

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 5 June 2002

The **SPEAKER (Hon. I.P. Lewis)** took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

MURRAY RIVER FISHERY

In reply to **Hon. R.G. KERIN** (13 and 14 May).

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: In response to the questions asked by the Hon. R.G. Kerin on 13 and 14 May, 2002, the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries has provided the following information:

In a ministerial statement on 27 May 2002 the Hon. Paul Holloway, Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries advised that he had been awaiting approval from cabinet before embarking on a consultation process with the affected river fishers on the removal of gill nets and future structural arrangements for that fishery.

Following cabinet direction on this matter he has now written to each of the 30 affected river fishers advising them on cabinet's decision and inviting them to attend a meeting in Loxton on 7 June, 2002. In respect to the Leader of the Opposition's question as to whether or not the government has had formal discussions with the South Australian River Fishery Association, it would not be appropriate for the minister to meet with that association or any other organisation without first consulting directly with the affected river fishers.

The meeting will explain the government's policy decision relating to the structural adjustment process and it will allow consultation with licence holders on the implementation of the adjustment arrangements. The minister intends to chair the meeting personally, and senior officers from PIRSA Fisheries will also be present after the meeting to follow up on issues raised by individual fishers.

I am advised the minister has offered to fully brief the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow minister following the 7 June 2002 meeting.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE** (27 May).

The **Hon. M.J. WRIGHT**: Business SA's transport manifesto does not include the objective of removing the curfew on Adelaide Airport and, if it did, I would not support it. The manifesto states that 'Adelaide Airport curfew arrangements should be reviewed to maximise access for freight movements and passenger services.' I agree with that objective to the extent that it is consistent with the continued protection of the amenity of surrounding residents.

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Health (Hon. L. Stevens)—

Interim response to the Social Development Committee Report—Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder.

WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY

The **Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: Today, we are celebrating World Environment Day. It was 30 years ago today that the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed the first World Environment Day to recognise the significance of the environment to all people and all countries of the world.

It gives me great pleasure that, even in its first few months, my government has already taken significant action to protect one of our greatest assets—our environment. We have taken decisive action to protect the Murray River. In Corowa, we recently worked with other states to negotiate the best deal possible to increase water flows in the river. We

followed that with a further agreement with Victoria to return even more water to the Murray River. We have introduced in this place legislation aimed at ensuring that South Australia does not become Australia's radioactive waste dump.

Today, I would like to announce two new initiatives that will significantly improve our environment. First, this government has signed an agreement to purchase 6.4 per cent of its total annual electricity to be sourced from renewable energy sources. The power will come from the Starfish Hill wind farm located at Cape Jervis. This arrangement will reduce the government's greenhouse gas emissions by over 35 000 tonnes per annum. This is an enormous environmental saving for our community and one that demonstrates this government's genuine commitment to environmental management. This landmark deal will decrease our reliance on non-sustainable energy and, importantly, help increase market demand for renewable energy sources. I commend Starfish Hill wind farm and AGL for working together to achieve this positive outcome for us all.

Today's second major initiative is my government's restructure of the EPA. It has long been clear that the Environment Protection Authority has not been meeting the expectations of the community. It has been viewed by some as a toothless tiger, with a lack of will to enforce environmental compliance and to prosecute offenders. This is going to change. A fundamental part of our environment policy is based on strengthening the powers of the EPA to investigate and prosecute environmental offenders. The Environment Protection Authority will be recast as a truly independent authority.

It will be separate from the Department of Environment and Heritage, responsible through its own board to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. The new authority will commence administrative operations on 1 July 2002. The board membership will be strengthened. A broader range of skills will be represented, including broader experience in management, industry and the public sector. The new authority will focus on the core activities of pollution reduction and management. Some of its key functions will include:

- licensing and compliance
- monitoring and evaluation
- investigation
- supporting pollution avoidance activities
- interjurisdictional collaboration and cooperation

The new authority will also play a lead in monitoring the control and storage of the small amounts of radioactive waste produced in South Australia, for instance by our hospitals. The authority will conduct an audit of waste currently stored in our state. It will make recommendations for the best ways to manage the waste into the future. We will be introducing legislation into this place to increase penalties for intentionally or recklessly causing serious environmental harm.

