Time ought to be allowed for that to occur just in case there are some hidden implications of the bill which we have not thought of and which might need to be taken into account. There should be a requirement for parental consent to be made in writing rather than verbally, and perhaps some opportunity for the body piercer to be assured that the person providing the consent is, in fact, the parent.

There may also be a need to require body piercers to keep records of the piercing of any child. The detail of those records ought to be fixed by regulation, and an analogy can be drawn here with the Secondhand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Act 1996. Under that act a person to whom the relevant provisions apply is obliged to keep detailed records of the goods in question and must also verify the identity of the seller. There is no legal reason why, when a minor seeks to have body piercing and is accompanied by a parent or guardian, the provider of the service should not be obliged to record and verify the identity of the child and accompanying parent or guardian, particularly with a view to establishing the bona fides of the relationship.

There might also be a need to provide some amendment to tighten the defence available to the body piercer. There should be some requirement of proof that the body piercer, in fact, required the child to produce proof of age in some way and that the child did not produce false proof of age in response to that requirement. The defence in the current bill leaves the way open for body piercers simply to rely on the apparent age of the child without any attempt at verification. The defence is taken from the equivalent provisions in the Liquor Licensing Act. I am not proposing those amendments at this point, but I feel confident that, at a later date, such amendments will be proposed.

I am sure that they will improve the bill as it stands and add to the effects that the honourable member seeks by putting the bill forward. I am sure that all members of the House would agree with me that, while we respect the right of people to have body piercing performed should they wish, we must also recognise that children 16 and under are a special case requiring parental guidance and that we, as members of parliament, should be putting measures in place to ensure that these children do not do something in a moment of exuberance that they might live to regret later. I support the bill and, as I said, I commend the honourable member for putting it forward; and I hope that it will be supported by the House.

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): I also support the legislation that the member for Fisher has introduced into this House, and I commend him for doing so. As my colleague the member for Waite has indicated, it is the intention of the government to introduce some amendments to the legislation. I have not been privy to all of the details relating to those amendments. I would obviously want to look at them but, from what I have been told, they will, in fact, strengthen the legislation introduced by the member for Fisher.

I have already spoken on this matter in the House in the way of a grievance debate following representation I received from people in my electorate. I would not have thought that the electorate of Heysen was a body piercing type electorate any more than any other, but I have certainly had some representation and correspondence on this issue. One father who made contact with me was very concerned about the possibility of his son, who was well under the age of 16, having some body piercing carried out. He was very concerned that there was nothing that he could do about that situation. He felt very strongly that there should be some legislation in place to ensure that young people, as the member for Waite has indicated, do not go ahead and do something on the spur of the moment and regret it at a later stage.

This father was concerned about that and I share that concern. It is a different situation with respect to people who

are older than 16, male and female, and who wish to wear an earring, or whatever—that is up to them. This bill is about protecting young people, and I support it very strongly. The member for Waite has referred to a number of amendments that will be put forward. As the honourable member said, it really inserts a commonsense situation as far as the legislation is concerned. It inserts a commencement section and, as the member for Waite has indicated, given the nature of the changes made by the substantive amendments it is intended to introduce, it will be necessary to delay immediate implementation so that the regulations can be made.

I think that is fair enough. It is also important in that context that the opportunity is provided for consultation with the industry. One amendment suggests that there will be a requirement for parents' consent to be made in writing. I am sure that the member for Fisher would not disagree with that, and there are other amendments as well. I commend the member for Fisher for introducing this legislation. It is timely, as far as I am concerned, because it is only a matter of a week or so ago that I did raise this matter in the House, as I said earlier, in the way of a grievance.

There is obvious concern in the electorate and I think that this legislation will deal with it. Having said all of that, I certainly respect the situation where some cultures allow, and perhaps even encourage, their children to wear earrings, or whatever the case may be, at a much earlier age. I think that situation must be recognised as well, and I am not suggesting in any way that that should be interfered with. I think the legislation introduced by the member for Fisher makes a lot of sense. It will make even more sense with the amendments that will be introduced at a later stage. I hope that the majority of members support the legislation, and I certainly commend it to the House.

Mr McEWEN (Gordon): I put on the record my support for the principle underlying the bill before us. This is not a matter of body adornment: it is more a public health issue and of managing the rights of minors. I would hate to see this get to a point where people have undue family pressure put on them in terms of adornment or not adornment. In the committee stage we therefore need to look carefully at some of those rights and responsibilities. The primary issue of needing to protect the health of individuals in the community is the fundamental reason why I indicate at this stage my support for the bill.

Mr CONDOUS (Colton): In supporting this bill, I say that it has very serious implications, and I think members should consider these when making a decision. The Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act is quite clear. On the face of it, it is consistent with the age of consent of 18 for tattooing, currently in section 21A of the Summary Offences Act. I am of the strong opinion that any member who does not support this bill is prepared to say,'I will give consent to the overriding of parents' authority.'

Our structure of family life, our principles and our values of family life have deteriorated for one reason only, that is, because both federal and state governments have given the right to overriding parental authority. Girls as young as 14 years of age say, 'I am going to leave home because my mother does not like me out until 1 o'clock or 2 o'clock in the morning. She does not like me having sex with my boyfriend, but I know that if I leave home and get a decent place in which to live, or share with another girl so I have my own bedroom to do what I want, the federal government will give me money on a fortnightly basis, that is, social security so that I can do what I want to do.'

I think any parent would be disappointed if their 14 year son or daughter walked out of the home simply on the basis of wanting freedom for sexual and other activities—it might even involve drinking and drugs as well—because an act allowed them to get financial assistance to enable them to do so.

Is a person under 16 years of age acting responsibly in having body piercing? I would say that in 95 per cent of the cases, in a few years when they reach the age of 20, 21 or older, they will think about it and say, 'What a stupid thing I did when I was 14 or 15 years of age in piercing my body'. A number of teenagers and women today say to me, 'I only wish that I could get rid of this tattoo perfectly, without going through the laser treatment which is still allowing my skin to show evidence of tattooing that was done when I was 15 years of age.' Backyarders were prepared to do it.

I must also ask whether the people to whom they are going to get pierced are using the correct procedures to sterilise all the equipment? Have they got a steriliser in the place where they are carrying out the body piercing? Is the equipment going in? One must remember that body piercing today is carried out on a huge scale, I am told, of the female vagina, using rings, because it is a trendy thing to do; there is piercing of the male penis because it shows a bravado, especially if you can strip off and show the rings going through it as you sit on a motor bike. What will be the consequence in 20 years if the sterilisation was not correct and in fact hepatitis B develops in the body and liver problems are also experienced?

The Attorney-General has made clear that he believes that, when a minor seeks to have body piercing done, they should be accompanied by a parent and have a letter of approval, and they should also have a photograph as evidence of the child's age. Someone this morning will move an amendment to require parental consent to be given in writing.

The Hon. R.B. Such: That's already in there.

Mr CONDOUS: It is, is it? Okay. I think the effect of the amendment is to require body piercers to keep records of the piercing of any child, and the details of those records should be fixed by regulation. The analogy being drawn here is drawn with the Secondhand Dealers Act. The act provides that a person to whom the relevant provisions apply is the seller, and there is no legal reason why, when a minor seeks to have body piercing and is accompanied by a parent or guardian, the provider of the service should not be obliged to record and verify the identity of the child and the accompanying parent or guardian, particularly with a view to establishing the bona fides of the relationship.

The member for Fisher has responsibly put forward a very important change in our community's life. If a minor cannot go to a doctor to have an injection without the consent of a parent or guardian, why should they have the right as a minor, at 14 or 15 years of age, to go to a body piercer to have some rings inserted in some part of their body? For God's sake, as people of responsibility in government, when are we going to start to take up some of the old-fashioned values which were not so bad many years ago when minors were not given the authority and the rights that they have today?

I even go one step further—and I know I will get criticised for this—and say that they are not ready to drive a car until they are at least 18 years of age. My daughter, who is currently 15, is asking me, 'When am I allowed to drive?' I say to her, 'As soon as you are 18 years of age I will send you

to a proper driving school because you may have a few brains by then to act responsibly—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: No, I am talking about a motor vehicle—in getting behind the steering wheel of a car, which is just as lethal as, if not more lethal than, a gun.'

In relation to body piercing, I would be interested to see who supports the member for Fisher on this bill. I believe that members opposite leave themselves open and vulnerable at the next election if they vote against this and say, 'I will not give a guardian the right. I will give the child the right to make the decision.'

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CONDOUS: Well, you do what you want to do, but I am going to be watching every member. It would be a great thrust in an election campaign to say, 'This is how the member voted.'

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Minister for Minerals and Energy): I am pleased to support this bill in the House today and commend the member for Fisher for bringing it forward. It would appear that some in the House are treating this bill with a bit of mirth. That disappoints me. Only Labor Party members are treating the bill with mirth. I would hope the opposition will support this bill and that, if members opposite have not made up their mind, they will seek to adjourn the debate on it, discuss it with their constituents and, when they have better informed themselves, come back to debate this bill.

I rise to support this bill not simply as a member of parliament but after receiving complaints from constituents about this very issue. I also support the bill as a parent of two children under 16 years of age and having also discussed it with them and with some of their friends. Body piercing is becoming fashionable, particularly among young people. It is fashionable to have multiple—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The member interjects that it has been around for 70 000 years and, indeed, in some cultures it has. In many cultures, it is a cultural statement to undertake body piercing. However, at present in Australia it is a fashion statement to have multiple studs inserted in the ears, tongue, nose and belly button. It is also fashionable for various anatomical body parts to be pierced. That is particularly what the member for Fisher was concerned about when bringing forward this bill. If a doctor requires parental consent to treat a child under 16 years of age, it is only reasonable and proper that a person who is undertaking to pierce a body part of a child should also have the same requirements placed on him or her as are placed on a medical practitioner.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Does the member have something she wished to interject to get on the record?

The SPEAKER: Order! Interjections are out of order.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Yes, sir, I apologise; I should not be encouraging the honourable member, as she needs no encouragement. It is certainly not appropriate that a young girl is able to go to someone to have parts of her anatomy pierced when a doctor cannot undertake a medical examination of those areas. One complaint I had from a constituent involved her 15 year old daughter. Her daughter works in a part-time job and saved up the money to have her belly button pierced. Even though she knew neither her father nor her mother approved of her having that done, she was able to go and have her belly button pierced, anyway. At the age of under 16 years, in that case you may argue that, as that part of the body is usually covered by clothing, if she changes her mind, it will not cause significant problems. However, body piercing can result in infection. One of my own children had an ear pierced, and that resulted in a badly infected ear. She required antibiotics to treat the infection, and after that decided—I think very wisely—that she would allow the pierced hole in her ear to grow over and has never wanted to have that part of her body pierced again.

This issue is not simply about whether a child is old enough to decide whether they should have their body pierced but also about the ramifications afterwards. Certainly, parents who have complained to me when their children have had their bodies pierced without parental consent and it has resulted in infection, the parents are then called upon by the child to pay the bill for the antibiotics, which is not a small bill.

Ms Hurley interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The honourable member indicates that her own doctor bulk bills. It is, indeed, commendable that he does, but I am talking about payment for antibiotics. Unfortunately, a doctor cannot also dispense antibiotics: a pharmacy must do that, and there is a cost to the pharmacy. It is a cost that is then borne when that occurs. It is a serious issue, and the member for Fisher does himself credit in bringing forward this bill. However, while I and other government members are pleased to support the bill, as the member for Colton and other speakers have indicated, the government will be seeking to make some amendments to this bill to provide what we believe is even greater protection not only for the children who might be having themselves pierced but also for the person undertaking legitimate business and providing a body piercing service. Obviously, if they are lied to by a minor or if they have false identity produced to them, some protection also needs to be provided for them. The amendments we have put forward enable that coverage to occur.

This bill will address an anomaly and will ensure that children can no longer go to a hairdressing salon or other place where they might be having parts of their body pierced without parental consent. It is a long overdue amendment, and I am pleased to support it.

Ms KEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

AUSTRALIAN ROAD RULES (SPEED LIMITS IN BUILT-UP AREAS) VARIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 March. Page 1227.)

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I appreciate the opportunity to continue my remarks on this important subject of Australian road rules and speed limits in built-up areas. It is extremely important that we resolve this issue of whether we allow councils to apply blanket city-wide 40km/h speed zones within their area or whether we will go for a better compromise of, say, blanket city-wide 50km/h zones. As recently as last Monday night, I attended a meeting of the Grange Road Residents Association in my constituency, and they are most concerned because they have missed out on a 40km/h speed zone. They still have a 60km/h zone applying to their road. Members of that association are parents with children, and elderly people. A lot of the traffic has gone

from the 40km/h speed zone streets into their street, and they would like a revisiting of the entire issue so that hopefully we come up with a better compromise between amenity and safety, and certainly something that is equitable so that all suburban streets enjoy the benefit of a slower speed zone, which I strongly support, and we do not have the divided situation we have at present.

Ms HURLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION (TRANSFER OF OLD SCHEME MEMBERS TO THE NEW SCHEME) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 December. Page 800.)

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I oppose this bill. You, Mr Speaker, would be aware that it seeks to bring all members into the new parliamentary superannuation scheme. As one who served in the previous parliament you, sir, and many of us, are well aware that the then government of the day, the Liberal government, decided to tackle the issue of superannuation for members of parliament. This issue was considered and debated and, in fact, parliament at that stage made the determination that all new members of parliament would come in under the terms and conditions of the new superannuation scheme, so that they knew, before they stood for parliament and before they entered this institution, exactly what their entitlements would or would not be.

In fact, all members in this House had the option at that stage, once the bill had passed, whether they wanted to join the new scheme or whether they wanted to remain in the old scheme. There have been arguments put both ways. Some members have said, 'The new scheme would be more beneficial in certain circumstances,' and other members have said, 'No, sticking with the old scheme would be more beneficial in certain circumstances.' I do not know if it is quite a few, but certainly some members opted to change to the new scheme and I was speaking to a member the other day who indicated that in their opinion it was preferable to be in the new scheme. We, as members, had a right to choose and the determination was made in the previous parliament.

Therefore, I do not know what thinking has caused the introduction of a bill to seek to overrule the current situation. I believe it is not right to enforce a compulsory change to one scheme or another. Changes to superannuation schemes in the private sector and in the public sector have happened on many occasions in the past and, if you were in the earlier scheme, you invariably had the right to choose whether you wanted to go to the new scheme or whether you wanted to remain in the old scheme. I believe that is a fair and equitable situation and I believe the majority of members on my side see the situation likewise, whether they are in the new or in the old superannuation scheme.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I want to speak briefly on this matter because MPs get this shoved down their necks all the time, particularly by the media. I support the existing system, without being parochial or self-centred in this matter.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr VENNING: That was the member for Hammond's choice. Members at the time, in about 1998, I think it was, had the choice to either stay with the old scheme or change to the new scheme. We all considered it: we all obtained our accountant's opinion about what was the best individual option and made a choice. New members do not have a choice: they are in the new scheme.

Mr Lewis interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Not always. Some of my colleagues—and I will not name them—who, I would say, are astute not only politically but also financially, and who have assets, chose to go with the new scheme. It depends on your age on retirement from parliament, the amount involved and also your financial situation. So, it varied, and it still does. I do not want to see this change because I do not think that it is fair to change the rules after decisions were made. Members had that choice. As the member for Hammond said, no doubt he changed to the new scheme. I bet it was not for the reasons he is saying: it would have been for financial reasons. That is what it is all about: you would be a fool to do it for any other reason. All our financial situations are different.

I would be happy, and always have been, to have superannuation rules changed so that we do not collect any superannuation until the age of 55, the same as everybody else. I have always had difficulty explaining to my constituents that any MP can collect their benefit when they retire from parliament. The same rules should apply as they do to any other member of the public: that we do not collect until the age of 55. I am on the record saying that and I am happy to support it if it is ever brought forward again.

I am sick of this humbug of superannuation. I have my own private superannuation, and to say that this is a fantastic deal is a lot of rubbish! If I had the option of not being in it, I would not be in it at all. I am tied into a situation that I think is inflexible, has no challenges and has nothing in it for me. In fact, I would prefer that there were none of the so-called perks that are talked about for politicians—travel or otherwise. Members of parliament should be paid accordingly—up the salary and have no perks, so that MPs can decide for themselves on matters like this. I remind members on both sides of the House that this is compulsory; we have no choice in the matter. The only choice we did have—

Mr Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond will get the chance to respond later.

Mr VENNING: I have been a member here for 10 years. We had a choice in 1996 whether we wanted to stay with the existing system or go to the new one. Some members including the member for Hammond chose to go with the new one. The member for Hammond comes in here with altruistic beatings of the chest and says that he is doing it to save the government money. Well, with all due respect, I must say, 'What a load of rubbish!' The member for Hammond has a reasonable financial head on his shoulders, and I do not expect him or any other member of this House to make any decision that hits him or her financially. The deal we get in here is not exceptional; I am sick of hearing all the rubbish in the papers. What other job can you have where you are locked into a compulsory superannuation scheme, and what is your job tenure or job security?

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

Mr VENNING: It is an 11 per cent contribution, as the member for Bright reminds me. You go out into the private world and see what you can do; see what sort of rates you can get and check the job security at the same time. You have to be in this place at least 10 years for it to be attractive at all. I ask those members opposite who will be here for only a short time to check the deal that they get. It is not exceptional,

and I am sick of the humbug that has been going on about parliamentary superannuation.

For members to come in here and carry on with these altruistic murmurs and rumblings about saving the taxpayer money by changing this scheme is a lot of rubbish. Some of our colleagues have gone from the old to the new system, purely because their own financial situation has been maximised. No doubt that will be costing the taxpayer more.

As the member for Goyder said quite clearly, I will be voting for the system we have, because I think it is fair. Back in 1996, members had that choice and they have made that choice. To change this now would be grossly unfair.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): It takes a topic like this to get members really excited. I do not want to sound holier than thou, but I do not spend a lot of time thinking about superannuation. Perhaps I should, but I did not come in here to focus on superannuation. There is a lot of misunderstanding about the superannuation for MPs, but one area that is not misunderstood by the public is that the old scheme is very generous. One could argue that the new scheme is also fairly generous.

I do not believe we should have benefits which are way and above what the ordinary citizen would get in a similar situation. That is the key thing; you have to take into account the risk and changing careers mid stream. I do not know about other members, but all my entitlements basically went down the gurgler when I came in here. I have no regret about that, but I am getting to an age where I am unemployable. Some people probably would have said that 20 or 40 years ago. Indeed, many members in here would probably say it now.

You have to take into account the risk element and the uncertainty that we face. Whilst clearly that varies from electorate to electorate, I have always regarded the notion of the safe seat as an offensive term. I do not think it applies any more to anyone in here, and anyone who thinks they have a safe seat is heading for the use of their super quickly.

There is a lot of misunderstanding in the community. I heard someone on the radio the other day say that MPs could cash in their super at any time to pay their bills. That is news to me; I am not aware of that provision at all.

I have not spent a lot of time looking at super, because that is not what motivates me in life. However, from what I have heard from other members, I think that in many ways the new scheme can be better than the old scheme. If a member dies, under the new scheme the family gets the total contribution and benefit, whereas under the old scheme they would not get that: they would get a pension or some part thereof.

The point I would like to canvass is that I know that some years ago we had an option to change from the old scheme to the new scheme, and some members did that. I do not know the numbers and I am not particularly interested, but a more sensible approach to this provision would be to allow members to have the option of changing to the new scheme if that is what they want to do, given their varying family circumstances and other considerations.

That would be an appropriate course of action. Our scheme is very generous, although it has some anomalies. The Minister for Mines and Energy would probably run me out of town or be aghast if I suggested that the provision—which allows you to get a pension from an early age for the rest of your life—allows for a benefit that is excessive. He would argue that I am probably close to retiring age and therefore I am talking from the viewpoint of self-interest. I find it hard to justify how if you are at an early age you can get a pension for the rest of your life when other people in superannuation funds cannot do that. They cannot access a fund normally before they are 55 years. That is an anomaly, but I am not trying to pick on younger members in here who may be in that situation.

It is an anomaly where you can get an enormous life-long benefit from an early age. I do not believe the system was ever intended to cover that possibility. The system was designed to cover people who commenced in mid-career, who took a chance, got elected and lost all their previous entitlements and there would be something to sustain them in retirement. I do not believe it was ever envisaged that people would commence in their 20s, serve 10 years and then get a pension for the rest of their life. I know that there has been controversy in the federal arena with Senator Bill O'Chee. The public is right in raising those concerns. This bill is not about that. The bill should give us the option of changing from one scheme to the other.

I would like to see a proper actuarial assessment of which scheme offers the best benefits and what is best for not only the contributors but also for the taxpayer because at the end of the day we are sustained by the taxpayer and I do not believe we should use our power in here to look after ourselves in a way that is way above what we would be entitled to outside this place. I indicated earlier that most people do not experience the same set of risks that we do, but they have other risks: they face unemployment too. I would be happy over time for the whole aspect of parliamentary superannuation to be reviewed so that it is more in accordance with what the rest of the community could expect in similar circumstances. I argue that we should have the option of moving from one scheme to the other rather than making it mandatory that we all be compelled to move to the new scheme.

The House divided on the second reading:

AYES (3)

Lewis, I.P. (teller)	McEwen, R. J.
Maywald, K. A.	

NOES (43)

Armitage, M. H.	Atkinson, M. J.
Bedford, F. E.	Breuer, L. R.
Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Ciccarello, V.	Clarke, R. D.
Condous, S. G.	Conlon, P. F.
De Laine, M. R.	Evans, I. F.
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Gunn, G. M.	Hall, J. L.
Hamilton-Smith, M. L.	Hanna, K.
Hill, J. D.	Hurley, A. K.
Ingerson, G. A.	Kerin, R. G.
Key, S. W.	Kotz, D. C.
Koutsantonis, T.	Matthew, W. A.
Meier, E. J.	Olsen, J. W.
Penfold, E. M.	Rankine, J. M.
Rann, M. D.	Scalzi, G.
Snelling, J. J.	Stevens, L.
Such, R. B.	Thompson, M. G.
Venning, I. H. (teller)	White, P. L.
Williams, M. R.	Wotton, D. C.
Wright, M. J.	

PAIR(S)

Majority of 40 for the Noes.

Second reading thus negatived.

CONSTITUTION (MEMBERSHIP OF HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 16 November. Page 588.)

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): It is a while since I have spoken on this important bill. Usually I would say that small is better. On this occasion, however, I do not believe that a smaller parliament is necessarily the way to go. Some members confuse representation with the size of the bureaucracy of government. If you go out into the electorate, as I do regularly, you will find that not many people complain about over representation: they complain about big government. By reducing the number of members of the House of Assembly you are not achieving what people want. You are increasing the size of the bureaucracy to support the members of parliament and reducing the ability of members of parliament to get to their constituents. That would be contrary to what democracy is all about. It is difficult enough to try to get to all the functions and attend to constituents' needs in the metropolitan area, but think about how much more difficult it would be for the country electorates. Let us face it: South Australia is a large state.