To demonstrate just how seriously the government takes environmental issues, we will double the maximum fines for companies from \$1 million to \$2 million. We also intend to introduce:

- an extended range of offences and penalties for polluting
- new civil penalties
- the use of community service orders for environmental projects
- new penalties for what is called 'illegally obtaining a competitive advantage'. This involves increasing the penalties for those who deliberately break the law,

knowing that the financial return they get far outweighs the penalty they pay for damaging the environment.

We are serious about protecting our air and waterways and we want everyone to know it. As a direct complement to the regulatory strength of the new Environment Protection Authority we are also creating the Office of Sustainability. It will commence administrative operations on 1 July 2002.

The Office of Sustainability will be the centre for environmentally innovative thinking for the whole of the government. It will be responsible for developing future planning directions for South Australia and then identifying practical measures for responding to them. The office will supply information and raise public awareness about sustainability and eco-efficiency issues from all government agencies. It will evaluate proposals from across government to ensure new initiatives are integrated and environmentally responsible.

The Office of Sustainability will support new development with the formation of the Green Business Unit. This unit will become a resource for people and businesses with creative, green ways to do business. These exciting innovations will make a real difference, not only to the way we live and the way we do business now but for future generations. They demonstrate that my government is committed to ensuring that we all live in a safe and clean environment and to ensuring that there is environmental security for those future generations.

GAS SUPPLY

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.
Leave granted.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yesterday at 5 p.m. I issued temporary gas rationing notices under section 37 of the Gas Act 1997. These notices had the effect of restricting gas supply to Origin Energy, which retails gas to a gas fuelled power station, industrial commercial and domestic customers in South Australia; Terra Gas Trader, which sells gas to gas fuelled power stations in South Australia; and AGL, which sells gas to a gas fuelled power station in South Australia. The need to issue the notices was a result of a problem with a boiler in the Moomba gas processing plant, which restricted gas production at the plant. The problem occurred at 12.30 p.m. on 3 June, and was rectified by 8 p.m. Normal production at Moomba was restored at 11 a.m. on 4 June.

Other factors which contributed to the need to issue notices were the lower than normal state of line pack in the Moomba to Adelaide pipeline (line pack is the stored gas in the actual pipeline itself) and low pressures at the Adelaide end of the pipeline. Northern Power Station was also generating at half of its normal 260 megawatt capacity. South Australia is highly dependent on gas for power generation, with about 50 to 60 per cent of normal power generation being fuelled by gas, and with the rest of the power coming from coal-fired stations, such as Northern Power Station, and the interconnector between South Australia and Victoria, with a maximum import of 500 megawatts.

The notices had the effect of reducing gas supplies to several large industrial customers, including Adelaide Brighton Cement, OneSteel in Whyalla and Mobil Refinery at Port Stanvac, and to the South Australia gas fuelled power stations operated by TXU, Australian National Power, Origin Energy and NRG Flinders. The management of gas emergencies under the Gas Act is coordinated by an 'industry group'

led by the Technical Regulator responsible for the administration of the Gas Act and involving all parties involved in gas supply in South Australia, including Epic Energy, the owner and operator of the pipeline; Santos, which operates the Moomba gas plant; the gas retailers (Terra Gas trader, Origin Energy and AGL); Australian National Power, which owns and operates the Pelican Point Power Station; and the Electricity Supply Industry Planning Council, which provides the 'responsible officer' who is responsible for liaising with NEMMCO, the operators of the National Electricity Market, as well as monitoring the security of electricity supply in South Australia.