There are 47 members. The members for Stuart, Goyder and Giles are very good members and represent those large electorates, but imagine if we reduced the number to 31 members, as proposed here. What would happen to the representation? It is only logical that if the number is reduced from 47 members to 31 members there will be less opportunities for members to see their constituents.

Mr Lewis: Why don't you amend it to make it 52?

Mr SCALZI: Already when we are talking about—

Mr Lewis: Who said 47 is right?

Mr SCALZI: The member interjects; perhaps he would like to bring in a bill to increase it—

Mr Lewis: I did—this is my bill.

Mr SCALZI: The member wants to reduce the number and I am putting forward reasons why it is not a good idea to do so. I do not wish to introduce a bill to increase the number of members. However, if in the future the population of South Australia increases and there is a need for greater representation then it is only logical that that should be done. Some countries might have fewer members of parliament—less representatives—but the bureaucracy assisting those members is much larger. If a cost benefit analysis is done it will be found that the cost is not necessarily the members of parliament but the bureaucracy. If that fact was explained to the constituents I believe that those claiming that there should be a smaller chamber would think twice. At least if we have members of parliament and you do not agree with their representation you can get rid of them—that is a democratic right. However, once there is a bureaucracy it is difficult to shift that. What is the cost of that? It is the same sort of argument as saying that we should not have a Legislative Council or another House and that, by reducing that, taxpayer money will be saved. In the short term you might. But democracy is not about the short term; it is about the medium and long term and what is the best form of representation for the state.

Having representatives who can get to their constituents and address their needs—whether it is in the metropolitan area or the rural area—is the fundamental and most important reason for the system we have today. So, I cannot support the reduction of members and nor do I support the abolition of the other place. I know that members on both sides—

Mr Atkinson: Why not?

Mr SCALZI: Because we need a house of review. The member for Spence interjects and he is a stalwart in support of the Westminster system, but he only wants the Westminster system according to the member for Spence's definition, that there should not be an upper house. Well, in Westminster there is an upper house and it serves the country well and it serves the states well. If there are problems with having an upper house then we should reform it—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The member is giving me the title; he used to call other members 'lords'. Good lord, can the honourable member for Hartley be regarded as a lord? Surely not—not from my background. The upper house performs a very important function: it is a house of review. From time to time it becomes a house with a view—I acknowledge that. At times there is no doubt that the government wishes that the house of review would stop being the 'house with a view' and allow legislation to proceed. However, that does not mean that something that serves us well should be abolished just because it does not suit you at a particular time. But obviously the member for Spence believes that that should be the case. If it is an obstacle then get rid of it no matter what are the consequences for democracy in the long term.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: If it is the Labor Party's platform, I doubt whether the member for Spence would get 100 per cent agreement from the Labor Party members in the other place. With respect to the bill before us, I believe that 47 members in a large state such as South Australia requires that level of representation.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: I do not know why the opposition has to continuously refer to the electorate of Hartley. I have said to members opposite that it is wrong for a government to gloat in government but it is even worse for an opposition to gloat 12 months before the polls.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The member thinks that it is going to take place; the electorate might think otherwise.

Time expired.

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop.

An honourable member: Hear, hear! A good member.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Thank you, sir, and thank you to the interjector as well.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: He was deadly serious. I wish to speak against this bill—

The SPEAKER: Order! I understand that the member for MacKillop may have already spoken to this bill and, if so, I will ask the member to resume his seat. The question before the chair is that this bill be read a second time. We do not have 24 members present in the House and, as it is a constitutional matter, ring the bells.

While the bells were ringing:

Mr HANNA: On a point of order, sir: I note that when my constitution bill comes before the House there is no assistance from the chair in terms of summoning 24 members to be present.

The SPEAKER: The chair can intervene immediately on that. The chair was very prepared that if your bill had come

before the House he would not have put the second reading without calling for 24 members to be present. I have an obligation to do that as I do on this occasion.

Mr HANNA: To continue the point of order, sir. Is it a matter of obligation or a matter of wishing to assist the member for Hammond in this case?

The SPEAKER: Order! I caution the member. The chair is acting constitutionally; it is a constitutional matter and there need to be 24 members present in the chamber when I put the vote for the second reading.

Mr ATKINSON: I have a point of order. During debate on the member for Hartley's bill amending eligibility to sit in the House of Assembly and the other place, you ruled, sir, that it was not a constitutional amendment requiring an absolute majority and you got Crown Law advice to that effect. Sir, have you taken Crown Law advice on whether this bill is, in fact, an amendment to the constitution requiring an absolute majority and, if not, why are you not abiding by the previous ruling of Crown Law that it did not go to the essence of the constitution and, therefore, did not require an absolute majority? You will remember that you allowed the member for Hartley's bill to pass without an absolute majority.

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair has taken advice, and I am firmly of the view that this is a matter that does affect the constitution of the House, and I have decided, in my role, to ensure that 24 members are present when I put the vote for the second reading, and I believe that I am correct in doing so.

A quorum having been formed:

The SPEAKER: I have counted the House and, as there are 24 members present, I will now put the question: that the bill be now read a second time. For the question, say aye, against no. I believe the noes have it.

Mr LEWIS: Divide!

While the division was being held:

The SPEAKER: Order! There being one vote for the ayes, the measure passes in the negative.

Second reading thus negatived.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): I again draw attention to the inadequacy of standing orders, which preclude the possibility of their being any record of that vote in either the *Hansard* or the proceedings.

The SPEAKER: The honourable member has made his point.

HOPE FOR THE CHILDREN NETWORK

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I move:

That this House congratulates the Tea Tree Gully Rotary Club and other clubs of Rotary District 9500 on the establishment of the first South Australian network of Hope for the Children and commends their dedication and commitment to—

(a) providing support for new mothers who are socially isolated and suffering stress; and

(b) reducing the incidence of child abuse within our community.

Last year I had the opportunity and privilege to attend the launch of the first South Australian network of Hope for the Children. I was delighted to attend. It was the culmination of three years' hard work by many dedicated individuals who recognised a real need within our community. As I have said on previous occasions, very often the simplest and most obvious ideas are usually the best and we are often left wondering why it has not been done before. I am sure that everyone in this place who is a parent or who has had care of a child could relate stories of the trauma they experienced in one way or another when they first encountered the responsibility and demands of caring for a baby. Nothing really prepares you as this tiny little being takes complete control of your life.

Those involved in the establishment of the South Australian network of Hope for the Children recognise the difficulties experienced in this situation and they also recognise that there are many among us who have had enormous experience in caring for children and in parenting and who would love to pass on the benefits of their experiences. That is the basis of the Hope for the Children Network. Hope for the Children is about matching skilled, trained and experienced volunteers—very often mothers and grandmothers who no longer have child rearing responsibilities—with families who may be suffering stress.

These volunteers go in to give a hand. They give the mother some relief and offer practical and easy solutions to problems that can seem insurmountable at the time. This is not an official arrangement although referrals can be made from a range of health and welfare agencies. It is not about pointing a finger and saying, 'You are a bad mother'; 'You are a likely abuser'; or 'You are not coping.' It is about recognising the stress we all can be put under when a baby just will not sleep and, therefore, we do not sleep, either. It is about the difficulties of managing a baby and maybe an active toddler at the same time. It is about lending a hand when it is needed just to relieve some of that stress and anxiety.

Barbara Hollborow, a former magistrate in the Children's Court in New South Wales, launched the South Australian network. Barbara is also a published author, and she is a mother and grandmother. She knows only too well the problems that families can face and she knows only too well what the consequences can be in some instances when a little help is not available when it is needed. On the morning of the launch of the South Australian network, I heard Barbara Hollborow being interviewed by Phillip Satchell. At the time I did not know who was speaking, but obviously it was a person with real knowledge and experience in the area of caring for young people. Barbara made the point that she believes very strongly that our children are the responsibility of our whole community. They belong to us all and we all have a responsibility to care for them—a hard point to argue against.

Barbara also made the point that too many of those who came before her as a magistrate having committed offences had also been before her for care and protection orders. This happened time and again, and she also recognised that for many of us it really is just the luck of the draw. Circumstances over which children have no control can ultimately determine the direction of their life. It was for these reasons that Barbara has also enthusiastically supported Hope for the Children as their patron. She has worked tirelessly to promote an organisation whose focus is early intervention and early support; an organisation that is about preventing problems escalating and providing a reassuring environment for all members of families. Hope for the Children is also very actively supported by actress Rachel Ward, who has acted as an ambassador and raised over $500 000 for this organisation.

I am delighted that the South Australian network of Hope for the Children is up and running and is located at the Modbury Hospital. Currently, there are some eight volunteers working with families in our area. They welcome referrals from a range of agencies, hospitals, doctors, health and welfare agencies, government departments, kindergartens and

child-care centres—and the list goes on. If there is a family out there struggling, they want to help. There are currently five networks operating in New South Wales, one in Queensland, one in South Australia and another one in the planning stages, I understand, for Port Augusta.

In 1996 a pilot project was established and a study conducted into the effectiveness of the Sutherland family network. The study found that there is a place for volunteer home visiting projects within the broad framework of health care services. It found that the aim of home visitation projects was to empower women, enabling them to recognise the work skills they perform in child care, housework and emotional work in families. Mothers in the study were generally lonely, isolated and depressed, and needed support with sick babies, postnatal depression, behavioural problems, traumatic birth and isolation.

Mothers were helped simply by being able to talk with another woman, someone who would listen, especially to their woes. Mothers were helped by the fact that another woman would come of her own free will to visit—a woman on whom they could depend to call every week. Practical help such as holding the baby for a time to allow the mother to catch a quick nap, and emotional support and friendship were often the most helpful. Mothers felt more comfortable with volunteer help as opposed to professional help. Early visitation after birth appeared to result in better outcomes for mothers and their families, and the study found that mothers with more than one child have benefited from the service offering friendship in a contemporary community that is increasingly fragmented and isolating for new mothers. The Sutherland network currently has 54 volunteers working with 45 families.

Hope for the Children is about understanding; it is about support; and it is about friendship. Hope for the Children is non-threatening, non-official and non-judgmental. Its aims are to reduce stress, to provide early intervention, to save families and to save lives. I will quote some testimonials from people who have received the benefits of assistance through the Hope for the Children Foundation. One woman said:

> I found the volunteer a good help in the way that we talked about postnatal depression. I opened up to her how I feel. I don't think I ever tell my husband as much as I tell her. My husband and I have a close relationship but he can't possibly know how I feel because he has not been through it, the physical side of it, and I don't think he can really understand how I feel, not 100 per cent. I think the only people who really know how I feel are the people who have been through it and I feel I can talk to the volunteer about it.

Another mother said:

> It keeps me going and in good spirits. The kids love her. I thought it would be like the professionals calling but it's turned out to be very different, very personal and helpful.

I commend the Tea Tree Gully Rotary Club and the other clubs of Rotary District 9500 on their three years of very hard work to establish the first South Australian network and for their ongoing commitment to support local families and their children. I also congratulate John Gardner of the Tea Tree Gully club who has been the driving force in the establishment of the South Australian network. John has now taken on the responsibility of establishing other South Australian networks, while another person is now taking on the responsibility for the management of the north-east network. These people are doing a magnificent job, as are all the Rotarians who are working hard to support them in their efforts.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I am pleased to support this motion. Likewise I, too, congratulate the Tea Tree Gully Rotary Club and other clubs of Rotary district 9500, on the establishment of the first South Australian Network of Hope for the children. I commend their dedication and commitment to providing support for new mothers who are socially isolated or suffering stress and reducing the incidence of child abuse within the community. As an honorary member of the Rotary club of Maitland and a former substantive member of the Maitland Rotary Club, I know only too well the excellent work that Rotary carries out in the community. I am delighted that such a move has been made by the Tea Tree Gully Rotary Club. It is a great credit to its president and all members for this initiative. Without the service clubs in our community, we would be a far worse community. It is very appropriate that in this year of the volunteers we recognise the work of service clubs, particularly Rotary, and all the other service clubs. It would be an enormous impost on the government if we had to pay for all the work that service clubs do over a period, and it is wonderful to see what Rotary is doing, particularly in the Tea Tree Gully area. With those few comments, I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): This is the archetypical motherhood motion, in every respect, in that what it does is speak about the things that everyone everywhere would do if only they had the resources to do it. In this case, Rotary district 9500 has decided to allocate some of the resources at its disposal to this program. I support the motion, like you, sir, having just spoken and now as Acting Speaker in the chair, I am a member of Rotary and have been for about 20 years. I am not a member of Rotary district 9500; I am on the wrong side of the River Torrens for that. However, my Rotary club is Tailem Bend. It is the smallest in South Australia; in fact, its membership fell to 11 in number. The district in which it is established, that is the postcode, has one of the lower per capita incomes of any place in Australia as do other communities in the Mallee, historically. Yet, in spite of the size of our club and the smallness of the disposable incomes of the people in the district in which we are established, we raise more per Rotary member and more per member of the community and adult population than other Rotary clubs, either in our district or that of 9500. I am proud to belong to Tailem Bend for that reason. Every year we successfully stage what we call a music hall, which is a concert of volunteers in the best traditions of South Australian country communities' entertainment of themselves. I have always commended the people who have participated in that. I have deliberately not participated in that but I guess next year I will for the fun of it, should they think it worthwhile to have me participate.

I support this scheme, because it will provide support for new mothers who are socially isolated or suffering stress. Goodness knows how they are to be identified. I would be interested to examine the criteria of what is a new mother and what is an old mother because, if there is a new mother, the automatic corollary is that there has to be an old mother. So, someone is new, someone is working their way from new to old, and those who are old. How it will reduce the incidence of child abuse within our community again I am not sure. But I am certain that the capacity for Rotary to think laterally and devise means of effectively delivering such an outcome—albeit erratically—across the spectrum and maybe by different criteria but no less erratically than what the govern-

ment could do if it tried the same thing, as it does. It is worth trying and worth doing, because children ought not to suffer. We have the prosperity that enables us to address the problem without encouraging dependency as a mindset.

I am one of the few fortunate people I suppose who had assistance—public charity—provided when I was a child to help me through school, those years of my life when it was most difficult for my parents and brothers and sisters, given that there were so many of us. Times were different. There was not very much to go around and we were all required to work. That is not now possible. Children do not have the same opportunity to wander free. Now it is against the law to cut gum tips, which are the strong smelling leaves, of infantile form, on regrowth on some eucalypts where the principal stems have been cut down, for whatever reason in the process of clearing the land or obtaining timber for construction of haysheds or other sheds, and so on. It is now against the law to go and cut those leaves and sell them.

Indeed, it is against the law to cut firewood, because it is clearly against the laws of preservation of native vegetation, as are some of the other things that I did at that time such as trapping rabbits. In my time in this place we have also made it unlawful to trap rabbits using gin traps. We have also made it more difficult for anyone to sell, as I did, fruit and vegetables, either grown by myself and my brothers or taken as windfalls that were not wanted by the owner of the orchard. We have done that by putting restrictions on what you can sell and what you cannot, and how it has to be weighed and labelled. So it is no longer possible for children to engage in those kinds of things.

I am sure that the additional levels of stress that thereby imposed on families who seek to help themselves results in the fact that more children are in greater need, and parents suffer greater stress through understanding the difficulties which confront them and feeling helpless to deal with them, unable to inspire their children. This program at least provides some assistance, if not the means of again engendering self-help as a solution to the problem. I commend the member for bringing it to the House and Rotary district 9500 for having the wit to put it together.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I support the words of the member for Wright. I certainly agreed with and listened with great interest to what she had to say. Even though she is not a member of the government, as members of Parliament we should listen to and act on speeches such as this. All politics aside, it is in relation to issues such as this that we as politicians can act as a team and recognise needs within in our community. Indeed, I am also honoured to be an honorary member of Rotary, Kapunda branch. I commend the Tea Tree Gully Rotary Club and other clubs of Rotary district 9500. The Network of Hope is a great concept, especially the volunteer ethic involved with it. As the member said, it is the volunteer who is appreciated when they are called more so than the professional. I do not want to cast aspersions on the professionals, but the volunteer is just that—a volunteer, a person of like mind, of like type and often from the same socioeconomic background as the patient. Even though we need professionals, I am sure that often a volunteer is the best person to give that service in some instances.

The support for new mothers—and I believe that a 'new mother' is defined as someone who has her first baby—is necessary because it can be rather frightening. I went through that myself as a young father when my wife and I had our first child—I was the father, of course, not the mother—because the day ended up being very traumatic. The birth did not go as expected: a Caesarean was in the offing and no blood was available, so for me that meant a 70 mile drive to Wallaroo to get blood and get back to the hospital, hoping that all was well when I got there. I was as supportive as I could be, being a husband and father. I am sure that there are some things that wives would not discuss with their husbands because of the fact that they are not women and would not understand. I think all these things are entwined in the member's sentiments and the motion that she has moved this morning.

I believe new mothers, above all, will always need assistance. This cuts across all areas and often applies to those in socio-economic groups where you would not expect any problems to be experienced. When new mothers have difficulty coping, anything that reduces the likelihood of child abuse also must be supported. It is never intentional but, in times of great stress, children are abused accidentally and, often, it is later regretted. If there is an outlet and someone can be called on or spoken to, it is a great move.

This is the year of the volunteer, and there are thousands of volunteers doing marvellous works all over our state helping others. We all wonder where we, as individuals, can help and what skills we can offer as a volunteer. This issue is a prime example of how people possess skills when they otherwise would not think they had such skills. A woman who has been a mother and who has raised her children successfully certainly would be an ideal person for this volunteer service. She has been there, done that, and can understand the problems and pitfalls confronting a new mother, particularly when there are other pressures, whether they be financial, family or other. So, it is the skills of comradeship, the skills of motherhood and the skills of a person with compassion that I think matter in these instances. A person from a country area takes these things for granted but, in the city—where I find myself more and more nowadays—neighbours do not talk to neighbours. People are unaware of the problems being experienced next door, whereas in a country community they would be more aware. So, anything such as this which has been put forward is a very positive move. I commend the member for not only moving this motion but also for bringing it to us today. I certainly support the motion.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I would like to make a brief contribution. I commend the member for Wright for bringing this motion before the House, and I also commend the Tea Tree Gully Rotary Club. There are several Rotary clubs in the southern area that I interact with, and I am always impressed by their commitment to the community.

The role of being a young mother is not an easy one. I guess the same applies, in a different way, to the role of young fathers. The extended family has diminished. When I was growing up, it was not long before someone put a baby in your arms and you soon learnt some of the basic principles of looking after babies and young children. Sadly, that has diminished now, not only for young women but for young men as well. We often see in court the tragic consequences where usually a young male—often the father, but sometimes a stepfather—for example, in response to frustration at a crying child, shakes a baby and does other things which are quite dangerous and inappropriate. So, anything that assists young mothers in this case—or, as I say, anything that assists young fathers—is to be commended.

When I was minister for training, we instituted a program called 'Maternity for Fraternity', which was a phrase, I think, coined by my media officer at the time, Kim Wheatley. That was designed to get teenage mothers back into education. It operated out of the Christies Beach campus and was very successful. We sought to do the same in the northern suburbs. I am not sure what happened to that program, but it was well received by young teenage mothers and, coupled with proper child-care facilities, they were able to go back to school and continue their education which had ceased once they had become mothers at a very young age. I hope that, today, similar programs are being conducted by the government, and I certainly commend the Rotarians for doing something outside the government sphere to help young mothers.

It is not easy. Obviously, I have not given birth to a child, although I have had a kidney stone. People say that is very similar in terms of the pain level, but I guess the pain of a kidney stone is a short-lived pain. The challenge for young mothers is great. They are under a lot of pressure. In many cases, there is quite a stigma. Often, value judgments are passed about whether they got pregnant in order to collect social welfare. I do not wish to reflect on young people in that way but, irrespective of how or why a person is in that situation, the community needs to support young mothers and young infants; and also, where possible, it needs to provide support for young fathers, if they are present, to make them aware and give them an understanding of the importance of their role as well. In that way, in the future, hopefully, we will have fewer people in the community who have suffered as a result of inappropriate or uncaring treatment when an infant. So, I commend this motion to the House.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I also rise to support this excellent motion and congratulate the member on putting it before the house. I want to commend the work of the Rotary District 9500 and also Rotary clubs in general, in particular, the Tea Tree Gully Rotary Club. I am privileged to be an honorary member of a Rotary club myself, although, sadly, I do not get there for fellowship very often because, as all members would know, a member of parliament has a lot of electorate work and a lot of paperwork to service their electorate, and the chances of getting to regular Rotary meetings, unfortunately, are very slim.

However, I know and appreciate the great work that Rotary clubs do. In this international year of volunteering and, having the pleasure of working with volunteers—over 30 000 of them in my portfolio—I certainly know the importance of volunteering. In any country or any state, irrespective of how well off that country or state may or may not be, a lot of the services that are provided could never be provided if it were not for volunteers and, clearly, in this case I speak particularly about the Rotary clubs.

Obviously, as a father myself, I understand a little about how difficult it is to have young children. Although my oldest is now 16, it seems like only the other day that I realised that I became a father. It is a huge learning curve and, I must say, 16 years later, while the oldest one is a great kid, it is still a huge learning curve—in fact, I think it gets steeper.

The Hon. R.B. Such: For you, or her?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: For both, I think—the father, the mother and the child (or the young adult). But nothing is more important than supporting young children and their parents. What happens in the early foundation years basically sets the framework for the future of the child. I see cases in my portfolio area where, from the history, it is clear that things that go right or wrong in teenage years and adult years are often the cause of what happened when someone was a very young person.

So, this mentoring support for new mothers who are socially isolated and suffering stress is an important initiative, and I wish the Network of Hope for the Children every success I could possibly wish for it. Reducing the incidence of child abuse within our community is fundamental. I know that police spend nearly 50 per cent of their whole workload on violence and abuse of one kind or another, and we are always on the bandaid end of that. Anything that can be done to be pro-active is important. There is no university degree for being a parent. A person can get a degree for just about anything, but there is no degree for being a parent. It is a fact of life that parents have to cope with the highs and lows. Even with the great support my wife had with our first child—support from our parents, our sisters and my brother—I know that there are stressful times even in that environment, and you have to understand the tiredness involved.

This is a fantastic initiative. As I said, even in my wife's case, with all that support there were still issues involving, for instance, tiredness and those occasions when a child was unwell or would not feed. Sometimes even simple things like managing to bath the child, getting adequate sleep yourself, getting the child settled and going out shopping are holistic pressures on young mothers, particularly if they come from a socially disadvantaged area, are very young or may not have the opportunity of enjoying the support that the majority of the community has from other families. Let us hope that this program can be evaluated along the way. It is a very important program, and once it has been through its evaluation, if it proves to have the successes that it should, it is something that all members of parliament should consider broadening with the support of Rotary or in any other way that the government and parliament might be able to help. I congratulate all those involved and look forward to seeing the positive results of this initiative.

Motion carried.

RAILWAYS, METROPOLITAN

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I move:

That this House calls on the state government to request funding assistance from the federal government so that the existing broad gauge rail system in the metropolitan area can be converted to standard gauge, electrified and extended to serve suburbs such as Seaford, which are not currently part of the rail network.

Members may not realise that Adelaide is the only mainland capital that does not have an electrified suburban rail system. I think the time is ripe when we should be putting pressure on the federal government—because it assisted in the standardisation or the electrification of Perth and Brisbane—to get a similar deal here. It was put to me some time ago that the federal government some time ago offered to do what I am seeking, but the government of the day said, 'No; we will stick with buses.' That decision is to be regretted. We still need buses in some areas, but if the commonwealth government offered to pay for standardisation and electrification some years ago, whoever said no I think owes the state a sincere apology.

I am sure the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, would be keen to get money from the commonwealth, and I have always been very impressed with the activities of the minister. I believe she is an intelli-

gent, caring and responsive person. It is probably not easy for her to go out saying what I am saying; nevertheless I think this motion has merit. While obviously she needs to speak for herself, I am sure that she would not refuse total funding from the federal government.

Members may not realise that, in respect of the metropolitan area, the Belair line now has only one track for suburban passenger trains, so trains travelling between Adelaide and Belair and vice versa have to wait at a loop for the passenger train on the other track to pass so that it can continue on its way. In a city like Adelaide in this day and age, that is very primitive indeed. There would be a lot of advantages in converting to standard gauge. One of them would be that Mitsubishi at Tonsley Park could access the rail link. I am not just talking about the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link in this respect, but that would be an obvious one to mention. Mitsubishi cannot access the rail system at the moment, because of the broad gauge line going past their plant at Tonsley Park. The situation at Tonsley Park is also important, bearing in mind that the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning recently said no to a southern O-Bahn. Although many of my constituents are disappointed, I can understand why: the cost would be very high indeed.

If members think about it, they would know that the plan was to bring the O-Bahn alongside and parallel to the railway line from Tonsley to the city. With trains you would get an interruption every 20 minutes or so, but with buses there would be an interruption at every rail crossing every two minutes. I do not think it would be long before John Fotheringham had steam coming out of his ears, and motorists would probably have steam coming out of not only their ears but also other parts of the body! Clearly, there were other impacts in respect of the O-Bahn, and that would have involved the electorate of Unley, because properties there would have been significantly affected. I can understand why the minister and government have not proceeded with it. Whilst the current O-Bahn is a great system, in many respects I do not believe it has the flexibility that is desired. The point I am making is that, in relation to the Tonsley rail line, we could have an interchange there with buses coming in and connecting with rail into the city. We could do that as part of the current system, but it would be even better if we had a standard gauge system and it was electrified.

There has been talk for many years about extending the rail line to Seaford, and I think that is warranted. It will always be a challenge to extend a rail line to the eastern suburbs. I think the member for Bragg would probably fall off his chair at the initial thought of a rail line going out there, but there are other parts of Adelaide where a rail network could be extended.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: He is the member for that area, so he still has a responsibility to it. Other suburbs could be serviced by a rail system. Paris now has integrated buses into the rail system. It is a variation, it is not the same as the O-Bahn, but some of the buses have been converted so that they can be driven onto the existing rail line. So, a whole lot of variations could be considered as part of a revamp of what is required, and that is an integrated transport rail system in metropolitan Adelaide.

The cost of what I am talking about would be great. I am not kidding myself here: we are talking hundreds of millions of dollars. I do not think John Howard will lose sleep in the next week thinking about how he will get the money, because I do not believe something like this is likely to happen overnight—obviously not—but that does not detract from the merit of the proposal. It would have great benefit for South Australia, not only in terms of stimulating industry but also obviously creating employment. Again I make the point that Perth and Brisbane have been provided with a system that we should have here in terms of equity. I am not asking for something that the other states have not had; they have had assistance in this regard, and we should be treated in the same way.

I am aware that, with the Alice Springs to Darwin rail project under way, some areas in the country could need standardisation. I am aware that the Tailem Bend to Loxton line is still a broad gauge and that the Wolseley to Mount Gambier line is also broad gauge, so I am sure the members for Chaffey and Gordon would be keen to see those lines also standardised and linked into the main rail network. The focus of this motion is essentially on an improved transport system for the metropolitan area.

The point about Mitsubishi I have highlighted. What needs to be considered—and one way this could be funded—is creating what I call 'infrastructure bonds'. I used the term 'build SA bonds' once before when I wrote to the Premier and Treasurer. This is the sort of project people in South Australia would be prepared to put money into, particularly if they got some taxation concession for so doing. I do not have a problem with that being offered and it is one of the ways we could go. We could fund projects like this rather than much of our money going into interstate or overseas investments. We could be investing in our infrastructure and improving transport systems in South Australia and doing other significant infrastructure work.

This project has merit. It is unfortunate that apparently we were offered it once before under a previous government and it was rejected but now is the time to ask the commonwealth government to come to the party so that we can get a suburban rail system that is comparable to Perth and Brisbane, which is standard gauge electrified and integrated with the rest of the system, and covers a wider range of suburbs, including, Seaford. I commend the motion to the House.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I rise also to support the general intent of this motion from the viewpoint of any funding assistance that could come from the federal government to address some of the issues around standardisation of some of the odd broad gauge rail links still where I still see key opportunities for our state in broad gauge. While the member for Fisher has spoken about this in the House, I have had discussions with council and others going back a couple of years and talking with the southern partnership. If we are to be serious with projects that can on a bipartisan basis assist our southern region, I firmly believe that fixing a relatively small distance of track from Tonsley through to the oil refinery and Mitsubishi is one of them.

I have discussed this with Geoff Tate. I have not pushed it hard enough myself yet, but perhaps with cooperation between a number of members we can look at how we can jointly push it. I have seen lots of strong growth in Lonsdale over the years. I recall only a couple of years ago the City of Onkaparinga went down and said they it the largest amount of building applications in Lonsdale's history. That is now quite evident when you go to Lonsdale. There is hardly anything you cannot buy in Lonsdale or Hackham these days when it comes to materials and services. We can look at the growing wine industry and the fact that Fleurieu Gold, the

food trail through the Fleurieu Peninsula and through my own home town at Mount Compass, is being developed. The cheese factory is starting up again. There is talk about the opportunities now in being able to set up niche cooperatives for fully added and processed dairy products, and the list goes on.

We should be able to have a container packaging depot in Lonsdale where we set up a new industry in packing. Why should we be taking all those goods on the roads to areas like Port Adelaide and having jobs down there for packing when we could set up a hub and also help Kangaroo Island because we see a lot of produce coming off there. I see the B-doubles almost every day as I am coming from my electorate to Adelaide. Why do they have to come to Port Adelaide from Kangaroo Island? They could come to Lonsdale, pack the whole lot there and create a lot of jobs, as there are multi-skilled opportunities there also. We could put them on to containers, straight on to the standard gauge and when they get to Adelaide they simply hook on to the rest of the Adelaide to Darwin railway and we could have our wine and various other products up to Darwin and into Asia more quickly, more efficiently and be able to develop jobs.

If you talk about key pieces of infrastructure, with the rail corridor I get disappointed when I see the bitumen tankers on the railway line: it is about the only time they use it—it is used rarely. It is a huge asset for our area and it is time we had a look at how we could standardise it because we all know there are costs up front with whatever infrastructure projects you put in. If you wait for all the opportunities to come to you before putting the infrastructure in place, most of the time you will not get the opportunities. You need to get the infrastructure right and the opportunities develop and evolve from there. I support that side of the general thrust of the motion from the member for Fisher. He has been able to listen to my comments and the two of us could get together at some stage. We have the southern partnership coming up, raise it and see whether we can drive it through there. I commend the motion.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise in support of this motion of the member for Fisher. I am passionate about rail and anything that advances our rail facilities in South Australia has my support. This state's history of rail gauge chaos is well known over many years. We have come a long way since the late 1800s when we operated three gauges in our state. I recall the situation in Port Pirie where we had three gauges—narrow, standard and broad—all in the main street of Port Pirie. You would wonder why it happened. Over the years we have brought this situation under control and today we have mainly standard gauge across our state but, as the member for Fisher said, we have these pockets of broad gauge. Metropolitan Adelaide being still on broad creates a lot of strategic problems for our rail network. It is taken as a given that everybody would desire to convert it, but the fact that it has not is remiss of all of us.

This also has divided the metropolitan rail services and our country rail services because all our country services are now on standard. It means that a passenger train operating in Adelaide cannot go onto country lines. It also means that country trains are unable to access the Adelaide Railway Station, except maybe one line coming in there. Certainly, it works both ways: if we want to promote our rail service throughout the state we must have the flexibility to take locomotives and passenger trains from the metropolitan, city and country areas and vice versa. The fiasco that has occurred in the past of having different gauges has been all but addressed. I do not know why we do not finish it off by going the whole way and bringing the Adelaide metropolitan area and the Northern line to the Barossa into line with everything else.

I think it is a great advantage to be able to bring in passenger trains. I have always been very upset and concerned that Adelaide railcars (we have three different types of car, particularly the series 2000 railcar) cannot provide country services. I know the bogies can be changed so that they can run, but it would be ideal if a service could be run from Adelaide to Port Pirie and then straight back onto the metropolitan lines, and vice versa, and similarly for the South-East lines.

I believe the time must come when rail services run back into our country regions—particularly to Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla and, indeed, Mount Gambier. It is a travesty that these services have been let go, and the problem is exacerbated because we do not have the rail infrastructure to match. I support the member's motion, particularly in relation to electrifying the system in Adelaide. We all talk about 'clean and green' and we are now all very environmentally conscious. If any federal money is available for projects such as this, we should all be there speaking for it with one voice. I would expect the opposition to support this motion because it is a very commendable one, and I wonder why I did not think of it in the first place. It is one of my favourite subjects and I did not think of it. However, I commend the member who has, and I support him.

I look forward to the day when there is only one gauge in this state and trains can be run wherever we like, and there is no nonsense about their not being able to run. I support the effort to bring Mount Gambier back on line. There have been various discussions about that prospect in recent days by both the government and private operators—particularly those operating in the grain trade who have to move grain all over the state without the prohibiting change of gauge. Over the years, the changes of gauges in this state have cost the state economy countless millions of dollars because of the inefficiencies that it brings.

The member has also mentioned the Riverland line from Tailem Bend across to Loxton, and it has been discussed at length. I believe the line through Appamurra should be done as a matter of urgency because of the grain silos there, and all the grain is now being transported by truck. We know the accident record in the Riverland and other areas, and this is an obvious way to bring not only efficiencies but also safety back onto our roads. I commend the member for this idea and I only regret that I did not think of it first.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I support this motion because I think it has a lot of credibility. As I said to the member earlier, I am surprised that the metropolitan lines do not have the standard gauge option because, in my opinion, it is absolutely essential that standard gauge is used throughout the state.

For a company such as Mitsubishi it is vitally important that it is able to put its finished cars straight onto a train and transport them to the export markets via the Adelaide to Darwin rail link when it has been completed. There is definitely no time like the present to start pushing to change this rail link.

I have had a reasonable amount to do with the rail link in my electorate through the Yorke Peninsula Rail Preservation Society, which has reactivated the railway line from Wallaroo

to Bute, which currently runs on broad gauge. The society recently purchased a Red Hen and it was very easy to put it straight onto the broad gauge and run it accordingly. I am also aware that the line from Wallaroo to Bute has both broad gauge and standard gauge—a dual gauge. To the best of my knowledge, both a standard gauge and a broad gauge train can run on that line from Wallaroo to Bute, except for a few points that have been removed to be used in another area. Why could not a similar change be made in the metropolitan area, where one extra railway line could be placed on the existing sleepers? I occasionally use the train, and I take note when waiting at a station to see what condition the sleepers are in, and it is my assessment that they are in pretty good condition. Therefore, it would not be difficult simply to lay one railway line next to the broad gauge line, and this could be done in stages. It does not have to be all done in the one year: it could be in stages over a few years.

It might be that priority is given to a line such as the one to Tonsley so that Mitsubishi could use it to export their vehicles as soon as possible, as well as to bring in supplies, particularly if they are coming from interstate. There is no doubt that it is essential to have a complete connection of all the rail links. This will take enormous pressure off our roads. I see in my electorate the amount of damage done by the heavy vehicles. Their suspensions have improved; in fact, air-bag suspensions are now being used, and even the road trains are doing less damage to the roads than some of the smaller trucks. Nevertheless, I look at, say, the major highway from Gepps Cross through to Port Wakefield and, over the past few years since it has been laid, I have been able to see how sections of the road have deteriorated considerably as a result of the continual flow of heavy articulated vehicles.

If we can get some of that freight onto the train tracks it will save this state millions of dollars. There is no doubt that the state government does not have the resources to say, 'We'll convert the gauge to standard gauge.' It must be a federal responsibility. I believe that, now that the commitment has been given for the Alice Springs to Darwin rail link, it is most appropriate for us to put maximum pressure on the federal government to say, 'South Australia is the only state not connected to the standard gauge system.'

I was interested to hear the member for Fisher say that Perth and Brisbane were given commonwealth assistance some years ago to change their tracks from broad gauge to standard gauge. Apparently, the Labor Government in this state at the time rejected the offer and said, 'No, we will be going to buses'—and similar transport. That was a monumental error of judgment at that time. However, it has happened and there is no point in our reflecting sadly about that. Let us look to the future and get things changed. The one possible problem I have with this motion relates to the electrification of the rail system. I would want to be assured that that is a move in the right direction, particularly as the Labor opposition has sought to highlight possible anomalies in the national grid system that it introduced and the price that we will be paying for electricity.

I have been assured by the Treasurer that additional power generating facilities will be built in this state and, with any sort of luck, within the next 12 months we will have an adequate amount of power—in fact, even a surplus amount of power. Once you have a surplus amount of power available to the public, immediately the cost of power is kept within limits; and, in fact, it is highly likely that the cost of electricity will decrease in the longer term if a surplus of power is being generated. Whatever the case, as a result of the increase in use of electricity, there is every incentive for new companies to build new power plants, be they small or large.

That is exactly what is occurring in South Australia and it will be to our great advantage. Certainly, there are some moves along those lines interstate, but I just hope that the interstate people are not falling behind the eight ball too much. Electric trains certainly run in Victoria but, again, that state has access to cheaper power than South Australia has. I would not want to see the member for Fisher going down the track of electrifying if we are not quite sure that it is helping not only from an environmental point of view but an expense point of view. It is very important to ensure that the cost of using rail is always so competitive that companies do not have to be encouraged to use it but that it would be automatic for them to use it as against these roads.

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The member for Fisher comments that it is much cheaper than diesel which we use now. It should also be borne in mind that, according to the motor industry, the type of engines that we are using for motor cars will be revolutionised in the next 10 or more years. We probably will not see the internal combustion engine around for that much longer in the form that we know it. There could also be moves in rail, too. I would say yes, 100 per cent, to adopting the standard gauge rail—absolutely no question at all. However, I think that electrification would need to be looked at a little further and we will have to work that out one way or the other.

Certainly, there is a situation in my electorate involving the rail link to Bute. We have sufficient surplus line so that we could also relay the line from Wallaroo to Moonta and, using volunteers, it would not cost that much. We would need only some sleepers and, hopefully, that could be worked out. I know the reality of doing it in a logical and progressive form, and I trust that the federal government will see fit to come to our assistance in this regard.

Ms THOMPSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

SUPPLY BILL

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the House the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

WANGANEEN, Mr G.

A petition signed by 221 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the Government to establish an inquiry into the death of Grant Wanganeen and review police training, deployment and liaison procedures, was presented by Ms Bedford.

Petition received.

BLAIR ATHOL PEDESTRIAN CROSSING

A petition signed by 944 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House urge the government to install a pedestrian crossing at the intersection of Audrey Avenue and Main North Road at Blair Athol, was presented by Mr Clarke.

Petition received.

FIREWORKS

A petition signed by 478 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House ban the personal use of fireworks with the exception of authorised public displays, was presented by Mrs Geraghty.

Petition received.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

A petition signed by 267 residents of South Australia, requesting that the House ensure the supply of electrical power is adequate to maintain the state's standard of living and is not manipulated for the excessive financial benefit of suppliers, was presented by the Hon. R.B. Such.

Petition received.

SA WATER

In reply to **Mr CONLON** (25 October 2000).

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I confirm my response that I am advised that the only cost incurred by the South Australian government was a meal with the Governor of West Java, as part of the parliamentary friendship activity.

AUSTRALIAN ROAD RULES

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): On behalf of the Minister for Transport and Urban Planning in another place, I lay on the table a ministerial statement made today in another place.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Tourism (Hon. J. Hall)—

Adelaide Entertainments Corporation—Charter and Performance Statement

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. D.C. Kotz)—

Local Government Act—Regulations—Superannuation Scheme Rules—Waiting Period.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Local Government): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

The SPEAKER: Is leave granted?

Mr Lewis: No.

The SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

QUESTION TIME

ELECTRICITY CONTRACTS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Premier aware that letters of offer of electricity for 2 600 South Australian businesses without power contracts after 1 July will now be sent out early next week, and that those offers include price rises averaging 30 per cent, with much greater increases for contracts of less than five years? How does the Premier expect South Australian businesses to be competitive, given that, even before this new round of increases, our electricity prices are the highest in the national market?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): It was not so many days ago that the member for Hart was suggesting that no offers were being put on the table at all. The fact is that we have worked with a range of companies to ensure that offers were to come through and the fact that by far the majority, in percentage terms, will get an offer put on the table is to be welcomed.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: That is a speculative—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I have had suggestions from the opposition on a range of measures in the past, and when one goes back and checks the facts one finds that the facts do not match the substance of the allegation that is being made. That is clearly the case borne out time and again.

In relation to the second part of the question from the Leader of the Opposition, I simply point out that South Australian businesses can become competitive. The reason that they are competitive and have an advantage over New South Wales and Victoria is in areas such as a very substantial reduction in WorkCover costs. The Leader of the Opposition sees fit to absolutely ignore the fact that we have reduced from 1 July last year—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader will remain silent.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: —a 7½ per cent increase in WorkCover premiums. We have announced a further 14 per cent reduction in WorkCover premiums. The savings for businesses in this state in a full financial year will be something like $108 million. Whilst the member for Hart and the Leader of the Opposition want to inflame this position, I understand that the Independent Regulator, Mr Lew Owens, suggested to the Economic and Finance Committee yesterday that this matter should not be inflamed. I wonder whom he might have been referring to in relation to that suggestion.

What the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Hart also overlook is the fact that a number of additional generators have announced in the last 10 days that they are going to put additional generating capacity into South Australia. So, what we have done is move a step forward in creating the competitive environment that is needed to drive prices, and in addition to that—

Mr Foley: There's no competition.

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Hart to order.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I can tell the member for Hart that part of the reason there is not sufficient competition is that the Labor administration of the past did nothing about an alternative gas supply in South Australia. It did nothing! Over 13 years, it looked at infrastructure and the long-term interest and needs of this state, and simply ignored the infrastructure. It ignored the South-East of South Australia in terms of an alternative energy source, such as a gas pipeline.

It took this government, without taxpayers' funds, to negotiate a gas pipeline between Melbourne and Adelaide that will bring 45 petajoules of gas into our state. What that will do is put competitive prices in gas—and of course, gas is required for 40 per cent of electricity generation in our state. So, the member for Hart overlooks all these facts of putting together the infrastructure upon which real competition can be built into the marketplace. Why are we in this position? It is because of years of inaction by the former administration.

GAMBLING REFORM

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): My question is directed to the Premier. Can—

Members interjecting:

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

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: I bet you're not game to say that out there. Can the Premier inform the House of the reaction within the community to—

An honourable member interjecting:

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

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: —the gambling reforms on which he briefed the House yesterday?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I thank the member for Bragg for his question, and I again publicly acknowledge his personal role with the task force that worked through a range of measures upon which we will be introducing a bill later to the House that will address this vexed question of problem gambling within the community. Our gambling reforms are the result of widespread consultation, cooperation and constructive approach by members of the gaming machine review. This is a crucial issue for the state. It is an area where some problem gamblers create enormous problems for themselves and their families.

I note that the member for Hart described the measures as 'window-dressing'. Key welfare groups have expressed publicly their support for the initiative. They happen to believe that this is a historic first step. The Adelaide Central Mission, for example, has issued a statement enthusiastically welcoming the initiative. The Heads of Christian Churches Gambling Task Force, which also joins the review, says that the outcome is 'the most significant and much needed reform to the gambling industry yet seen in South Australia'. The Catholic welfare group, Centacare, which also helps the review, says that this is 'a very large step in the right direction for preventing problem gambling'.

However, the member for Hart persists with statements such as, 'This is but window-dressing.' The member for Hart is clearly out of step with the welfare sector.

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Well, the leader says, 'It was a stunt.' I have acknowledged—

Mr Foley: I said it was a stunt.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: Sorry, I misunderstood: the leader says that the member for Hart says it is a stunt. The leader made a submission—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: A very good submission.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: The two page submission was good and I thank you for it. I acknowledged yesterday, and again today, that the leader made a submission. The leader made a submission and the member for Hart calls it a stunt and window-dressing. Perhaps they could open up dialogue between them and get one policy—just one policy; any policy would do, but just one policy might not be a bad start. Clearly, the member for Hart is not only out of step with welfare groups in this state but also out of touch with the leader.

ALICE SPRINGS TO DARWIN RAILWAY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Can the Premier rule out reports that 110 railcars for the Alice Springs to Darwin railway project will be built in China and not in South Australia; and what action is the government taking to make good on its promise that 70 per cent of the value of goods and services for the railway will be produced by South Australian and Northern Territory companies?

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): I am delighted to inform the House that Mr Curry has his facts wrong—100 per cent wrong. I notice that he was on radio this morning suggesting that an overseas firm had won this contract. I suggest that Mr Curry get up to speed and not keep six months behind the ball game. The fact is that his claim is erroneous. The contract to supply the ballast wagons has not yet been awarded by the company involved, which is the Australian Railroad Group. In fact, I am advised that ARG is still negotiating with parties, including companies in this state, for the supply of the wagons. What we need to do is get the facts out and not ignore the reality and circumstances simply for the sake of getting up a story.

The leader should also know that the UTLC, as I am advised, was in fact informed that this matter is still pending. The local participation plan is something on which we have significantly concentrated to ensure that we can maximise South Australian industry involvement.

The other point I bring to the attention of the House is as it relates to the manufacturing sector, and to reject claims that we are not assisting our manufacturing sector. I simply make these couple of points. In exports, manufacture is now up 73 per cent; that is, our manufacturing component is up, and it has expanded. It is up from less than 68 per cent 2½ years ago. The total manufactured exports in that time have grown $1.7 billion or 50 per cent. They now run at over $5 billion a year. Capital expenditure in manufacturing industry is now as high as it has been at any time since 1990 and at a level of about $900 million annually, or about 50 per cent higher than the end of 1993 level of manufacturing investment bequeathed to us by the former Labor administration.

GRAFFITI

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Will the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services outline to the House details of the state government's new crackdown on graffiti? It is a pity they do not have a crackdown on the graffiti that the member for Spence puts out.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart is commenting.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I know that the honourable member has a keen interest in what I am about to say, because he has discussed this issue of graffiti in the party room many times, and I know in his own electorate he has been doing what he can to reduce graffiti. Today the Premier announced tough new laws on graffiti. At present across Australia graffiti costs the community and the taxpayers about $200 million a year. In South Australia it is about $10 million a year. That is a lot of money that cannot go into jobs, education, health, police and other areas. For a long time, the government has been working with community, local government, crime prevention units and police to do what we can to combat graffiti.

That includes the situation where, about five years ago, the government introduced a voluntary code of conduct in relation to graffiti and retail sale practices. Unfortunately, no matter how hard you try in government to gain cooperation and expect businesses to do the right thing—and I must say that many of the businesses have done the right thing in South Australia with the voluntary code, and I commend them for that—some businesses continue to leave racks of spray cans

out the front of their shops with $2 signs on them. That is totally unacceptable. There comes a time when, whilst the government has worked well with the retailers to encourage this code of practice and we have KESAB involved in others, you have to make a firm and tough decision.

Legislation and regulation will be developed to ensure that all spray cans will be locked away. Of course, that is no different from the requirements pertaining to poisons in hardware stores, merchandise stores and stock firms across the state. That is one of the key planks in this strategy. The other is that, if you are a minor, you will not be able to buy spray cans at all. That is a very clear and strong piece of legislation and one that has to be put before parliament. I am sure that all members of the parliament will support the government with this initiative.

There is another plank whereby the state government, local government and police will develop a comprehensive policy to be able to track across the whole of the metropolitan area, in an integrated way, the issues around tagging, surveillance, monitoring and apprehension of offenders. We want to see all people putting their efforts into the right sort of opportunities for the community, and there are some talented young people out there. But they cause damage with this type of artwork. When they write graffiti and engage in street crime and vandalism on private and public property that is unacceptable. It is not in their interests, and it is certainly not in the interests of the broader community.

There are a couple of other issues involved in this. Graffiti tends to send a perception that there is crime in an area. When you have a look at the statistics in that area around crime, often you see that the crime is relatively low. But if you go along a rail or bus corridor, you see this graffiti, and it sends a perception that there is crime in that area. That is clearly something that this government does not want to happen.

I conclude by commending the crime prevention groups that have been doing a great job of graffiti removal and strategies to combat graffiti. I also commend the councils, particularly the Onkaparinga council, which is recognised world-wide for its initiatives to wipe out graffiti. Interestingly, the Onkaparinga council had to remove 7 809 hits of graffiti in the last 12 months in a program costing $180 000 and involving 1 000 volunteers. We would prefer that those volunteers were able to put their efforts into things that they choose to put them into rather than wiping out graffiti. Whilst this is a tough decision, it is a decision that is right for the South Australian community; the community endorses it; and, I am delighted to be able to report this initiative to the parliament today.

DRY ZONES

Mr CLARKE (Ross Smith): Given that this seems to be tough on crime week, my question is directed to the Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services. Given the minister's statements yesterday stressing the importance of dry zones in dealing with criminal behaviour, will the Adelaide city dry zone be enforced in a similar way to dry zones in the South-East, or will different rules apply to the people in Victoria Square from those that applied to the Gipsy Jokers motorcycle gang in Beachport and Robe?

Police sources have confirmed that, in January 2001, local police area commanders allowed members of the Gipsy Jokers motorcycle gang to engage in public drunkenness in areas designated as dry zones at Beachport and Robe, and also allowed them to undertake motorcycle burnouts on public roads and ride their motorcycles without helmets.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (Minister for Police, Correctional Services and Emergency Services): I will attempt to answer the question, if members on the other side would stop laughing and start listening.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: The member for Hart is laughing. There is a certain allegation in the question which says that the police have two sets of rules. On behalf of the Police Department, I am committed to look after the South Australian community. And 93 per cent of the South Australian community tells us how good a job the police do, and a member on the other side—an ex Labor member—is accusing the police of having two ways of policing. I take offence at that. Having said that, of course, dry zones have to be—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Ross Smith!

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Having said that, of course, dry zones will be policed in the normal way, whether they are in the South-East, in the CBD, at Port Augusta, along the coast, down at Victor Harbor, or wherever.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume his seat. I draw the attention of members to my statement towards the end of question time yesterday. I made the point that the chair is getting fed up with the constant interjection that is coming from both sides of the chamber. I am fast running out of patience. I came very close to naming members yesterday, and I can assure you that I am not far from it today.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Thank you, sir. The police in this state do a very good job. Look at the excellent work that the police did with the outlawed motorcycle gangs in very difficult circumstances. The police are constantly monitoring and working on the difficult issue of outlawed motorcycle gangs, and the government is committed to support them with initiatives like this—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Mitchell.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: —that I have advised the House we are working through, albeit with difficulty, given a High Court decision. So, there are a lot of strategies in place to combat outlawed motorcycle gangs. If the honourable member has specific evidence which causes him to believe that police did something as he has said—specific evidence—then let him put it to me—

An honourable member: He did!

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: No, give us the specifics: give us the dates, the times and the names of the police officers, and we will look at it. But, at the end of the day—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Ross Smith. I caution him to be careful.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: —I will support and back up the general efforts of the South Australian Police in the community, because they do a very good job.

EDUCATION, PUBLIC

The Hon. D.C. WOTTON (Heysen): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services advise the House of some of the many achievements made by his department in public education over the last 12 months and outline the impact these achievements have had on the community?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Heysen for his question, because I am overjoyed to be able to tell the parliament about the fine achievements we are making in public education. Let me just mention a few. The Partnerships 21 management scheme has been designed, directed and embraced by parents in our school community and is delivering more meaningful outcomes for each and every student. It is an outstanding achievement when we consider that 75 per cent of schools have voluntarily joined this scheme and that we are seeing reduced class sizes, better outcomes in literacy and numeracy and improved facilities because of Partnerships 21. This has been with overwhelming parent and teacher support. I even note that the AEU is now buckling under, and I wonder whether this means that Labor will also change its P-21 stance from that of flawed to now favoured model of education in South Australia.

What of our success in rural areas? We have developed a country directorate specifically to be able to concentrate on our rural schools and to ensure that our rural teachers and parents have a voice through a director in the department to whom they can go to discuss their problems or what they require in their schools—country calls to act on the community voice. Some 89 per cent of those country parents recently surveyed rated their education as good or very good. We are delivering cutting edge IT to our most remote schools, providing a significant advantage for students in those very remote areas. We are increasing incentives for teachers working in our country schools.

Our achievements are on all education fronts, and let me run through a few more: 95 per cent of 17 year olds are in school, training or employment; 96 of eligible children are enrolled in pre-schools; 90 per cent of year 5 students' literary skills improved in the basic skills testing; and 76 per cent of schools seek less than the compulsory school charge. We have had a sixfold increase in vocational education and training participation. We have better than the national average staff to student ratio in our class sizes. Our junior secondary students are ranked among the very best in the world in maths and science.

Clearly, our solutions and policies are making a real difference to young South Australians now. But it begs the question: where would they be under Labor? I will tell you where they would be: they would be absolutely nowhere, because Labor is devoid of ideas and policy and is groping in the dark. In her quest for policy the member for Taylor will find that even the AEU's batteries are solidly flat.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Leader of the Opposition): Given that we have passed the October 2000 and then the revised March 2001 deadlines for a construction start on the $220 million upgrade of the Adelaide Airport, will the Premier now tell us when the project will start; and is the Premier confident that the appointment of Mr John Harvey as a mediator will lead to a breakthrough in the current impasse? The Premier announced on 27 August last year that he had signed an agreement which finalised a five-year quest for an upgraded Adelaide Airport. The Premier also told the media at that time that the project had been delayed by negotiations with other domestic carriers such as Virgin Blue and Impulse, but that the agreement that he had signed with Adelaide Airport, Ansett and Qantas last August was the breakthrough that would enable the project to go ahead. The new airport terminals to be built by Hansen Yuncken were due to be fully operational by next year.

The opposition has been told that Qantas has hired another builder, Multiplex, to prepare work on its own separate terminal both to comply with its licensing agreement but also as an alternative in case the preferred multi-user terminal does not proceed. The opposition has been told that Qantas will not sign up to the user levy for the new airport unless it is guaranteed that no other carrier will be given a better deal.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): Let me correct several of the so-called facts as presented by the Leader of the Opposition. As I have indicated—and it is correct for the leader to put the view—we have been working on this project for what seems to be almost an interminable period of time. It has been a long time.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I will go back to before the interjections of the member for Hart. Either you are asking the question as a political stunt or you want some information. If you want the information, I will be more than happy to impart it to you and the House. If you want to play, as the member for Hart does on almost every subject, political one-upmanship, then I will leave it go. I take it that the leader does want detailed information.

This project I have been working on for some time. It is over five years that we have been working on this, but I also point out that while that is an excessively long period of time, in the two or three decades before, during which there were governments of all political persuasions, we were not able to secure any outcome, but we are now on the eve of being able to achieve that.

What changed in the circumstances after I signed the MOU with both Qantas, Ansett and Adelaide Airport Limited? It was the entry of new competitive airlines into the Adelaide market. Upon the entry of Virgin Blue into the Adelaide market, it changed the circumstances of the MOU and the larger carriers. One in particular sought an agreement that in fact the new entrant, Virgin Blue, would sign up to the passenger facilitation charge the same as the other airlines. They sought my support to facilitate a commitment from Virgin Blue to so do. I had meetings in Sydney on a number of occasions and in Melbourne and I went to Brisbane to meet with Virgin Blue in relation to its contribution to the PFC.

The position is that Virgin Blue has now agreed to sign up to the passenger facilitation charge and has agreed not to challenge the PFC before the ACCC. That being the case, it removes one of the key impediments from other airlines as it relates to the multi-user integrated terminal facility. In good faith Adelaide Airport Limited has expended between $8 million to $10 million currently in pre-construction work at the site. It has done that in good faith, expecting resolution of the issues with both major airlines. A number of issues have not been able to be resolved with an airline. I have taken up that matter with the chairman, having met him now on two or three occasions.

As a result of discussions it was decided to engage the services of a party to broker between the two parties—

Adelaide Airport Limited and the airline. They were to broker an arrangement and look at the issues that were outstanding. I was advised as of last night that good progress is being made in that area. I hope and trust that the outstanding issues may be able to be resolved within the next 10 days. I cannot give an absolute guarantee of that to the House. I can, however, give a guarantee to the leader and the House that I will take every step that needs to be taken. I will meet anyone, anywhere, at any time, in effect, to try to secure the right outcome, because I believe that this new terminal facility is particularly important for our state's future.

In relation to Multiplex, my understanding is that Qantas is not proceeding with any refurbishment of its current domestic terminal facility, and that matter has been clarified between Qantas and the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Government is the authority and has regulatory responsibilities in the transfer of the privatisation, at least as I understand it, from the old Federal Airports Corporation to the new private owners, Adelaide Airport Limited.

The matter has been complex and it has been occasionally exasperating, but I am sure that perseverance will pay off. From discussions I have had, it is clear that all the parties want the end result of a new multi-user international terminal for Adelaide. It is important for our economy, our construction industry and jobs, not to mention showcasing South Australia with a terminal facility which is appropriate and adequate and which reflects what we are as a state, rather than, as I have said on a number of occasions, two tin sheds that really masquerade as airport terminals at Adelaide Airport.

In addition, we would have aerobridges that would suit and meet the needs of the elderly population in particular. I and other members in this place have alighted from a plane at the airport and seen elderly people trying to negotiate the steps and, if you have severe inclement weather (a sou-westerly and it is raining), how difficult that is for those people. That just underscores the importance of not only jobs but also the construction industry and the expansion of our tourism industry, which, I hasten to add, at least on the last figures I saw, was expanding at a greater percentage increase than any other gateway in Australia.

The fact that our *Secrets* campaign has gone so well and that new entrants are bringing additional markets into the Adelaide tourism market is a great success story. The tourism area deserves great credit for what has been achieved, particularly the marketing and badging of Adelaide as a tourism destination because, at the end of the day, that means jobs for our young people in the tourism and hospitality industry. We have been working hard on this key piece of infrastructure. We have not been successful at the end of the day. I am sure that we will be, with a bit of perseverance, but I point out to the House that circumstances have unfolded, such as new entrants coming into the market, that have put different complexities to finalising the contractual agreements.

CLIPSAL 500

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Will the Minister for Tourism agree with me that, while members opposite are reading the newspaper, the government has excelled at attracting major events to Adelaide in the face of negativity from the opposition; and could she inform the House on progress being made in the lead-up to the Clipsal 500 race this weekend?

The Hon. J. HALL (Minister for Tourism): I am absolutely delighted to outline to the House the progress that has been made with the race and the expected attendance that we are likely to see over the next few days. I was at the track this morning and I must say that it looks absolutely sensational. The weather gods, I hope, will be smiling upon us. For those in the House who are interested, tomorrow's forecast is for fine, warm and sunny conditions, with light winds and 28°; Saturday's forecast is for a fine day—

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. The member for Ross Smith.

Mr CLARKE: My point of order is that this information is readily obtainable through the Bureau of Meteorology. It is readily available to the honourable member and it is wasting the time of the House.

The SPEAKER: Order! I bring the minister back to the substance of the question that she was asked and ask her to stick to that.

The Hon. J. HALL: The reason that I thought the member for Ross Smith might be interested is that the weather conditions are obviously very important for the attendances and for those who decide to buy their tickets at the last minute and become part of the general admission crowds.

The great thing about this event is the enormous community support that clearly exists. Those members who witnessed the parade along King William Street yesterday will have observed that there is enormous community interest and support. The crowd attendance was much larger than anticipated, and the interest in the all female celebrity race was quite extraordinary. I was quite amazed at the number of men, in particular, and young people who were out there getting autographs of a number of the female celebrities who have developed a very great competitive spirit. I am sure that their races over the next couple of days will be well supported.

One of the interesting things about the race this year is the incredible entertainment part of the program. We are expecting much more support from younger people turning up on the three race days to participate in the entertainment. Sky City Adelaide which, as we know, is the re-badged name of the Adelaide Casino, has taken the naming rights for the entire entertainment program, and that really is quite extraordinary. As we know, the program started last weekend with the family day, and more than 10 000 people went down to the track to be part of the Down Syndrome 'buddy walk'. They made a lot of money out of it, and we are very pleased about that. Father Joe was there in his inimitable style blessing the track, which has become quite a tradition.

The celebrations start from this evening in terms of much of the add-on entertainment. On Saturday we will see a lot of off-track entertainment, starting with the program called Xcelerator, when some 21 bands will be performing.

Mr CLARKE: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the program for the race this weekend is well known and is advertised in the newspaper. I think the minister can take it that we can read.

The SPEAKER: Under the standing orders, the minister is not out of order in the form of words she is using at the moment. Minister.

The Hon. J. HALL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The extra program activities this time have been designed very specifically to attract additional young patrons. As we know,

the Clipsal 500 is designed to be a community event, and we would like to break some more records. The general admission ticket costs about $38.50, including a booking fee. We do hope that the weather will ensure that the attendance is very good. The television coverage of this event will be very important long term for tourist numbers to the state. The race will be telecast nationally, both Saturday and Sunday, from 12.30 to 4.30, and the audience is expected to be around several million. The race will also be telecast for the first time in New Zealand live and one network will have a delayed coverage. In addition, a one-hour package featuring the 500 will be shown throughout Europe and South America and in parts of the United States on a channel called Speed Week. That sort of coverage is incredibly important for our tourist numbers and the very special sort of tourists, 'event tourists', who exist these days. I place on record our thanks to Andrew Daniels and the great team.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I assure members that we will get to the conclusion of the minister's reply more quickly if they remain silent.

The Hon. J. HALL: In conclusion, I would like to inform the House that the roads, the closure of which is causing some disruption at the moment, will be opened a little earlier after the race this year: they will be open essentially after Wednesday of next week, a day earlier than last year, although Dequetteville Terrace and Hutt Street will be open next Monday. I thank everyone for the patience that they have displayed over the last few weeks.

HOSPITALS, LOANS

Ms STEVENS (Elizabeth): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services. Given the minister's admission that hospitals have been asked to take out SAFA loans to meet operating debts, can the minister confirm that the Life Journeys Expo and conference being organised by his department at the Adelaide Convention Centre later this month, will cost over $900 000, including a government grant of $300 000? The opposition has a copy of the minutes of a meeting of the Life Journeys Expo reference group held on 9 January 2001. These minutes reveal that the expo has a budget of $908 825, including a grant from the Department of Human Services. On 16 February 2001, a report in the national media described this expenditure as 'a sick joke', and said that the expo would be followed by a road show into rural areas, where services are disappearing, to convince the population that all is well.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Minister for Human Services): I thank the member for Elizabeth for the question because I am delighted that she raised the issue about the Royal Adelaide Hospital, etc., having to raise loans. Yesterday, she asked a question and made an allegation that the Royal Adelaide Hospital had to raise an overdraft provision of $1.6 million to fund its operations, as reported in the financial statements for the year 1999-2000. I have looked at the annual report of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and, whilst there was reference on one page to the fact that the hospital had a bank overdraft of $1.6 million, it also reported on exactly the same page, exactly the same table, that it had cash in hand of $27.9 million.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will come to order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: $27.9 million total cash; other current investments, $27.5 million on top of that—$54 million. So, the $1.6 million was not the Royal Adelaide Hospital having to go out and borrow to fund its operations; it was simply an overdrawn ledger account. We know that the member for Elizabeth has the habit of standing up and not giving fulsome information that she knows of when she asks questions in the House. I might add—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I know, $54 million. In fact, we can look at some of the other hospitals that she referred to yesterday as well. For instance, she referred to the North Western Adelaide Health Service: it had cash in hand, or total cash, of $9.6 million. I could go on and cover the other hospitals as well.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: It is a pretty long list.

The SPEAKER: We have a point of order. The minister will resume his seat.

Mr WRIGHT: Sir, I cannot hear the minister's answer because of the interruptions from the opposite side.

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

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Another hospital that I think the member mentioned yesterday was the Flinders Medical Centre. The Flinders Medical Centre—

Ms STEVENS: I rise on a point of order, sir, in relation to standing order 98. The substance of the question was in relation to the Life Journeys Expo. The minister is entirely disregarding the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The chair cannot put words into the mouth of the minister. Provided that he does not debate the subject, the minister is free to answer the question as he sees fit.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I point out to the member for Elizabeth that in starting her question today she specifically referred to the hospitals having to take out overdrafts. I am simply pointing out to her that her allegations, both yesterday and today, are quite without foundation. The part that concerns me most is that, in the very part of the annual statements from which she reported the $1.6 million for the Royal Adelaide Hospital—in exactly the same table—the $27.9 million was sitting there as cash on hand. However, she failed to reveal that to the House.

I take up the other part of the member's question today about the expo.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The other part of her question, because in the first part of her question she referred to—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Spence for the second time!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The expo is all about taking a proactive stance in terms of the lifestyle and health of people within the South Australian community. It is about people understanding the early signs of diabetes; understanding the importance of what they eat and the impact of that on their health; the importance of exercise and the impact on health; and the importance of youth health. In fact, the expo will be broken up into several different segments, one talking about the importance of youth health and another talking about the importance of child health and some of the

important services provided by the Child and Youth Health Service. There will be a section for older people, and there will be a section for other adults. There will be information about mental health services.

I find it absolutely astounding that a shadow minister for health should stand up and criticise the fact that we are out there taking a proactive stance in trying to get the community to better understand health and the factors that might lead to—

Ms Stevens interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —better health outcomes for them. From a total budget of something like $1.6 billion for health in this State, we are spending a mere $300 000 not just on one event but in fact on promotional health over the whole year, including at country shows and country expos. In fact, I attended one last Friday at Port Broughton, where about 350 to 400 people—

Mr Conlon interjecting:

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

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: —came to learn about things such as farm safety, diabetes, heart pressure, stress and all those issues. Is the honourable member—the phantom minister for health—going to criticise us for being out there trying to help people understand some of these important health issues? I am astounded.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Is she opposed to farm safety? Is she opposed to our diabetes program that is aimed at increasing public awareness? Is she opposed to the fact that we are putting more money out there?

The Hon. G.A. Ingerson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Bragg for the second time!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I think every member of the House can see the extent to which the member for Elizabeth, in raising this issue, is simply dragging down any promotional activity on health within South Australia. I thought she would have been one of the first to come out and applaud the fact we are having a major health expo to deal with these issues and to try to educate the public more effectively on those issues. I assure her, just like at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, we will not be taking out a bank overdraft to fund the expo.

ROADS, OUTBACK

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Local Government advise the House of any funding that may be available to improve roads infrastructure in the outback areas of the state?

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Local Government): I appreciate the important question from the member for Flinders and express my disappointment at not being able to address the relative matters implied in the member's question through the ministerial statement process as a matter of important state interest. Members in this House would be well aware that last November the commonwealth government announced that some $1.2 billion would be provided across Australia over the next four years under the Roads to Recovery program. From this program, South Australia is to receive some $100 million to be administered by local government bodies and the five Aboriginal communities that are recognised as local government authorities. A total of $59.4 million will go to roads in regional areas, and some $40.6 million will be spent in the greater metropolitan area.

Unfortunately, at the time of the announcement, the unincorporated outback areas of our state to which the member for Flinders is referring did not receive any funding from the Roads to Recovery program. Because this government understands the increasingly important role that our outback communities are playing in the economic and social development of our state, the Acting Premier, the Hon. Rob Kerin, wrote to the Prime Minister, and I, as Minister for Local Government, wrote to the federal minister for local government in January this year. We pointed out that, although the move to allocate money through local government bodies has much to commend it, it has the unintended effect of cutting out these specific areas from this special purpose regional program. That is two-thirds of South Australia that does not have conventional local government.

The state government wishes to ensure that the people living in outback areas of our state share in the improved roads that will result from the increased funding that comes through the Roads to Recovery program. In addition, as we know, tourism is a rapidly growing industry in the outback of South Australia, so it is vitally important that we have in place the necessary infrastructure to cope with and to further entice the growth in the number of visitors to what is a very important region, resulting in increased wealth and employment opportunities for the local people.

The federal transport minister, the Hon. John Anderson, has today announced the federal government's decision to provide an additional $8 million to the Roads to Recovery funding over four years for the unincorporated areas of South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales. I am particularly pleased to inform all honourable members that South Australia will now receive half of that total extra funding, that is, some $4 million, which will go to the roads in the outback areas of our state. The federal government has rightfully stated that this decision—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: My thought entirely. The federal government itself has rightly stated that this removes the omission that previously existed, and this is further evidence of the fact that Liberal governments listen to the people and take quite decisive action to address those concerns. I am quite sure that all South Australians, particularly the more than 8 000 people who live in outback South Australia, will be pleased to know that the efforts of their state government have actually borne fruit. They will also be pleased to know that the federal government has agreed to the state government's request to recognise the unincorporated outback areas of our state and that our roads will now receive funding under this very important nation building Roads to Recovery program.

SCHOOL LEAVING AGE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Given the Premier's announcement last year that the government had decided to increase the school leaving age from 15 to 16 years, will the minister tell parents and students who need to know whether the leaving age will be increased in time for the start of the 2002 school year?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for her question and I advise her that it is the intention of the government that,

as from the start of the school year 2002, the minimum school leaving age will be 16. However, the student must be either at school, in an apprenticeship or in some form of training to be able to leave earlier than 16. Other than that, 16 will be the minimum school leaving age.

CABINET MEETINGS

Mr LEWIS (Hammond): My question is directed to the secretary of cabinet. When is cabinet going to meet in the Mallee and Murray Bridge?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will resume his seat. I rule that the question is already out of order. The member for Bragg does not have an official title to which he is responsible to the House for being secretary to the cabinet. I suggest that the honourable member addresses his question to perhaps the Premier or someone at the head of government.

Mr LEWIS: I thank you for your direction, Mr Speaker. I thought it was an official title. My question, then, I guess, is directed to the Premier. When is cabinet going to meet in the Mallee and Murray Bridge? Cabinet has been meeting in rural areas and provincial cities to create the perception that it understands and cares about the problems of those of us who live outside the metropolitan area. Cabinet has been to the Riverland four times; it has been to the South-East twice; it has been to Eyre Peninsula; it has been to the Mid North—in fact, it has been everywhere except Hammond. I will be happy if I am accorded the same respect and opportunities as the members for Chaffey and Gordon, but I am not holding my breath. That was not—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member is now expressing an opinion.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier): Of course, any elected member will be afforded the courtesies of an elected member, full stop.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: It must be the end of a couple of weeks of sitting. The member might recall that there were some preliminary exploratory discussions last year and they were held over. A visit is scheduled for this year. I have just been informed that the date is 7 May. As the member for—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I am sure the member for Hammond will be delighted at our visit and I will ensure that courtesies are extended to him.

EDUCATION ACT

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Given that the minister amended the Education Act relating to school governance and fees late last year, and yesterday announced changes to the TAFE Act, will the minister confirm that he will not be introducing a new Education Act before the next election? In November 1998, the minister announced a review of the Education Act and the Children's Services Act and released a timetable for a draft consultation bill for a new integrated act to be released by late 1999. A project director was appointed and the minister established a high-powered reference group, including representatives from universities, the education union and multicultural and ethnic affairs, chaired by the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, MLC. Between July and August 1999, four discussion papers were released, and schools and interested parties made over 5 000 submissions. Where is the new act?

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Wright for her question. She is exactly right, that this government undertook a very long period of consultation. We received some 3 500 representations which put proposals to the government about the new Education Act. That took some time to work our way through. As the honourable member said, the Hon. Caroline Schaefer, in another place, headed up an advisory committee which worked exceptionally well in terms of pulling all of those proposals together and making recommendations for the new act to ensure that we have what the community wants. Those drafting instructions are now with parliamentary counsel and we are now awaiting the completion by parliamentary counsel of a new act.

ABORIGINAL AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT WEB SITE

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I am pleased to advise the House that the Department of State Aboriginal Affairs has won an IT award for its innovative web site. The web site was recognised with a bronze award in the web based development category at the Adelaide Art Directors Club award ceremony. The site was designed by N-Space in conjunction with DOSSA's Information Technology Coordinator, Mr Scott Rathman. I am sure members who have visited the DOSSA web site would agree that it is an informative site which highlights the important work being done in Aboriginal communities around the state. Indeed, the site's introduction is one of the most visually captivating I have seen on the internet, and I encourage all members to go to www.dossa.sa.gov.au to witness this particularly impressive creation.

The Adelaide Art Directors Club was established in the late 1970s to promote and maintain high standards in the fields of South Australian advertising and design. To this end, the club initiates and supports a variety of educational programs, exhibitions, publications and social events for the betterment of its members and for the communications community at large. The AADC is the longest running advertising industry body in Australia.

The main purpose of these awards is to showcase the best that the industry has to offer in advertising and creative art, both home grown and overseas. Indeed, in judging these awards, the directors club looks for three main aspects, those being ease of use, design excellence and technical excellence. The AADC awards are held annually. However, it is not always the case that a gold, silver and bronze award are presented. If AADC does not believe its standards are being achieved, it does not present awards. In fact, it is very unusual for gold awards to be given, thus demonstrating the high standard of the DOSSA site. Indeed, this year only one silver and one bronze award were presented. I am sure that all members will join with me in congratulating the Department of State Aboriginal Affairs on being recipients of this highly regarded bronze award.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

Ms RANKINE (Wright): The delays, the excuses and the deals which have been consistently proposed and promised only then to fall through in relation to the development of the Golden Grove district sports field are about to extract a very heavy cost in my community. The development of the Golden Grove district sports field has been a real bone of contention for some considerable time, and local sporting clubs are well and truly losing their patience. I have no doubt that their frustration will be exacerbated when they learn, as I did last week, that the Tea Tree Gully council is about to lose a $75 000 regional recreation and sports facilities grant because not so much as a sod of soil has been turned on this project.

Last week, the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing wrote to me to advise that the grant was awarded to the council for the sports field development in August 1999. Under the terms of the grant, work should have commenced by the end of December 1999. Indeed, I met with the council during this time and brought these grants to its attention. I have consistently pushed, encouraged and tried to cajole the council into developing this much needed facility.

The minister has been extremely lenient in this matter, and I appreciate his efforts in trying to ensure that this community receives the benefit of this regional facilities grant. He has granted the council an extension of time, but even the government is running out of patience with this council, I venture to say. It is now crunch time. If work does not commence by 1 June this year, the $75 000 will be lost. We simply cannot afford for this to happen. Our young people, our sporting clubs and our community cannot afford for it to happen.

As I have told this House on many occasions, between 35 and 40 per cent of the population of the Golden Grove development are under 19 years of age. Our young people are desperate for facilities that encourage their participation and involvement in their community. The involvement in sporting activities is not the only answer, but for many it provides an outlet for their enthusiasm and energy. It helps build self-esteem and it provides productive and positive interaction with older people.

They have access to positive role models. Our supporting clubs in Golden Grove are reaching desperation stage. The Golden Grove Football Club has something like 30 teams—30 teams with no home ground and no clubrooms. They share the Greenwith oval with the Golden Grove Little Athletics Club and the two schools that developed the oval. It was not developed to sustain the level of use to which it is currently subjected and has deteriorated to such a level that it is virtually unusable for organised sport.

The Golden Grove Dodgers Baseball Club has been forced to field its junior teams at The Heights school at Modbury, and seniors play at Surrey Downs—again, with no clubrooms they can call their own. The Golden Grove Cricket Club was forced to move out to Elizabeth to access a turf wicket. Next season it returns to Golden Grove but will be playing at Gleeson College on a school ground. Just about every night of the week the 20-plus netball complex, the only facility completed at the district sports facility location, is full of netballers. In addition the Tango Netball Club has over 300 members playing netball at Golden Grove.

The Golden Grove Little Athletics continues to grow, the demands are huge, participation is high and the problem they face, as with our other clubs, is lack of facilities. In 1987 a community development plan was produced by the Golden Grove community planning team and was endorsed by the joint venture committee, the City of Tea Tree Gully and state cabinet. The plan provided a statement of the likely levels of a wide range of human service and community facilities to be provided by state and local government to meet the needs of the Golden Grove community. It was updated in 1990.

In relation to the district sports field, the community plan indicated a development time frame of between 1992 and 1997. Here we are in the year 2001 with huge demands on existing facilities, huge demands on local sporting clubs, an extremely large population of young people, a $75 000 government grant in the offing and not a sod of soil turned. We are at serious risk of losing this funding. Why? Because proposal after proposal has been put up only to fall over. Proposal after proposal has been waved under the noses of these local sporting clubs, with hopes built up only to come crashing down.

The cynical among us could be forgiven for thinking that this may have been a deliberate ploy to delay putting any money into these supporting facilities at all. There is no doubt that over the years there has been an extremely strong Golden Grove cringe on the Tea Tree Gully council—an extreme reluctance to allow additional funding or resources to go into this area. The development of the district sports field has been the subject of much hype. Proposals that were clearly unsustainable were paraded as serious proposals.

Time expired.

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON (Bragg): Today we witnessed the perfect example in question time of why Labor should never ever be able to control the purses of our state again. Any member, particularly a potential minister (and I feel sorry for the member for Elizabeth as I know she was a principal in the education area, but clearly she did not teach accountancy), who looks at a cash flow budget and cannot work out that a $29.517 million surplus is in fact a positive for a particular institution will create a major problem for this community. It is quite incredible that when you look at this cash statement, a simple document of three lines—not a great requirement to read a lot—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Yes, I did. Here we have a position involving $27.948 million in cash, investments of $3.231 million, a bank overdraft of $1.662 million, with a net cash effect of $29.517 million. Those issues, in themselves, are not important: what is important is that on this particular date of 30 June a statement occurred.

Anyone in business knows that the probable reason that the $1.6 million is in overdraft is because a series of cheques have been written out, paid into the bank and the cash has not been transferred at that time. Anyone who runs a business and anyone who wants to run the state ought to know that. But the member for Elizabeth stood up in the House yesterday and talked about a $1.6 million overdraft, when all you have to do is to look at three lines. It is not a matter of whether you read an annual report, here you have to read only three lines. You do not have to be a Rhodes scholar: you have to only look at it. I am really concerned that this is the sort of issue that will go right through this potential government.

The State Bank issue has long gone; but the potential for mismanagement opportunities and for it to happen again has happened here today. The potential Minister for Health could—here is the lady herself—not even get it right. Let me put on record the situation with respect to a few of the other hospitals: the Repatriation Hospital, $1.57 million in cash; the

Flinders Medical Centre, $15.53 million in cash; the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which we have already talked about, $27.948 million; the Women's and Children's Hospital, $6.138 million; and the Northern Areas Hospital, $9.602 million.

The point that I want to make is that anyone who cannot work out that cash in the bank is in fact an asset has a real problem and we have a real problem in potentially electing this group of, in my view, accounting illiterates. Fancy even considering putting a group of accounting illiterates into this House—could not even run a chook raffle let alone try to organise the accounting with respect to the hospitals.

Ms Stevens interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: It will be an interesting report.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.A. INGERSON: Let me make a comment about the Hindmarsh stadium because I can make this statement: the Hindmarsh stadium was built on time and under budget. If you want to put Hindmarsh Stadium into context, there is $108 million worth of cash as at 30 June in the hospital budget system and the member for Elizabeth stood up yesterday and said that the hospitals have a cash problem—$108 million of cash surplus as at 30 June 2000. What I am concerned about is that, in a budgeting sense, the member for Elizabeth does not even realise that the day after it could be more or it could be less as money moves through. The accounts are recognised in a static position as at 30 June.

Time expired.

Mr De LAINE (Price): I bring to the attention of this House a matter that is extremely serious. By this government's inaction or the inaction or the emergency services lives and property are being put at grave risk. The matter relates to a device invented and developed by Mr Tom Schwerdt. Tom was a firefighter with the South Australian Fire Brigade and then the MFS for his entire working life. He is now retired through injuries sustained on the job. During his time as a fireman, Tom saw a problem that is common to firefighters around the world. To gain access to water mains fire connections it is necessary to pull up the steel plate covers with which we are all familiar on our roads and footpaths.

Over time, soil, dirt and dust etc., gets into the small gap that exists between the cover plate and its retaining ring. Water, and sometimes oil from motor vehicles, gets in and all these ingredients quite often make it impossible to open these crucial water points. Tom Schwerdt has invented and developed a tool called a Schwerdt Lifter that will lift these plates out in seconds, even if they are very seriously stuck. That is the good part of the story. The bad and quite irresponsible part of the story is that the government or the department continues to ignore Tom and his invention, thereby putting lives and property at risk. I want to know why they are doing this. Approximately one year ago, Tom sold one of his lifters to the then head procurement officer in the CFS. He said that he would show the tool around the CFS units in South Australia, but apparently this has not happened.

There was an article in the Hills *Courier* publication recently about this problem, with a photograph of a CFS volunteer trying to lift a cover plate with a normally issued lifting tool, but without success. The MFS has bought a few from Tom, as did EWS before it became SA Water, and some councils have purchased some. Noarlunga council has had six units now for about 12 months now and say that they are great.

The MFS has 16 lifters for its new fire appliances, but there are approximately 90 appliances in the state. So, only 16 out of 90 appliances have these unique lifters. The only two CFS units to have these lifters are Aldinga and Myponga, which obtained them directly from Tom.

I would like to give an example of the use of this tool. Early last year the Aldinga CFS unit was called to a house fire in Aldam Avenue, Aldinga. The fire appliance could not shift the nearest cover plate to access water. It then got out its long hose, went up the street and tried to access the next four plugs but all cover plates were stuck. They then called for a water tanker but, by the time the tanker arrived, the house was burnt to the ground—a stupid waste of property and a threat to life when a device exists to overcome this problem.

The Aldinga CFS unit heard about Tom's lifter and contacted him. He went to the stuck cover plates in Aldam Avenue and, using his lifter, got them out immediately. The Aldinga CFS people were amazed. Tom has received a citation presented to him from the Aldinga CFS to recognise him and his invention. It is crazy that we have multimillion dollar fire appliances rendered useless because they cannot access water to fight fires when we have available here in South Australia a device that will quickly and easily lift these road plates.

The Aldgate CFS had a demonstration recently with Tom, and three plates that could not be got up in any other way were easily taken out by Tom and his device. Journalists were present and witnessed the event. In fact, one of the journalists used the tool to get one of the plates out—that is how easy it is! I am told that this is a worldwide problem, and the good thing is that it can be used world wide. Overseas people have expressed great interest in these tools, and with slight modifications they can be made to suit their own particular plates.

Tom has a world patent which costs him a considerable amount of money to maintain. He feels that the government may be trying to force him out to take over the patent for itself. Tom has informed me that he is very happy to work with and share his invention with the South Australian government for the benefit of firefighters around the world, and also for the economic benefit it will bring to our state.

Time expired.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Yesterday the member for Fisher brought to the attention of the House the fact that Anzac Day this year will be commemorated during the school holidays. I would like to highlight the commemorations that will take place at schools in my electorate. I have brought to the attention of the House on numerous occasions the very good work that takes place in schools in my electorate with regard to Anzac Day and Remembrance Day. I would just like to place on the record the continuing good work that the principals and staff are doing in this area of civic education.

We all know how important Anzac Day is to Australia. It is really when Australia became a nation. I believe that, with the sacrifices made by the servicemen and women in the various conflicts, the contribution they have made to Australia's development should never be forgotten. Norwood Morialta High School will commemorate the importance of Anzac Day in the school's daily bulletins before the end of the term.

The Principal of East Torrens Primary School, Frank Mittiga, informs me that they will commemorate the importance of Anzac Day after the school holidays. Ms Maggie Kay, the Principal of East Marden Primary School, has for a long time been involved with the commemoration of Anzac Day with the Payneham RSL. Here, I commend Clarrie Pollard, the President of the Payneham RSL, and the members, for their close collaboration with the primary schools in the area. Of course, the churches in the area are also involved in this commemoration, which will take place at an assembly on Wednesday 11 April, with two representatives from the RSL. There will also be an essay competition for the senior students.

Sister Theresa Swiggs of St Josephs Primary School informs me that individual classes will participate in the commemoration before the end of the term. Ms Diane Colborne of St Josephs Primary School, Tranmere, will participate in the commemoration at the final assembly on Wednesday 11 April. Mr Kym Golding, the Principal of Sunrise Christian School at Paradise, will also commemorate at the final assembly on 11 April and at classroom level. Mr Malcolm Lamb from Pembroke College informs me that they will commemorate as soon as school resumes. I would also like to mention the Principal of Norwood Morialta High School, Ms Sue McMillan. I commend all these people for the work they are doing to commemorate Anzac Day, which is such an important date for Australia in giving recognition to the ex-servicemen and women who have fought in all the conflicts since 1915.

I know that members will be involved in many ceremonies on Anzac Day. I certainly will. I will be attending the dawn service at the Payneham RSL, as I have done in the past and I look forward to the other commemorations that will take place on the day.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: The member for Spence interjects; no doubt he will be involved in the two-up celebrations in which—

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: We helped to bring the bill across and I should think that he would thank me for enabling that to happen. It is important to commemorate Anzac Day, as it is important to commemorate all these important dates, including Remembrance Day. This year we commemorated the defence of Darwin, which is also very important to Australia.

Time expired.

Mr WRIGHT (Lee): Historically, the SAJC has been a critical player in thoroughbred racing in South Australia. Sadly, in recent years, they have lost the respect of the industry, but the behaviour of some people over the past few months has even stunned their most ardent critics. Last year, the SAJC hosted a couple of meetings with regard to the proposed sale of the TAB and corporatisation. Following a question from the floor, members were informed of an upgrade to the grandstand and office facilities at the Morphettville racecourse. Funding for the project was to come from a $2 million capital works grant from the now defunct RIDA. Work commenced during the winter of 2000. In early January this year, there were very strong rumours of a cost blow-out, requiring extra money to finish the project. On two occasions, on 10 and 27 January 2001, that was denied by the current Chairman, John Murphy. On 10 January he said:

> I heard the blow-out rumours at the Cheltenham races on Saturday but they just aren't true.

Then, on 27 January, John Murphy denied any knowledge of a request, rumoured to have been made the previous week, from the SAJC for a further $600 000 grant from Thoroughbred Racing SA to meet escalating costs pertaining to the Morphettville refurbishment. I quote John Murphy again as follows:

> I certainly have not signed any letter to send to TRSA asking for that sort of money.

Well, a letter was sent. The letter was sent on 22 December, some weeks beforehand, to Michael Birchall, Chairman of TRSA, and it was signed by Matt Benson for John Murphy, Chairman of the SAJC, on SAJC letterhead. In that letter, the SAJC committee does exactly what Mr Murphy denies, that is, it asks for compensation from Thoroughbred Racing SA. The blow-out was revealed in the *Advertiser* on 5 March this year and the Chairman's response, to say the least, is perplexing. He said:

> We have not as yet had a reply to the letter you are referring to, but Michael Birchall told me at the races on Swettenham Stakes Day, one month earlier, 'Yes, we have had a request for money and, secondly, we have knocked it back.'

But Mr Murphy also said:

> When the budget first came up it was all done in a hurry because $2 million became available from RIDA and it had to be used quickly. . . We did not have time to get proper costs. . . We have made changes even on the first floor which are the recommendations from the new CEO.

This is nothing short of a joke. This is a Faulty Towers type stuff-up. On two occasions the Chairman of the SAJC John Murphy publicly denied an overrun with the full knowledge of an overrun. How do we know that? We know that because of the letter of 22 December from the SAJC, from the Chairman John Murphy to TRSA, where he used the word 'overrun'. This proves it conclusively—end of story.

What I would like to know is how many members of the committee knew about all these shenanigans? How much information was provided to the club membership? What in fact has Thoroughbred Racing SA been doing about all this? Why has not it been monitoring more closely what has been happening? TRSA, of course, is the government's baby because it abandoned racing a long time ago. Let us not forget that the South Australian Jockey Club has the major say in appointments to TRSA and also the right of veto.

We have a system put in place by the government which is an absolute failure. Incidentally, while we are talking about TRSA, I said during the TAB sale debate that it would only be a matter of time before the government injected huge capital into the Glenburnie Racecourse at Mount Gambier, in the Independent member for Gordon's electorate. The chickens have come home to roost. An announcement in excess of $500 000 has been made—and I have been informed it is more likely to be closer to $1 million. If we were flushed with money, well and good, but we are simply not. Here we are 12 months on from the abandoning of Adelaide Cup No. 1 in the year 2000 and we still have no announcement about the Morphettville track upgrade. We have a crisis in the confidence of the SAJC.

Time expired.

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL (Minister for Water Resources): Because the Opposition does not seem to ask questions on unemployment statistics in this state, I will take this opportunity to grieve. The most recent unemployment figures released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics show that South Australia has an unemployment rate of 7.3 per cent

and, most importantly, that the youth unemployment rate is 22.1 per cent—the lowest of any state. It is currently 6 per cent lower than the national average. Despite these good figures, which are not one month blips but in some cases have run counter to national trends, we still see negative media headlines such as, 'State government under pressure as jobless numbers continue to grow'. One headline which caught my eye on 7 February stated, 'Job losses hit rural regions hardest'. The article then quoted the Deputy Leader of the Opposition calling on the government to tell regional South Australians, 'what it intends to do to halt the appalling loss of jobs in our regions in the past year'.

I thought to myself, 'Gee, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is really game. Not only does she quit a safe Labor seat to contest the seat of Light—one of the most prosperous regions in the outer rim of the metropolitan area—where there is a very good local member who happens to be a very good Minister for Education and Children's Services and a particularly hardworking local member but also she has the nerve to stick out her neck on the line for a leader—the man who used to be the minister for unemployment under the Bannon government—and to assert that regional unemployment trends are bad.' One can say anything they want about the deputy leader, but I will give her one thing: she is game, especially when her colleagues are obviously plotting her downfall with false scare tactics such as this.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: Most things are unconvincing on your side of the House because they appear to be decided before you go to vote; about three people on your side seem to have all the votes in their pockets, but that is a story for another day.

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: I could not fit those votes in my pocket and they were live; they were living members. We did not have a dead one among them. Fact 1: in Gawler last year, unemployment fell from 8.3 per cent in December 1999 to 7.6 per cent in December last. Fact 2: in the Barossa District Council area unemployment fell from 5.2 per cent in December 1999 to 3.5 per cent last December. Fact 3: in the Angaston District Council area unemployment fell from 4.4 per cent in December 1999 to 3.7 per cent in December 2000—'a mere 3.7 per cent' to quote one of my ministerial colleagues—the very period in which the Deputy Leader claims regional unemployment was going bad. In fact, if we look at the overall picture—

Mr Foley interjecting:

The Hon. M.K. BRINDAL: The member for Hart says it is boring and he is leaving. The man who would be Treasurer finds boring the fact that more South Australians than ever before are working. It is quite interesting. Let him go out and face the ABC now or sit in here and listen to the rest of the speech. I notice that he sits in here to listen to the rest of the speech.

If we look at the overall picture for the balance of South Australia, that is, the 89 districts outside the metropolitan area, over the past 12 months to December 2000 we find that unemployment fell from 8.3 per cent to 6.8 per cent—a fall of .5 per cent lower than the metropolitan unemployment rate. You have to wonder why the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is scaring regional South Australia with claims of some kind of regional job crisis—or, to use the quote from the *Advertiser* that she used, that we had 'dropped the ball'. The only thing dropped here is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. Her party hacks have wrenched her from her red ribbon, dyed in the wool Labor seat and sent her on mission impossible to the electorate of Light. You can see the assignment tape disappearing into the mist as they dump her afterwards.

Time expired.

POLICE SUPERANNUATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Returned from the House of Assembly without amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (GAMBLING REGULATION) BILL

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN (Premier) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000; the Casino Act 1997; the Gaming Machines Act 1992; the Gaming Supervisory Authority Act 1995; the Liquor Licensing Act 1997; the Racing Act 1976; the Racing (Proprietary Business Licensing) Act 2000; the Railways (Operations and Access) Act 1997; the South Australian Motor Sport Act 1984 and the State Lotteries Act 1966; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: 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.

Mr Speaker I introduce this Bill as a clear demonstration of my Government's commitment to dealing with the ongoing issue of problem gambling.

The Bill has been triggered by the long-held concerns of myself, many other Members of Parliament and many members of the community about the effects of gaming machines in South Australia.

Poker Machines were introduced under the former Government nearly ten years ago….and there is no doubt that they have boosted the hotels industry while also leading to an increase in problem gambling.

With these reforms, Mr Speaker, South Australia will, for the first time, have a regulatory body directly charged with helping to minimise problem gambling.

The new Independent Gambling Authority will manage a responsible gambling industry and direct its efforts to minimising harm from problem gambling.

Mr Speaker, for too long this issue has been placed in the too hard basket.

For too long Parliament has been afraid to act.

My Government has taken a decisive step. First, I acted to put in place a temporary freeze. Then I undertook to come back to the House with a more comprehensive package.

That package, which I introduce today Mr Speaker, is one that has been arrived at through wide consultation.

The Gaming Machine Review we put together worked in a co-operative and constructive manner to come up with recommendations that are worthwhile and achievable.

I commend the review group and thank them for their efforts.

The Gaming Machine Review was chaired by Graham Ingerson MP and the members were Angus Redford MLC, Stephen Richards (Chair—Heads of Christian Churches Taskforce on Gambling), Dale West (Executive Director—Centacare Catholic Family Services), Mark Henley (Senior Policy Adviser—Adelaide Central Mission), Peter Hurley (President—Australian Hotels Association), John Lewis (General Manager—Australian Hotels Association), and Bill Cochrane (Vice President—Clubs SA).

The group received submissions from a variety of sources, including from Members of Parliament—the Hon Nick Xenophon from the other place and the Leader of the Opposition among them.

One of the key areas of consensus was for the establishment of the Independent Gambling Authority. It will have responsibility for regulating all forms of gambling in South Australia. In a crucial reform it will regulate codes of practice across all those gambling sectors.

In the case of gaming this will make a number of measures legally enforceable across the State—such as the installation of

clocks in venues, the ban on cashing of cheques in venues and the ban on gambling while intoxicated.

The Authority's functions will be extended to incorporate research and to report on the social and economic impacts of gambling. It is proposed that the Authority will become the Government's principal gambling research body.

Mr Speaker we have accepted the Review Group's recommendation that the freeze on gaming machine numbers be extended for a further two years.

This will mean that one of the IGA's first tasks will be to ascertain whether—at the end of that period—the freeze on gaming machines in South Australia should continue or whether any other mechanism to address gaming machine numbers should be introduced.

This will mean that no new gaming licences will be approved for a minimum period of two and a half years (from December 7 last year).

And that any permanent measures will be based on detailed research—and judged against what they can do for the issue of problem gambling.

We will also act to establish a Minister for Gambling so that the functions of the Treasurer can be separated from gambling regulation.

Notwithstanding these significant reforms, Mr Speaker, the review has identified a number of changes that can be implemented as soon as possible to help counter problem gambling.

These include:

- Banning of autoplay facilities on all gaming machines in South Australia. Removal of this function requires the player to make conscious decisions regarding each game cycle and will minimise the incidence of players playing more than one machine at the same time.
- Specifically banning the introduction of note acceptors on all gaming machines in South Australia. While note acceptors have not been approved by the Liquor and Gaming Commissioner to date—this will ensure they can never be installed in South Australia.
- Establishment of a barring register for problem gamblers to be administered by the Authority. Those persons on the register will not be permitted to enter the specified gaming venues from which they have been barred. Gamblers may voluntarily elect to place themselves on the register. Numerous problem gamblers have informed the committee that they would feel more comfortable being barred by a third party such as the Authority.
- A daily limit to be enforced on all cash withdrawals from ATM and EFTPOS facilities on premises that contain gaming machines (proposed limit—$200 per day). Controls on ready access to cash are seen as a key mitigating factor against problem gambling.
- The minimum rate of return on new gaming machines will be increased from 85 per cent to 87.5 per cent.
- It should be noted that these amendments are proposed to apply to all gaming venues in South Australia, including the Adelaide Casino.

Mr Speaker, this is a very important package of reforms.

It provides immediate action to help stem the tide of problem gambling.

It responds to community concerns.

It establishes a better regulatory environment for the future, ensuring that problem gambling is an ongoing focus in the management of our gambling industry.

It draws a line in the sand when it comes to the proliferation of gaming machines, while setting up the right mechanism to deal with the difficult issue of permanent measures to control machine numbers.

There are many in the community who would have wanted more; there are many in the entertainment industry who feel these controls are an unwelcome imposition.

My view is that these measures get the balance right.

Importantly they put in place the structures that will allow, in fact demand, ongoing research, consideration and action regarding the costs and benefits of gambling in our community.

I commend this legislation to the House and hope that all members will support it, especially given that it has been endorsed by key welfare groups and the hotels industry.

I commend this bill to honourable members.

Explanation of clauses

PART 1

PRELIMINARY

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause brings the preliminary part of the Act and section 18 (the extension of the freeze on gaming machines) into operation on assent. The remainder of the Act will come into operation by proclamation.

Clause 3: Interpretation

This clause is formal.

PART 2

AMENDMENT OF AUTHORISED BETTING OPERATIONS ACT 2000

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

This clause reflects the changes to the titles of the Liquor and Gaming Commissioner (now to be Liquor and Gambling Commissioner) and the Gaming Supervisory Authority (now to be the Independent Gambling Authority).

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 12—Approved licensing agreement

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 24—Investigative powers

These clauses change references to these titles.

Clause 7: Amendment of s. 49—Responsible gambling code of practice

This clause provides that the Authority may add matters to be dealt with under responsible gambling codes, being matters directed at reducing the incidence of problem gambling.

Clause 8: Insertion of s. 51A

This clause provides for scrutiny by Parliament of codes of practice and all alterations to codes of practice. Either House may disallow a code or alteration to a code, in the same way as if it were a regulation. This process does not delay operation of the codes.

PART 3

AMENDMENT OF CASINO ACT 1997

Clause 9: Amendment of s. 2A—Object

This clause amends the objects of the Act to reflect the provisions proposed by this Bill relating to responsible gambling and minimisation of harm caused by gambling.

Clause 10: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

This clause changes the two relevant titles and inserts new definitions of 'authorised game' and 'gaming machine'.

Clause 11: Amendment of s. 23—Investigative powers

This clause is a consequential amendment.

Clause 12: Insertion of ss. 37A and 37B

This clause inserts two new sections into the Act. New Section 37A requires the Commissioner to have regard to guidelines of the Authority when authorising a new game to be played in the casino. The Commissioner must not approve games likely to exacerbate problem gambling. New section 37B requires all new gaming machines in the casino to return winnings to players at a rate of not less than 87.5 per cent.

Clause 13: Amendment of s. 38—Approval of management systems, etc.

This clause is consequential.

Clause 14: Insertion of Division 4A in Part 4

This clause inserts a new Division dealing with codes of practice. New section 41A provides that the casino licensee must adopt and implement a code of practice for advertising, being a code that is to be approved by the Authority. New section 41B provides for the adoption and implementation of a code of responsible gambling, also to be approved by the Authority. The code must deal with information to be given to patrons about responsible gambling and the availability of services for problem gamblers. Staff training in these matters is to be dealt with in the code. The Authority can require other things to be included in the code if they are directed towards reducing the incidence of problem gambling. New section 41C provides for the review by the Authority of both codes every 2 years or less. The Authority can, after consultation with the licensee, require amendments to be made to the codes. New section 41D provides for Parliamentary scrutiny of codes of practice and of alterations to codes.

Clause 15: Amendment of heading

This clause is consequential.

Clause 16: Insertion of ss. 42A and 42B

This clause inserts two new sections into the Act. New section 42A makes it a condition of the casino licence that the licensee cannot allow cash facilities on the casino premises if they allow a person to withdraw more than $200 per card per day (a different daily limit

may be fixed by the regulations). This provision will not come into operation until 3 months after commencement. New section 42B inserts another condition prohibiting the use of banknote receptors on gaming machines and also prohibiting that facility on a gaming machine designed for automatic playing of successive games. This latter condition also has a delayed operation date of 3 months.

PART 4
AMENDMENT OF THE GAMING MACHINES ACT 1992

Clause 17: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

This clause changes the titles of the Commissioner and the Authority, shifts the definition of 'cash facility' (currently in the body of the Act) and makes a consequential amendment.

Clause 18: Amendment of s. 14A—Freeze on gaming machines

This clause extends the freeze on the grant of new gaming machine licences from 31 May 2001 to 31 May 2003.

Clause 19: Amendment of s. 40—Approval of gaming machines

This clause provides that, when approving games for gaming machines, the Commissioner must have regard to guidelines of the Authority. The Commissioner must not approve games likely to exacerbate problem gambling.

Clause 20: Amendment of s. 51A—Cash facilities not to be provided within gaming areas

This clause is a consequential amendment.

Clause 21: Insertion of s. 51B

This clause inserts a new section providing a daily cash limit for withdrawals using cash facilities on premises licensed to have gaming machines. The limit will be $200 (or some other limit prescribed by the regulations), unless the Commissioner has fixed a higher limit for any particular licensed premises for some good reason, eg, the remoteness of the location of the premises. This provision is an offence. The operation of the provision has a 3 month delay.

Clause 22: Insertion of s. 53A

This clause inserts a new section prohibiting banknote receptors and automatic play buttons on gaming machines on licensed premises. Again this provision is an offence with a 3 month delay for the automatic play prohibition.

Clause 23: Insertion of ss. 74A and 74B

This clause inserts a new section that provides for the 2 yearly review of the codes of practice gaming machine licensees will be required to adopt pursuant to the conditions of their licences (see the amendments to schedule 1). The codes can be altered by the Authority after due consultation with a body representative of licensees. New section 74B provides for Parliamentary scrutiny of codes and alterations to codes.

Clause 24: Amendment of schedule 1

This clause amends schedule 1 which sets out the conditions that are attached to gaming machine licences. The condition in paragraph *(n)* is amended to provide that new gaming machines (and games) must return winnings to players at the rate of 87.5 per cent or more. Two new conditions are inserted requiring licensees to adopt codes of practice dealing with advertising and responsible gambling. These provisions are identical to those inserted by clause 14 into the casino licence.

Clause 25: Transitional provision

This clause is of a transitional nature. It provides that, in the first instance, the holders of gaming machine licences will be taken to have adopted an advertising code of practice and a responsible gambling code of practice approved by the Minister. These codes will, for the purposes of the Act, be taken to be codes approved by the Authority.

PART 5
AMENDMENT OF GAMING SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY ACT 1995

Clause 26: Amendment of s. 1—Short title
Clause 27: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation
Clause 28: Amendment of s. 4—Establishment of Authority

These clauses change the titles of the Act, the Authority and the Commissioner. The Authority is made a body corporate.

Clause 29: Amendment of s. 5—Constitution of the Authority

This clause increases the Authority's membership from four to six and provides for a minimum gender mix.

Clause 30: Amendment of s. 10—Secretary

This clause effects a statute law revision amendment.

Clause 31: Amendment of s. 11—Functions and powers of Authority

This clause adds two new functions for the Authority, namely, the development of strategies to combat problem gambling and to minimise the harm associated with gambling, and the undertaking of research in relation to these matters. The Authority is required to take two factors into account when performing its functions or exercising its powers under this Act or any other Act. Firstly, it must have regard to fostering responsibility in gambling and minimising the harm caused by gambling, and secondly, it must pay due regard to maintaining a sustainable and responsible gambling industry in this State.

Clause 32: Insertion of ss 11A and 11B

This clause inserts a new section into the Act empowering the Authority to establish committees to assist it in the performance of its functions.

Clause 33: Amendment of s. 12—Proceedings of Authority

This clause changes the Authority's quorum from three to four.

Clause 34: Amendment of s. 15A—Delegation

This clause empowers the Authority to delegate any of its functions to a committee established by the Authority.

Clause 35: Insertion of s. 15B

This clause inserts a new section into the Act. A person may apply to the Authority to have himself or herself barred from the casino or one or more hotels or clubs that have gaming machines. If the Authority makes such an order, the Authority will notify in writing each licensee affected by the order. If the barred person enters a place from which he or she has been barred, he or she is guilty of an offence with a $2 500 maximum penalty. The barring of a person under this section is confidential information for the purposes of section 17 of the Act.

Clause 36: Amendment of s. 17—Confidentiality

This clause extends the confidentiality provision to include members of any committee established by the Authority.

Clause 37: Insertion of s. 19

This clause requires the Authority to furnish the Minister with an annual report on the performance of its functions. The Authority need not include in the report any material included in annual reports furnished by the Authority under other Acts. The report must include a summary of research carried out by the Authority or in which it has participated and of any findings of such research. The report is to be furnished to both Houses of Parliament.

PART 6
AMENDMENT OF LIQUOR LICENSING ACT 1997

Clause 38: Amendment of s. 4—Interpretation
Clause 39: Amendment of s. 8—the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner

PART 7
AMENDMENT OF THE RACING ACT 1976

Clause 40: Amendment of s. 5—Interpretation

PART 8
AMENDMENT OF THE RACING (PROPRIETARY LICENSING) ACT 2000

Clause 41: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation
Clause 42: Amendment of s. 11—Approved licensing agreement
Clause 43: Amendment of s. 21—Investigative powers

PART 9
AMENDMENT OF RAILWAYS (OPERATIONS AND ACCESS) ACT 1997

Clause 44: Amendment of s. 18—Ministerial authorisation to sell liquor
Clause 45: Amendment of s. 19—Ministerial authorisation to provide gambling facilities

PART 10
AMENDMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MOTOR SPORT ACT 1984

Clause 46: Amendment of s. 27A—Application of ss. 27B and 27C

Parts 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 (clauses 38 to 46) effect the relevant title changes to the *Liquor Licensing Act 1997*, *Racing Act 1976*, the *Racing (Proprietary Licensing) Act 2000*, the *Railways (Operations and Access) Act 1997* and the *South Australian Motor Sport Act 1984*, respectively.

PART 11
AMENDMENT OF STATE LOTTERIES ACT 1966

Clause 47: Amendment of s. 3—Interpretation

This clause effects the relevant title changes.

Clause 48: Amendment of s. 4—Constitution of the Commission
Clause 49: Amendment of s. 9—Quorum

These clauses replace references to 'Chairman' with references to 'presiding member'.

Clause 50: Insertion of ss. 13B, 13C, 13D and 13E

This clause inserts four new sections into the Act requiring the Lotteries Commission to adopt an advertising code of practice and

a responsible gambling code of practice, both of which must be approved by the Authority. These codes will be reviewed by the Authority at least every 2 years and the Authority may require alterations to be made to the codes after due consultation with the Commission. The codes and alterations are to be subject to Parliamentary scrutiny.

Mr FOLEY secured the adjournment of the debate.

YOUTH COURT (JUDICIAL TENURE) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 April. Page 1268.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): Mr Deputy Speaker, you will well remember a debate in the dying hours of the Arnold government in 1993. That debate was on bills that were consequent on the report of the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice. That was a rousing debate in which I was pleased to participate, but the outcome was a good one. Juvenile justice in South Australia works much better today than it did before 1993. That debate was propelled by great public unease about repeat juvenile offenders. Up until 1993, the juvenile justice system had not been working well because its emphasis was too much on welfare and not enough on justice and prevention.

One of the recommendations of the juvenile justice select committee was that judges of the juvenile court, that is, the principal judiciary, should not serve terms longer than five years. There was a reason for that. The Senior Judge of the District Court at that time was His Honour Judge Newman and, after many years on the juvenile court, he had a revelation on the road to Damascus, as it were, and he suddenly found great fault with the juvenile justice system over which he had been presiding for many years.

In a number of articles published in the *Sunday Mail*, Judge Newman was critical of the system, and it was his remarks that helped encourage members of the parliamentary Labor Party to rebel successfully against the ministry for the first and only time in caucus. It was the backbench of the parliamentary Labor Party that compelled the government of the day to form the Select Committee on Juvenile Justice, and I was happy to be part of that peasant revolt.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: The minister asks whether I rolled Sumner. The minister should know that all successful revolutions or rebellions have their origin in betrayal at the highest level. I will just leave that matter to rest. The government brings in this bill to alter that juvenile justice package so that judges of the Youth Court can serve terms of 10 years. It does it for the worst possible reason, that is, that a current judge of the Youth Court is coming to the end of his five year term and the government admits frankly that it is legislating for this one gentleman to extend his term. That is one of the worst reasons for bringing a bill into the House.

The juvenile justice select committee did not recommend a five year limit lightly. It did not do it for no reason, as the Attorney-General suggests. The select committee recommended a five year limit, because it wanted to see a consistent and regular rotation of judges through the Youth Court. It did not want a situation where a judge like Kingsley Newman could serve many years administering a system which, towards the end of his tenure, and only towards the end of his tenure, he denounced.

Youth Court judges can be District Court judges or they can be magistrates. The idea of the select committee was that it would be normal for a District Court judge to serve a period as a judge of the Youth Court if that was what was decided by the Chief Judge of the District Court in consultation with the government.

The Attorney-General says that, if we do not agree to this bill, he will have to appoint new District Court judges every five years to serve on the Youth Court. Not so, Attorney. When Judge Jennings finishes his five year term on the Youth Court, there is nothing to stop his serving on the District Court. There is nothing to stop the Chief Judge appointing any of the District Court judges to be Youth Court judges, but the Attorney rules out this possibility.

If I have the good fortune to be the Attorney-General of this state in a Labor government, I certainly would not rule out the possibility of District Court judges being appointed to the Youth Court for a period. That was what was contemplated by the juvenile justice select committee when it made that recommendation. So, I believe it is soft indeed for the government to legislate to avoid the possibility of District Court judges serving their time in the Youth Court. If they do not like the appointment, then they can always resign.

Mr Clarke: There is no shortage of volunteers for the District Court.

Mr ATKINSON: As the member for Ross Smith says, there are no shortages of volunteers to serve on the District Court. I have heard it said that some magistrates would not want to serve in Port Augusta, Whyalla or Mount Gambier if the Labor government brings in or restores resident magistrates. If they do not wish to serve, if they do not wish to receive their salary of $140 000—

Mr Clarke: Plus a car.

Mr ATKINSON: —plus, as the member Ross for Smith says—a car—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: —and, as the minister says, fully funded super.

Mr Foley interjecting:

Mr ATKINSON: As I am informed, some magistrates resent being required to turn up at 9 o'clock regularly by the supervisors in the Magistrates Court. If they do not want to do that, then there is always a career at the bar or as a solicitor for them, and they can resign as magistrates. This bill is soft. It is an inappropriate response to the problem, and the opposition opposes it.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I rise to echo some of the views expressed by the shadow attorney-general, the member for Spence. The bill seems to be introduced for the unprincipled reason of suiting a particular member of the judiciary, and the comments from the opposition today and in the other place certainly should not be taken as a reflection on the merit of the incumbent—not at all. We are focusing purely on the reason behind the government's bringing this bill into parliament. It is, generally speaking, wrong to implement a significant reform because of an idiosyncratic circumstance and to suit an individual.

A perceptive question was asked in the other place by the Hon. Bob Sneath in respect of District Court judges serving in the Youth Court. The Attorney-General, the Hon. Trevor Griffin, was asked why the Chief Judge of the District Court, for example, does not have the power under current law to simply rotate District Court judges into the Youth Court position for five years and, when the five years are up, obviously, there are discussions between the Chief Judge and the Attorney-General about whether a new judge is to be

appointed and, if there is not, another District Court judge could be asked to go to the Youth Court or, indeed, be directed to go to the Youth Court. I would like to hear from the minister who has the carriage of this bill in the House of Assembly as to why that would be an inappropriate solution to the problem which the government perceives it has to address by this bill.

Another strange thing about the arrangements as they are viewed by the government is that, implicit in the government's proposal, it is not appropriate to appoint judges to the Youth Court who do not have some special quality to make them suitable for the Youth Court. I dispute that: I think that if you are a judge you should be able to be a Youth Court judge as much as you are able to be a magistrate or a District Court judge. I challenge the government to specify what perceived special qualities there might be which would render someone more suitable than another person for appointment to the Youth Court. Does it mean that the judge concerned should have children or should not have children; does it mean that the judge should be aged under 40; does it mean that the judge should have his or her car pinched by a teenager before they can be appointed? It seems to me that, if someone has the appropriate judicial qualities for appointment, there is no reason why they should not be most suitable for the Youth Court. I cannot see why any of the District Court judges, in theory, would not be appropriate appointments to the Youth Court.

I am not sure if it is the wish of the House to go into committee to examine the clauses in detail. I gather that we will do so, and some of these issues can be pursued further, but I put on the record those general concerns so that the minister can respond in detail when he concludes the second reading debate.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): Rather than respond, the honourable member can raise those matters in committee at the appropriate time. I thank members for their comments.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

Mr HANNA: I ask the minister to outline his response to the concerns I raised in the second reading debate.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: One of those concerns, I understand, related to the rotation of judges between the two courts. I am advised that the Chief Judge can rotate judges between the two courts. The point is to find judges who are suited to and are willing to undertake what is considered a specialist task. This bill does not affect the ability of the Chief Judge of the District Court to rotate judges.

Mr HANNA: The other issue that I raised, and it has been raised again by the minister in the response he has just given, concerns any special qualities said to be required for Youth Court appointments.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am advised that the view was that it would be of some benefit to the court if the judges being appointed have a good understanding of the juvenile justice system, the operation of which is, of course—in part, at least—different from the adult system. Also, they should have an interest—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: One of the points to consider is that they build up a skill bank over a period, and why would you rotate someone out if they are doing a good job and enjoying the work? Why would you lose that experience to the court? Why would you not seek to keep that experience? That is one of the issues raised. The member for Mitchell may not know, but I am sure that the member for Spence recalls, that the Liberal Party, from memory, originally opposed tenure in relation to this bill when it was first mooted in the dying days of 1993—as, I think, the member for Spence mentioned. I understand it was a compromise position that we accepted a five-year period. So, the government's position is—

Mr Clarke: So Griffin is finally undoing—

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, in fairness to the Attorney, he is not trying to undo it. The Attorney is recognising the will of parliament at that time that some tenure should remain. If he was seeking to undo it totally, it would be non-tenured, as it is in the ERD Court. So, given that the judiciary builds up some skill base over five years, why would you not seek to rotate that out? We think that the option to keep the skill base for a longer time is an option that should be available.

Mr HANNA: The argument put by the minister cuts two ways. If a person is going to develop skills in the Youth Court over a period of 10 years, does that not mean that their 'skills' in other areas might fall to one side? The minister might yawn and appear to be disdainful, but it is a serious question. It follows a letter from the Chief Justice which was received by the Attorney-General. The Chief Justice stated that he had no objection to the proposed extension of the period for which a person can be a member of the principal judiciary of the Youth Court. I highlight that the Chief Justice then went on to say:

> It should be recognised, however, that if a person is appointed to that court for 10 years, over that period of time the person might well lose skills to sit in a general jurisdiction, and might take some time to acquire those skills again.

With respect, I may say that that is not an outlandish comment, given the development in civil areas of the law that might not be applicable in the Youth Court. Someone out of the mainstream for 10 years might lose touch with developments in the District Court rules in the general jurisdiction, and so on. So, true it is that somebody who has been in the Youth Court for 10 years might become accustomed to that jurisdiction, but at the same time will they lose touch with the rules and principles to be applied in the general jurisdiction? Does the minister give the slightest consideration to that argument? I would ask other questions if I were not constrained by Standing Orders to the three questions I have.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: As I understand the bill, it is serving up to 10 years and not definitely 10 years, so that allows rotation still to occur within the system. It puts a cap on it of a maximum of 10 years, so you are not automatically appointed for 10 years. So, rotation through the system is still an option. If the issue that the member for Mitchell raises is a concern for those who have the power to rotate, then ultimately a decision can be made to undertake a rotation. The government has also—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The minister.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Mitchell has asked his three questions.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The government is also committed to undertake a review of the issue of tenure, and no doubt the arguments that the member for Mitchell puts will be raised and considered during part of that review.

Mr CLARKE: I have a number of questions. I think the members for Spence and Mitchell have belled the cat in so far as what this bill is all about. As both the members for Spence and Mitchell have said, the opposition's criticisms of this bill are in no way directed towards Judge Jennings, who is immediately affected by this legislation in so far as any extension to his term of office in the Youth Court is concerned. It is more the principle and, exactly as the other two members have said, it is bad law to legislate simply for one individual. I went to the second reading speech of the minister, where he goes on to say:

> Generally speaking, one should seek to engage judges and magistrates who are suited to the Youth Court. It is not just a matter of trying to find a judge or magistrate from existing officers to take on the Youth Court job. (They cannot, incidentally, be compelled to transfer to the Youth Court and, if that were to be the position, one would have to doubt the value of a judge or magistrate in the Youth Court jurisdiction who had to be compelled to sit there.)

On reading the second reading speech, it is my understanding that the Chief Judge of the District Court could tell any of his District Court judges that they had to take a job in the Youth Court if that was the wish of the Chief Judge of the District Court. I find that strange in so far as the second reading speech is concerned. The second reading speech goes on to state (and this leads me to my question):

> . . . if the government is required to appoint a new judge or a new magistrate to the Youth Court every five years, there will soon be a surplus of judges in the District Court and magistrates in the Magistrates Courts, all entitled to remain as judges and magistrates until aged 70 years and 65 years respectively. This would represent a substantial cost to future governments in South Australia.

I fail to see the logic because, at the end of the five year term as currently exists for one of the judges or magistrates if they are affected by the existing legislation, the judges simply go to the District Court. The Chief Judge can reappoint an existing District Court judge to be the judge of the Youth Court, unless there is a vacancy which the government decides to fill. The way that the Attorney-General has framed the second reading speech is that we have to keep an automatic, sausage like machine. As soon as five years comes up we have to appoint a new Youth Court judge from outside the existing range of District Court judges and thereby adding to the burden on the taxpayer. I simply ask the minister whether what is said in the second reading speech is factual and, if so, could he please explain it to me? That is not my understanding of the present position and the powers of the Chief Judge of the District Court.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I cannot explain to you if it is your understanding, but I can make comment on whether your understanding is the same as mine. On advice, my understanding is that, if a District Court judge is invited to go to the Youth Court and they decline the invitation, they remain a District Court judge. A vacancy would then exist in the Youth Court and a new judge would need to be appointed to the District Court and transferred across.

Mr CLARKE: The minister's using the word 'declines' clearly bells the cat on that. If the District Court judge declines his boss telling him to go to the Youth Court, perhaps he does not want to serve as a District Court judge any longer, and I can give the names and addresses of any number of barristers who would be more than happy to replace him or her, as the case may be. It is just a question of this government kow-towing to this sort of nonsense that a District Court judge can tell his or her chief, 'This doesn't particularly suit my convenience and I don't want to go to the Youth Court; the taxpayers must meet the cost to suit my convenience.' That is being a very weak Attorney-General and Chief Justice if that is what happens.

I will preface my remarks with another point before I get to my next question. At the end of the day, the real problem with what the government is proposing is that we will have a judge of the Youth Court (and I specifically exclude Judge Jennings) who, if this legislation is allowed to go through, will develop into a Kingsley Newman, the former Chief Judge of the Youth Court who, quite frankly, was a lay-about and did not do his work. That is why the legislation was introduced in 1993. Suddenly, Judge Newman had to go to the District Court and, when he realised he could not hack the pace and was not able to shuffle his workload down to magistrates at a lower level, he had to answer to his peers in the District Court and had the Chief Justice to answer to. He found the workload too hard and retired within 12 months of going back to the District Court. You will be inviting the same thing to happen again here in South Australia with this type of legislation.

There are good reasons to provide for that rotation. Why is South Australia probably the only state with a Youth Court with two judges with this sort of long tenure? In New South Wales and Queensland and possibly Victoria there is only one judge of the Youth Court, with magistrates—at least in the case of New South Wales—and they rotate every 12 months. So, part of the job of a District Court judge in New South Wales is doing at least a 12 month stint as a judge of the Youth Court. You do not need two judges in New South Wales to cover for sick leave, annual leave and so on, because other District Court judges can be called in to fill the position and, in any event, they are there for only 12 months. It seems to me a far more economical way, too. In South Australia, with our population, we have a senior judge, an ordinary judge and two magistrates. Why do we have that set-up compared with a state like New South Wales which has one judge who is rotated every 12 months?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Because the Labor Government in 1993 got the parliament's approval to introduce the system that the member for Ross Smith just outlined. As the member for Spence said in his opening comments in the second reading debate, the system that currently exists was introduced during the dying days of the Arnold government. If I can interpret the comments of the member for Ross Smith, he is criticising a system introduced in the dying days of the Arnold government.

At the end of the day, he and others in the House need to understand the way the system works. It is a cumulative total of five years currently or 10 years under the bill. A person is not automatically appointed for a continuous period of five years. The system allows for the appointment to be from one year up to five years, but the judge concerned has a cumulative total ultimately of five years under the current act or 10 years under the bill if it is successful. If the system outlined by the honourable member, where they rotate every year, was the wish of those with the power to decide the length of service of the judge's rotation, that may be why they wish to do that. That is up to the person who ultimately nominates the length of service.

Mr ATKINSON: Specifically who decides to appoint a District Court judge to the Youth Court, and who would recall a Youth Court judge back to the District Court? I had thought that it would be the Chief Judge of the District Court, but if I am wrong and it is the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court or the Attorney-General, could the minister advise the committee accordingly?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am advised that the Attorney-General recommends an appointment to the District Court, and a transfer to the Youth Court is made on recommendation to the Attorney-General by the Chief Judge. That is again a recommendation by the Attorney.

Mr CLARKE: All that the opposition has been able to glean from its questioning of the minister further confirms our view that the government is putting through this legislation for all the wrong reasons, simply to suit the particular circumstances of one individual. Ordinarily it is bad law to legislate to suit the circumstances of one particular person, no matter how well suited that person may be for the particular position.

The minister also said, I think in answer to one of the questions from the member for Mitchell, that you can rotate judges through the system so that they can go to the Youth Court. In fact, the minister has already admitted that the government intends independently to review this issue of fixed terms with respect to the Youth Court. That means that this legislation is simply being done in haste for one particular individual.

The minister, in his criticism of my last question to him—which was two judges and two magistrates in South Australia, compared with other states that get by with one judge—was that this is what they inherited from the former Labor government.

There has been no shortage of examples of this Attorney-General and this government generally seeking to overturn legislation enacted by former Labor governments, yet on this occasion they intend to worsen the vice they complained of back in 1993 by allowing a circumstance to arise where you will find a safe haven in the Youth Court for somebody to go away, hibernate there, shuffle their workload down to magistrates and not be answerable or accountable to anyone. That will be to the detriment of the juvenile justice system in this state.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): My only comment on the committee stage is that it is normally the role of the Attorney-General and the minister representing the Attorney-General in this place to defend the judiciary against criticisms made. I have noticed that this minister has declined on this occasion to do that.

Bill read a third time and passed.

EXPIATION OF OFFENCES (TRIFLING OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 April. Page 1269.)

Mr ATKINSON (Spence): South Australia was the first state to introduce the expiation or infringement notice system. It was introduced in 1938 as part of the Police Act. Under the expiation notice system a person who is alleged to have committed a minor offence has the choice of appearing in court to face the charge or to pay a small fee—considerably less than the maximum fine—to expiate the offence. Before 1938 the police had an informal system of expiation which it was necessary to regularise by legislation. Payment of the expiation fee is not an admission of guilt. The number of offences that may be expiated has grown enormously, and the number of expiation notices issued has increased to the tens of thousands. Those who receive expiation notices would claim that many of these notices are being issued lightly.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: Frivolously.

Mr ATKINSON: The member for Stuart says 'frivolously'. He may even say that they are trifling, but we will come to that. That is in circumstances where the offender would not have been reported or summonsed but for the expiation notice system. They argue that notices are issued where a warning or caution would have sufficed. It is conventional wisdom that the government has expanded the expiation notice system for the purpose of raising money for consolidated revenue and that the offences alleged are merely a pretext. The member for Stuart often argues this, as does the Hon. T.G. Cameron and the Hon. J.F. Stefani. This is the background to the bill.

The bill says to issuing authorities that expiation notices should not be used for trifling offences. The word 'trifling' has been the subject of much judicial interpretation, so the government is comfortable with that being the key word in the bill. Under the proposal, at any time before an expiation notice becomes an enforcement order or before the alleged offender pays, the alleged offender may apply to the authority to have the notice withdrawn on the grounds that the offence is trifling. The case law on trifling is that a typical offence is not trifling: if the breach is deliberate it will rarely be trifling. Trifling offences are inadvertent, technical or casual, or offences committed for compelling humanitarian or safety reasons.

It is quite common for alleged offenders or their MP on their behalf to write to an issuing authority requesting that an expiation notice be withdrawn. I am sure we have all done that on many occasions. The bill simply requires the issuing authority to consider whether the notice should be withdrawn because it was a trifling offence. The issuing authority's decision to withdraw or not withdraw the notice is not reviewable. If the issuing authority does not withdraw the notice after application by the alleged offender on the grounds that the offence was trifling, the alleged offender cannot seek a judicial review of the administrative decision not to withdraw the notice.

The Attorney-General would say that the alleged offender retains the right to refuse to pay the sum nominated in the expiation notice and to take the matter to court. I have lost count of the number of times I have advised constituents of that right they have, but none of them ever seem keen on exercising that right.

Mr Hanna: It is an expensive one to exercise.

Mr ATKINSON: As the member for Mitchell says, potentially it could be expensive. Certainly it would be inconvenient, and I think my constituents are often intimidated by the idea of appearing before a magistrate and arguing their case, although I remember that the member for Mitchell represented one of my clients on a matter in the Magistrates Court and took up some hours putting his case on an expiation notice issued for a matter that was not merely trifling.

Ms Hurley: Was it successful?

Mr ATKINSON: No, it was not successful. It was not merely trifling but a matter where my client and the client of the member for Mitchell had every right to commit that offence, an offence which Labor will legalise within hours of coming to government—but I will not refer to that matter.

I take it from section 6 of the principal act as amended that the court could dismiss the alleged offence on the grounds that it is trifling, but I will leave it for the minister to respond to that inquiry when he sums up. It is only natural that most alleged offenders would prefer the expiation notice to be withdrawn before the matter goes to court. I do not think that the bill will make much difference to the expiation notice system, as I am sure the member for Stuart would hope that it would do, but it will do no harm. I notice that the bill provides for certain offences prescribed by regulation not to be able to be withdrawn on the grounds that they were trifling. I ask the minister what offences the government intends to exempt from the operation of the bill.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I support the bill because I think that it would be fair to say that I have made considerable representations in relation to what I believe to be the unjust, unfair and unnecessary issuing of on-the-spot fines.

Mr Atkinson: Are you the father of the bill?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I would be far too humble for that. I just say that some of my representations have been taken into account because—

Mr Atkinson: If you think that you've been pickpocketed by the Attorney-General yet again.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It is far better to gain a measure of support than be like the honourable member and not achieve anything in this matter. There is still a great deal to be done in this area, in my view. I believe that the parliament's original intent of the legislation to create expiable offences was that they would never be handed out like confetti. The honourable member is correct: his own government was very successful in using them as revenue raisers. All subsequent governments—

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: —have followed suit. I want to make it clear that I am getting more and more concerned that members of the community really are quite intimidated at the thought of going to court. While the member for Ross Smith has had great experience—

Mr Atkinson: He is not a barrister: he is a barrator.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is probably unparliamentary. People are intimidated and, therefore, when they are given one of these notices and they object to the issuing officer, my understanding is that the officer says, 'If you are unhappy, go to court.' That is, in my view, a quite insulting comment to make because when you have to go to court and fight the government you are at a great disadvantage because the system can beat you. The system can drag out the process beyond the financial resources of any average South Australian citizen, and I think—

Mr Hanna: One of your ministers is trying to do that to me at the moment.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: —that is unfair and unreasonable. I am not aware of that matter. I will let the honourable member and the minister's lawyers deal with that because I am sure that the honourable member, as a member of the legal profession, has the ability to defend himself. However, most members of the community do not and, therefore, the system we have is quite unfair and unreasonable. I will give members a couple of examples: people getting on-the-spot fines for having dirty number plates on dirt roads when it has been raining—quite ridiculous. One of my constituents received an on-the-spot fine because he had three fishing rods in his possession instead of two. I put it to members that it is called—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: He was very upset and so was I. Needless to say that he did not pay the expiation notice and nor should he. The stupidity of the person who issued it really calls into question the sort of instructions these people are under. The same constituent, may I say, on the same day was given two expiation notices because he did not have a bell on his bike. The individual in question really did not have the ability to represent himself and he was being victimised. Fortunately, he came to me. A lot of people think that they are stuck with it; that there is nothing they can do. If they go to their local member of parliament, in most cases, a bit of commonsense can be applied.

These were good stories and obviously would have attracted a great deal of attention if the local member in question had wanted to do something about them. Fortunately, we got the problems resolved, but people should not be placed in that situation at all, particularly when they do not have the means to defend themselves or argue their case. We really ought to go through very carefully the number of offences to which these expiation notices can be applied. I believe that a fair number should be removed; I feel strongly about that.

Mr Atkinson: You can serve your constituents by being in cabinet and being in a position of influence.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Unlike the honourable member, I think that I have reasonable influence. Let me say to the honourable member that—

Mr Atkinson: Mr Graham Gunna.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The honourable member—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Stuart.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: —sometimes really does demean himself with his rather juvenile activities. The honourable member should get out in the real world and the world of reality instead of carrying on with his silly make-believe nonsense. He thinks he is achieving a great deal by ringing up the talk-back programs at 11 o'clock and 12 o'clock.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Measures of this nature are important. A considerable number of other pieces of legislation need to be brought into this parliament to refine this legislation to prevent police officers thinking that it is their automatic right, on every occasion possible, to write out one of these tickets. A proper system of cautions should be introduced. My understanding is that if a person has not received an on-the-spot fine for 10 years in Victoria, in most cases, they receive an automatic caution.

Mr Atkinson: This is the Bracks Labor government?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That was done by the Kennett government. That was one of the provisions introduced by Kennett. That, in my view, is a sensible decision because—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is right: too busy taking away people's rights. That sort of system does not bring the police into conflict with the community. A measure of that nature ought to be brought into place as soon as possible, and I look forward to pursuing it. I am pleased that we have this measure before the House. I discovered that if a considerable number of people start bombarding the commissioner's office with correspondence something gets done. It is like putting questions on notice: the police officers have to answer them.

Mr Atkinson: How many questions do you put on notice?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: These days I do not have to; there are other ways of handling the matter. But in the past I put many questions on notice, so I know exactly how the system operates. If one addresses the correspondence to the minister in relation to this matter someone in the department must provide an accurate answer back to the honourable member. If they are bombarded with correspondence, obviously, they would recognise that they have a problem. As the honourable member pointed out, this is a bill that makes a number of important improvements. We need to go further. We need to review the legislation to give people more rights.

It is, in my view, a bit like the current legislation in relation to speed limits on certain country roads: it needs to be changed to bring some commonsense into play. I look forward to this measure passing to law, and I look forward to seeing a number of other measures implemented in the near future.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I support this bill and I particularly pay the highest compliment to the member for Stuart, formerly the member for Eyre, who has been in this place for 31 years, I remind the member for Spence. To insinuate that the member for Eyre is a 'gunna', I think, is a gross insult, not only to the member concerned but also to the people who elect him. Of all the people in this place who is accountable to their people, he is. They do not live in cities: they live in out-stations and they all know him personally. If they thought that he was a gunna man, they would not be supporting him year after year. He cannot hide behind the city facade.

Mr Atkinson interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I will not stand in this place and listen to insults like that—cheap insults at that. All I can say is that performance defies this sort of nonsense, and 30 years stands—

Mr Atkinson: Thirty-one.

Mr VENNING: Thirty-one years stands up against any criticism that the member for Spence may level. This gentlemen has been here for 31 years and, if he were young enough, he could do another 31. I am amazed that the member for Stuart can sit here, composed as he is, and listen to trash like that which the member for Spence is dishing up. All I can say is that the member for Spence could never last 30 years. I believe that the people of Eyre and now Stuart have indeed been well served. I can tell members that I know them well and I can assure the House that Mr Gunn reflects their needs and desires exactly.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling): Order! There is a point of order.

Mr ATKINSON: I have two points of order. The first is that the remarks of the member for Schubert are not relevant to the bill. The second is that he has referred to the member for Stuart by his surname rather than by his electorate.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I uphold both those points of order. I ask the member to return to the bill and I also remind him to refer to members by their titles.

Mr VENNING: Yes, you are technically correct, sir. However, I thought I would put that little personal bit in. Once I did refer to the member by his electorate, both former and current, and I thought I would refer to him as Mr Gunn because that is as his electors know him. Before making my contribution, after hearing trivial, inane interjections like that, to a person—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I am just explaining. I have agreed that the Acting Speaker is correct. As I said, I support this bill wholeheartedly. This is another indication of a member doing what his electorate wants him or her to do. I know that people in my electorate are apprehended and carted off to court, when a stern warning or just some good advice would be much better. Good law-abiding people, with a known good record, should be offered a caution, as the member for Stuart has just said.

I agree that if such a person is caught a second time, he or she should without a doubt be pinged. I know of many instances where people have been fined for ridiculous, low level misdemeanours. I will mention one about which I am still absolutely incensed. A number one citizen in my electorate, who was an ex mayor of a large municipality, went to his neighbour's clearing sale and bought an old tractor that was in his wood heap. All it had been used for was cutting wood, and it had been sitting there for 20 years. My constituent bought the tractor and inflated the tyres. He was amazed that they actually held air because the tractor had sat there for so long. He drove it down the lane and across the paddock and, as he was doing that, a blue car went past and parked under a tree. My constituent came to the road, travelled 25 metres along it, and crossed the road into his drive and onto his property. Of course, my constituent had committed an offence because the tractor was not registered. It was taken to his wood heap, and that is where it will stay and, no doubt, eventually die there.

As soon as my constituent moved onto the road and onto his own property, the car returned and the policeman apprehended him. Not only the driver of the tractor (his son-in-law), but also the person following in a car (my constituent), were given the notice because both men had been involved in the deed. There was a fair uproar about this in the community. I cannot remember exactly what the fine was, but the case went to court. It was a very trivial matter. I do not think the magistrate could believe what had happened. I think the fine was about $17 and three hours loss of licence. If that is not trivial, what is? A good, stern warning should have been sufficient.

I took up this matter with the minister and I said to him, 'I have to confess that, if it had been me, I would have done exactly the same.' This happened out between Blanchetown and Morgan, way out in the middle of the never never, and I thought it was gross. I would like that police officer's name because I think he acted in a very heavy-handed manner. I have written to the minister several times. He has written back to me, saying that, because it was a certain offence, a warning was not appropriate. In two words, that is rubbish. I believe that common sense should prevail.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Sir, that is two. 'Rubbish' will do. And that is a polite word. I used a better word than that when I spoke to the minister but I cannot put that on the record. I am going to pursue it because members may know the citizen—I will name him privately to any member: you would know who he is—and I could not believe that this sort of thing could happen. The member for Stuart has highlighted the offences about which we hear time after time. The member for Frome, who has just walked in, would know about similar events involving people getting pinged for having a vehicle with dirty number plates and blown tail-lights. Under the legislation a lot of touchy actions have been taken against people who have not put on their seat belt. For example, I know that people have been sitting in the main street in their

car and they have moved the car off the kerb (because it was sticking on the kerb and damaging it) and they have been pinged because they moved the car without a seat belt on. Should one not be actually moving the car or at least travelling at a certain speed before being pinged under the seat belt legislation? Many people would get in a car and move it a few feet across the road without putting on their seat belt. I know I do not always put it on: maybe I should get into that habit.

Other offences, which happen regularly on farms and which are always the subject of police apprehension, include clearance flags on farm machinery. We know that they must be on the vehicle when it is moving down the highway, but, as a result of the wind, they fall off or are blown off; an officer in a police car will pull you over and you get pinged. The remaining flags may be there, but one may be missing. Often the chains to hold the machine to the drawbar slip a link and hang off one end. Something falling off the machine is another thing. Farm machines are designed to work in farm paddocks although they sometimes have to be moved along highways. In recent times they seem to attract more than their share of attention from the men in blue, whether it be because they are over width or the pin is not properly secured, or whatever.

Members should consider that there are very few accidents with these machines. Why all the attention? I think it is relevant that the member for Stuart has raised these matters, because they are trivial offences. I always wonder why people who are making a living, and not obviously engaging in ridiculous or larrikin behaviour, attract the attention of the police. The member for MacKillop would know that when the trucks are lined up at the wheat silos it is annoying to have a blue car or an inspector driving down the queue looking for something wrong with the trucks. Most farmers check their trucks before harvest and avail themselves of the facility now given to them of putting their trucks over the shaker (which is a test device) before harvest to get an accredited safety ticket.

I have a lot of time for the men in blue, but it is most demeaning and against the spirit of things to see them go down queues of trucks looking for faults. We know that many of these trucks come out only once a year and that they are not Rolls Royces, but as long as they are safe, the brakes and the lights work, I believe that we should turn a blind eye to some of the other things, for example, grease coming from wheel bearings or a tail-light that is no longer red but, rather, orange. I support the member for Stuart and this legislation. I hope the House can appreciate the situation involved here and agree with the spirit in which the bill is moved.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I thank members for their contribution. I recognise the amount of work the member for Stuart put into the development of this bill. I can sum up the member for Schubert's speech in two words (as he did in his speech)—very good. In relation to the member for Spence's questions, the answer to the first question is 'Yes', and the answer to the second question is, 'No offences yet.'

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr WILLIAMS: I think the title of this bill gives the wrong impression. I believe that to call something a 'trifling' offence gives the wrong impression. There are trifling breaches, but I think it is a misnomer to call the offence 'trifling'. Are the offences trifling or is it the breaches that are trifling?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: My advice is that Parliamentary Counsel is of the view that the title properly reflects the intent or purpose of the bill.

Mr Clarke: It doesn't sound very convincing.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN (Mr Snelling): Order!

Mr WILLIAMS: Notwithstanding that answer, can the minister explain to the committee what difference, if any, would occur if the bill became Expiation of Offences (Trifling Breaches) Amendment Bill?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I think this is a hypothetical question but I will answer it. I am advised that the likely effect of changing the title would mean that other amendments would be required throughout the bill. The point that the member is making may well be covered in clause 4 of the bill which talks about the interpretation of 'alleged offences'. In the body of the bill, under the interpretation clause, there is the explanation to the point that the member for MacKillop is making.

Mr HANNA: On that point, since I concur with the member for MacKillop that it would be more accurate to describe the kind of behaviour which has been referred to in debate as trifling offending or trifling breaches of offences, rather than trifling offences themselves, I ask the minister whether the kind of amendment contemplated by the member for MacKillop could be entertained by inserting 'breaches of' before 'offence' or 'offences', where appearing. For example, in clause 4, it would then speak of an 'alleged breach of an offence' or something of that nature. That is a simple amendment, is it not?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The advice I am receiving is that under the interpretation (clause 4 of the bill), there is no need to put in the word 'breach' because the bill clearly covers the point that both the members for Mitchell and MacKillop are making. Therefore, there is no purpose for having the amendment as such.

Mr HANNA: To follow on from the member for MacKillop, when the public thinks of trifling offences, it will think of offences that are at the lowest grade of penalties such as a $50 or $60 fine or something like that. Of course, there can be serious offences that are committed to a trifling extent; for example, one can commit assault by blowing a breath of air on the back of someone's neck. That is a totally different thing from trifling offending in respect of one of these insignificant offences. Until we get answers from the minister which satisfy the committee, I do not see how we can let this go.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: There is no question.

Mr HANNA: If alternative wording was to be proposed by the committee, would the minister prefer 'trifling breaches' or 'trifling offending' as the title for the bill, with subsequent amendments through the clauses of the bill?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The minister is happy with the bill as it stands.

Clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3.

Mr CLARKE: Will the minister outline those classes of offences to which this bill will not apply when it becomes an act and is law? Clause 3(2) provides:

> The provisions of this act relating to trifling offences do not apply to offences of a class prescribed by regulation.

Which offences is the government already contemplating excluding from this legislation by regulation? By way of example, there has been a lot of discussion in second reading speeches dealing with offences under the Road Traffic Act and the like. Will the Road Traffic Act, for instance, be excluded by regulation? That would defeat the very reasons why the member for Stuart was agitated about this legislation in the first place? What is the scope of the regulation? I would image that the government must have some idea.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I answered that during my lengthy reply to the second reading contributions.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The same as it was then, which is that the government has no offences—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Member for Mitchell, if you listen—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Yes, and it's the second time, actually. The answer is that at this time the government is not seeking to exempt any offences. A government can, by its own decision, seek to exempt by regulation any of the offences that can have an expiation notice issued for them, but that matter has parliamentary scrutiny, because it is by regulation and will need to go through the process.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

Mr CLARKE: Paragraph (c) provides:

> The conduct allegedly constituting the offence was merely a technical, trivial or petty instance of a breach of the relevant enactment.

For example, the member for Stuart was talking about somebody being given an expiation notice on two occasions on the same day for not having a bell on their bicycle. I have had a similar example of that in my own electorate. How technical, trivial or petty must an instance be to trigger this legislation that will enable it to be an action to be appealed as being trifling? I know it is somewhat hypothetical, but the member for Stuart specifically referred to not having a bell on a bicycle. I know of examples like that, and there are other similar types of examples. I just want to get the feel for the definition with respect to this matter from the minister.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Spence outlined the answer to this issue in his accurate contribution to the second reading debate where he talked about some legal history to the word 'trifling' and what it actually meant. That is also outlined in the second reading speech, which I refer the member for Ross Smith to. With regard to the person to whom the notice is issued, a judgment is made first by the issuing officer as to whether it falls into the technical, trivial or petty class. Then it can be reviewed issuing authority as to whether it falls into the technical, trivial or petty class, and then it can also be reviewed by the courts. There are three judgments to be made if that is needed. Obviously, the appropriate training will need to be given to those in the positions of issuing and review to make sure that they fully understand the intent of the bill, or then act.

Mr HANNA: I understood the minister to say that the person who potentially issues the notice makes a judgment about whether or not the offence is trifling. Obviously, there is a review mechanism in respect of the issuing authority. Will the minister clarify that, especially in light of new section 18B brought in by clause 7, which suggests that a person issuing a notice and an issuing authority can make decisions which are final and not subject to any form of review? How does it happen then that a person issuing an expiation notice might consider that the offending is not trifling but the issuing authority, on review, might consider that it is trifling, is that not an inconsistency in the law?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Minister for Environment and Heritage): I move:

> That the time for moving the adjournment of the House be extended beyond 5 p.m.

Motion carried.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: My advice is that it is consistent. Clause 5 refers to the person issuing the notice. Clause 6 refers to the issuing authority. Clause 7 clearly illustrates that there are two processes.

Mr HANNA: In response to that point before I ask my next question, on a first read through of that provision, it still seems to me that the person issuing the expiation notice makes a decision as to whether or not an alleged offence is trifling. According to clause 7, that decision is final and not subject to any form of review. Then, under clause 6, there is a mechanism for review of that decision by the issuing authority, which itself is final and not subject to any form of review.

My question relates to the contributions by the members for Stuart and Schubert, because I believe that they were under a misapprehension as to offences which are trivial and offending which is trivial. One of the examples given by the member for Schubert was the case of some kind of farm vehicle travelling down the road without the flag that is meant to be attached to it to warn other motorists. Looking at the excuses, if you like, under clause 4, which I take it relate to the common law understanding of what 'trifling' means, how could a motorist accused of not having their warning flag on their vehicle avoid being issued with a notice under any of those ways out which are stipulated?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: It is really not up to me to comment on each individual example. You could think up a million of them. At the end of the day, it is up to the trained officers to interpret the intent of the bill.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, I am not saying that, either.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Not at all. The issuing officer has a discretion as to whether or not they think the possible offence is trifling. If based on their experience they think it is trifling under the act, the expiation notice will not be issued.

Mr HANNA: The member for Schubert clearly is under a misapprehension, and perhaps the minister is, too, because in that case of a warning flag not appearing on a farm vehicle travelling down the highway, it will be very unlikely that there are apparent humanitarian or safety reasons for failing to have the flag attached. I do not know how it could possibly be said that it is merely a technical, trivial or petty instance of the breach, because if the flag is not there it is not there. That is exactly the form of behaviour that is sought to be caught by the offence in the legislation.

Thirdly, as to whether the alleged offender could or could not have reasonably averted committing the offence, there is a fairly strict onus on the motorist to ensure that the flag is there. If it is a question of whether or not to believe the story of the farmer that the flag blew off in the wind, you are giving a judicial function—that is, whether or not to believe

an alleged offender—to the issuing officer. That does not seem to be in accordance with our judicial system.

I would like the minister to confirm—in examples such as those given by the member for Schubert of a warning flag not being on a farm vehicle, and the member for Stuart's example of a bell not being on a bike—that those people will not be able to take advantage of this legislation because the offending is typical offending in respect of the offences set down in the legislation—in the Road Traffic Act, if I am not mistaken—and, therefore, no court of law could consider those offences trifling under this legislation or the common law.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I will not confirm that. It may be that the circumstances outlined by any of the speakers might fall into the category defined, depending on the situation. That is the exact point I make. The circumstances will vary so markedly from case to case that ultimately only those people who are trained will have to make the judgment and they will go through the process.

My understanding of the example that the member for Schubert gave of the flag on the back of a vehicle is that it would involve someone travelling about 10 yards across a remote road between two properties which that person owned: if they made a genuine attempt to tie a flag on the back for identification of a long load and it fell off in the 10 yards between the properties, some would argue that the alleged offender could not, in all the circumstances, have reasonably averted committing the offence because he made a genuine attempt to tie the flag on. Some people would say that would fall under this clause.

So, we could sit here all night and talk about examples, if that is what members wish, but the response will be the same. Ultimately, as the member for Spence knows and clearly outlined in his contribution, there is a significant legal history to the word 'trifling' and what it does and does not mean, and cases that come up in the future will, no doubt, be judged against that legal history.

Mr CLARKE: I have another example I would like to give, and I wonder whether clause 4 picks it up. I know of a recent example where a person was caught speeding. The individual did not argue the toss and was given 20 weeks to pay at $20 a fortnight. He paid the total within 20 weeks but, for one fortnightly period at the very end, he was $20 behind. The individual was given a further expiation notice for $103 because he had inadvertently not paid the $20 within 14 days, even though he paid the total original fine within the 20 weeks set out in the judgment.

My assistant went to the Port Adelaide Magistrates Court and the magistrate dismissed payment of the extra $103, given all the circumstances. Fortunately, that person was a retired person so, in a sense, other than losing time, he did not lose money to go to the Port Adelaide Magistrates Court. However, there are many people, such as casuals and the like, who would have lost a couple of hours' pay if they had to present themselves to the Magistrates Court to argue the toss.

If you have already been issued an expiation notice and are technically in breach of payments, under clause 4 are you able to argue that your breach was just a trifling breach and you should not be issued a further expiation notice for late payment? Is that type of incident encapsulated in clause 4?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am not aware of any expiable offence where you get another expiable fine for slow payment.

Mr Clarke interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No. Did he get a court order with a late notice fee?

Mr CLARKE: Yes, sorry.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: That is not an expiable offence, so it is not covered under this.

Mr HILL: I have an example I would like to put to the minister as well: it was brought to my attention by one of my constituents. I will read from his letter to me, which is quite extensive. I will not go through the whole letter, but it is a great example of a trifling offence. The letter states:

> Dear Sir,
>
> I am writing regarding an expiation notice I received on the afternoon of Thursday 1 February 2001. The said notice was issued with a $60 fine for driving my car with an incorrect number plate on the front of the car. I drive a VT Berlina. The car is maintained in excellent condition and does not have shoddy bits and pieces attached or hanging off. When I purchased the car, both number plates were the normal Festival State type. However, the allowed number plate space on the car, and many other new cars, is narrow. The wider plate at the front hangs down in mid air and it caused problems. I would frequently catch clothes and cut myself while cleaning the car. The last straw was at a car park when a passer-by caught and ripped her skirt on it and became quite irate.
>
> I, therefore, had a new plate custom-made by a professional company in the same style, colour and print as the original front plate to fit exactly the allowed or allocated space on my car. It is clear, firmly attached using the regulation screw holes. It does not have any coating, etc., to prevent it being picked up by speed cameras. It does not rattle, hang, protrude or in any other way cause problems. It looked exactly the same as the back plate except that it is slightly narrower and fits the design or space allowed for a number plate properly, unlike the other one. It is also exactly the same size, width in particular, as the premium plates on my wife's Commodore which were issued by the Department of Motor Vehicles.
>
> I was totally unaware that I had committed an offence, since there is no difference between this plate and thousands of other premium plates issued every day by motor vehicle offices around the state, and it overcame problems created by the wider plate. However, under the circumstances, I would have expected a simple explanation and a warning in this situation. Instead, I was apparently observed for the one illegal plate near the corner—

and he goes on about the particular corner at Christies Beach and the time he was there. The letter continues:

> On arriving home in nearby Port Noarlunga about an hour later, at almost 4.30 p.m., I found an officer waiting for me.

So, this officer had seen the plate, which was marginally low on a particular corner, found out where the man lived, turned up at his home an hour later and pinged him with a $60 fine. It seems to me that is one of the most trivial of possible offences and one which ought to be caught by this legislation. I ask the minister to comment on it.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I agree with the member that it is unfortunate that the officer did not take the opportunity to simply warn and explain the law to the member's constituent. If those circumstances fit the three categories in the definition, and the interpretation—and they are all in the bill and I will not read them all yet again—it would be covered but, again, it would be up to the issuing officer and the authority to make that judgment.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6.

Mr HANNA: My question relates to the stipulation that an expiation notice cannot be withdrawn if any amount due under the notice has been paid. An example that came through my office recently was one of the many expiation notices issued to school kids coming through the Adelaide Railway Station who did not have their school pass that day. They might be in school uniform and have a school bag and have a season ticket because they travel to school by train

every day, but they do not have their student pass with them; it is in another pocket or another bag and so they are issued with a $160 fine—some huge amount. I have heard examples where my office or the individual concerned has written to the appropriate authority to have the decision to issue the notice reviewed but in the meantime, because it takes weeks to get a response, the person has paid the expiation notice, because if you do not pay on time extra fees are involved, as the minister has already alluded to. So, can this provision not be circumvented in the practice of bureaucracy simply by delaying a decision as an issuing conducting the review by waiting until after the final date on the expiation notice? That really forces the person into a corner. It is a kind of double or nothing; you pay up because you do not know what the answer will be or, if you do not pay and the issuing authority says it will not withdraw it, you are up for extra costs because of late fees on the expiation notice. That will circumvent the purpose of the legislation, will it not?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I am not sure whether I understand the honourable member's question. I think he was asking whether, the issuing authority having issued an expiation notice giving a person 28 days or 30 days to pay, or whatever it is, if a person writes in with a dispute the time limit on payment should not be enforced until the dispute has been resolved. My experience with the issuing authorities that I have dealt with over my eight years in the field has been that when written about a dispute I have always sought that the matter not be progressed until a decision is made on my constituent's objection. To my knowledge that has always been agreed to by the issuing authority. I have always written in saying that Fred or Mary has a dispute with this, here are the circumstances and please have it reviewed. They have always given me a decision prior to forcing payment. On occasions they have extended the time while they have looked at the circumstances and the evidence.

To my knowledge, there is nothing stopping the issuing authorities already doing that. I do not see where it fits into clause 6. To my knowledge, nothing stops the issuing authorities undertaking that practice. My advice to the member is that, in my experience, if you clearly ask for that in your letter, the issuing authorities are cooperative to that point.

Mr HANNA: In respect of road traffic act matters, for example, is the minister saying that that is a matter of law or just the practice of the bureaucracy to extend the time for payment on expiation notices beyond the maximum period specified in the notice?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: With due respect, we are not talking about the Road Traffic Act here: we are talking about clause 6.

Mr HANNA: The minister's responses are encouraging me to go into the detail of every word of this bill. Maybe the minister has something to hide, his answers are so curt and derisory. My question was as a result of the minister's response to my first question on this clause, where the minister suggests that an individual given an expiation notice can write to an issuing authority for a review and at the same time ask for an extension of time in which to pay the amount specified in the notice, beyond the maximum period specified in the expiation notice. I am suggesting to the minister that there is actually no lawful authority for issuing authorities to do that. Is the minister telling me otherwise?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The advice to me is that there is lawful authority for them to do that, but I will seek clarification for the member and give him a more detailed response. The advice to me is that there is lawful authority.

Clause passed.

Clause 7.

Mr CLARKE: There is no review of a decision with respect to an offence, whether it be trifling or not. I am concerned about the situation where a person makes application saying that they believe the alleged offence for which they have been issued an expiation notice is trifling and it goes to the appropriate authority, they disagree and that is it but, nonetheless, the person concerned rather than pay the expiation fee decides to let the matter go to court and argue the matter there.

If they are successful, the magistrate dismisses the expiation notice. It might be on the grounds that the magistrate believes that it is trifling. I take it that no costs are allowed to the person who has been put through this inconvenience. This person, who might have had to give up a day's pay, half a day's pay or even a couple of hours' pay, has been put through perhaps unnecessary expense and time to fight the issue in the Magistrates Court simply because the person to whom they first applied could have, in an arbitrary manner—they might have had a bad day or an argument with someone that morning or whatever else and did not feel like waiving the matter—decided that they did not believe that the issue was trifling. But their decision cannot be looked into. Am I correct in my scenario and, if so, did the government give any consideration to allowing reasonable costs for such a person whose case goes through to the Magistrates Court and the matter is determined in his or her favour?

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: That scenario is correct, and the situation with costs is that it follows the normal process. The person who argues the case could be awarded costs, as is the normal procedure now.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SOFTWARE CENTRE INQUIRY (POWERS AND IMMUNITIES) BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the annexed schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Page 4, line 20 (clause 6)—After 'protection' insert ',privileges'.

No. 2. Page 4, line 26 (clause 6)—After 'protection' insert ',privileges'.

Mr ATKINSON: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the House.

A quorum having been formed:

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.W. OLSEN: I move:

That the Clerk be empowered, when the House is not sitting, to deliver a message to the Legislative Council.

Motion carried.

COMMUNITY TITLES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the House of Assembly's amendments.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.27 p.m. the House adjourned until Tuesday 1 May at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 3 April 2001

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

POLICE RECRUITMENTS

12. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** For each year since 1993-94:
(a) How many Police Officers were recruited and how many left the service; and
(b) How many officers were recruited from the Police Academy?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I have been advised by the Commissioner of Police of the following information:

The table below depicts the number of police officers who have commenced, graduated and separated from SAPOL since 1 July 1993. These figures include community constables (previously known as police aides).

	Commenced	Graduated	Separated
1993-94	118	102	88
1994-95	62	110	113
1995-96	26	42	152
1996-97	81	56	120
1997-98	201	187	115
1998-99	101	87	119
1999-2000	261	197	159
2000-01	257	242	150

The figures provided for persons commencing and graduating in 2000-01 are based upon the number of persons who have commenced or graduated to date combined with future planned intakes and graduations. The figure provided for the number of persons separated in 2000-01 is based upon separations to date combined with a projected average for the remainder of the financial year.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

14. **Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** For each year since 1993-94, how many births occurred at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, how many elective surgery procedures occurred and how many emergency patients were treated?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The number of births per annum at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital has decreased from 1526 in 1994-95 to 1297 in 1999-2000. The total number of births per annum in South Australia has also declined during this period.

Year	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
Births	1 526	1 394	1 304	1 215	1 305	1 297

Elective surgery admissions at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital have increased from 7314 in 1994-95 to 7768 in 1999-2000. The numbers of same day procedures have increased from 2873 to 4160 during this period.

Year	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
Elective Surgery Admissions *	7 314	7 615	7 620	8 076	7 030	7 768
Elective Surgery Same Day Procedures **	2 873	3 381	3 768	3 883	3 878	4 160

The number of Emergency Service Patients treated at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Emergency Department has decreased from 36 819 in 1997-98 to 34 840 in 1999-2000.

Emergency Department	1994-95	1995-96	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
Patients Treated	n/a	n/a	n/a	36 819	36 827	34 840
Total Attendances*	38 498	37 051	36 053	38 155	38 044	36 309

Source: The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Information Technology Department. N/a = not available
*Includes patients who did not wait for treatment.
Attendances at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital Emergency Department have decreased from 38 498 in 1994-95 to 36 309 in 1999-2000.

SA WATER

44. **Mr HILL:** Does the SA Water—Mains Capital Contribution Fund still exist and if so, how are the funds distributed and what is the cost per allotment?

The Hon. M.H. ARMITAGE: No. A specific fund for mains capital contributions does not exist in SA Water. The cost of extensions of water and sewer main are met from the capital works funds that are allocated each financial year following the receipt of applications from property owners.

ALDINGA POLICE STATION

55. **Mr HILL:** How many permanent and casual staff are currently attached to the Aldinga Police Station and what additional staff would be required to operate 24 hours a day?

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I have been advised by the Commissioner of Police of the following information:

There are a total of six permanent staff members consisting of one senior constable, four constables and one public servant. Following the Premier's Task Force, Aldinga Police Station has been allocated two additional police officers and the current senior constable position will be up-graded to sergeant rank, making a total of one sergeant, six constables and one public servant.

The south coast local service area provides a 24 hour coverage which encompasses the Aldinga district.

SOUTH COAST LOCAL SERVICE AREA

56. **Ms THOMPSON:** What is the current level and designation of staff in the south coast local service area, how many unfilled positions were there at 30 June 2000 and what was the daily average number of unfilled positions during 1999-2000.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: I have been advised by the Commissioner of Police of the following information:

The current designation of staff in the south coast local service area is as follows:

Section/Unit/Branch	Designation
LSA Commander	1
Intelligence	5
Criminal Justice Unit	11
Operations-Christies Beach	115
Operations-Country	
Goolwa	2
Kangaroo Island	3
McLaren Vale	1
Yankalilla	2
Victor Harbor	12
Investigations	
Crime Management Unit	5
Crime Scene Examiners	3
Child & Family Investigations Unit	4
Investigations	24

Response	23
Victor Harbor	2
Total	213

Due to the backfilling of some operational positions with probationary constables, at June 30 2000 the LSA was effectively operating with less than 1 per cent of its positions unfilled.

Regarding the daily average number of unfilled positions during 1999-2000, this information is not available as there is no provision within the HRM System to indicate this figure.

RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

58. **Ms THOMPSON:** What action has been taken since 1997 in the provision and support of indoor and outdoor recreation facilities in the area previously covered by the former City of Noarlunga.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I have been advised as follows:

In 1997 the cities of Noarlunga, Willunga and Happy Valley amalgamated to form what has become the City of Onkaparinga.

Since 1997 a total of $226 345 has been provided to the area.

At the club level $166 345 has been provided to recreation and sport clubs under the Active Club Program.

The Office for Recreation & Sport has also worked in partnership and provided funding to the City of Onkaparinga to develop a regional recreation, sport and open space strategy which provides the framework for the future development of facilities in the city.

$50 000 from the regional facility grants program has been provided to develop the Seaford Youth Park which incorporates a range of skateboard and BMX facilities.

One of the outcomes for the Office for Recreation & Sport is to facilitate the provision of high quality and well managed sport and recreation facilities at all levels. One of the mechanisms to achieve this is the development of regional recreation and sport strategies. $10 000 was provided to the City of Onkaparinga to assist in the development of such a strategy for this area.

HENSLEY INDUSTRIES

72. **Mr ATKINSON:** Have any of the Environment Protection Agency's site visits to the Hensley Industries foundry at Torrensville or visits to other adjacent sites for the purpose of testing the foundry's emission or noise been without the foundry's notice and if so, what were the dates, times and purpose of these visits.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I have been advised as follows:

The Environment Protection Agency (EPA) has undertaken inspections of the Hensley Industries site; these have only been undertaken with notification or advice to the foundry.

In normal circumstances, inspections and visits to any premises are carried out with advance notice given to the company concerned. This is to ensure the availability of a company representative with the authority to carry out any actions requested by the inspecting officer, and for occupational health and safety reasons. However, it should be noted that in certain circumstances, authorised EPA officers can and do conduct site visits at any time without prior notice.

In relation to residential areas adjacent to Hensley Industries, over many years, officers of the EPA, and of responsible agencies prior to the formation of the EPA, have carried out frequent assessments of noise and odour in these areas without the company's knowledge. Due to the large number of visits and the fact that many EPA officers have carried out these inspections, it is not practicable to give details of each one.

The company is aware that high volume air quality monitoring equipment has been installed by the EPA on a residential site to ascertain base-line air quality data on air-borne particles. Additional air quality monitoring equipment will also be located adjacent to the residential area shortly.