I acted on the advice of this expert group, who are responsible for the day-to-day operations and oversight of the South Australian gas supply and utilisation industry, and its impact on the energy (gas and electricity) market in South Australia. The group also considers the gas supply to New South Wales (the Moomba-Sydney pipeline) and the electricity supply situation (the Victoria to South Australia interconnector) as part of its considerations. It was this group which reached a consensus position about the need for temporary gas rationing, after carefully monitoring and analysing the situation.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Can you repeat this?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No, I can't, Mr Premier. I come to the crux of the matter. This morning, acting on further advice from the industry group, I issued new notices under the Gas Act which had the effect of partially lifting the gas restrictions imposed yesterday by about 20 per cent, lifting the deliverable gas to around 90 per cent of the maximum. This will allow the major industrial customers who were restricted yesterday to use gas at rates closer to their normal usage.

I am also advised that Northern Power Station is now returning to full generation capacity. I am advised, too, that the industry group will continue to monitor the situation very closely over the next few days and into the long weekend, and will advise me of any further developments. These unfortunate developments emphasise the need for an alternative gas supply for South Australia. The recent announcement by the Premier of the new gas pipeline from Victoria to South Australia to be built by SEA Gas is very timely indeed, and I will keep the house informed of any new developments.

FOOD REGULATIONS

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I seek leave to make a shorter ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I am pleased to be able to inform the house that I am releasing for public consultation new regulations under the Food Act to improve food safety in South Australia. In the next few days they will be sent to local government and more than 200 industry groups and individuals, with comments being sought by 31 July 2002. Members will recall the tragic Garibaldi food poisoning outbreak in January 1995 and other more recent instances of food poisoning that might have been avoided.

South Australia has a growing international reputation for its fresh and clean food, and we must keep it that way. The new regulations aim to ensure that food for sale is both safe and suitable for human consumption, and it is planned that they will come into effect at the end of this year. Penalties under the act have been substantially increased, and the act also sets the framework for the administration and enforce-

ment of inspection, sampling and analysis and the powers to issue orders.

Food businesses will be required to notify their local council of their operations, and all food handlers and supervisors will need to have the knowledge and skills needed to handle and store food safely. The new legislation moves away from a reactive and regulatory approach to food safety to one focusing on prevention, while at the same time increasing penalties for offences. Further information and a copy of the Food Act 2001 is available via the internet at www.dhs.sa.gov.au/pehs.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I bring up the fifth report of the committee.

Report received and read.

Mr HANNA: I bring up the sixth report of the committee. Report received.

QUESTION TIME

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): I direct my question to the Attorney-General. Why did the government not inform the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission of the government's desire to seek a deferral of its proceedings to await the yet to be convened Constitutional Convention? Section 82(3) of the Constitution Act provides that the commission shall proceed with all due diligence. At its hearing of 6 May—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order. I seek your guidance, sir. The Leader of the Opposition is asking a question about a subject that is on the *Notice Paper* to be debated today. I wonder whether the question is in order.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. It does pre-empt debate on an item on the *Notice Paper* today.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order. The motion has not been introduced: it is simply a notice of motion at this stage and, until the matter is laid before the house and the motion introduced, it is not on the *Notice Paper*.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Learn your standing orders. It is not on the *Notice Paper*.

The SPEAKER: Order! Whilst I appreciate the entertainment provided by those people who regard themselves as more expert in these matters than I am, I nonetheless draw members' attention to the fact that it is on the *Notice Paper* and notice has been given of it. Accordingly, the point of order taken by the deputy leader is not valid. I do not uphold that point of order, but I would like to talk to the leader, perhaps, to find a way by which it might be possible for him to put the inquiry he wishes to the Attorney-General in some acceptable manner. I will therefore call the deputy leader.

MINISTERIAL DOCUMENTS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I think that my question may be on a similar subject. I believe that, according to the standing orders of this

house, until the measure is actually introduced the matter is not formally on the *Notice Paper*.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I will not take up that issue, sir. I will therefore ask my question of the Attorney-General on another matter. Why did not the attorney, under the ministerial code of conduct, immediately seek to correct the record when the house was incorrectly informed yesterday that the Attorney-General had not met with the Speaker regarding the use of cabinet dockets in the house?

The SPEAKER: He had not.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: The Labor government has committed itself to honesty and transparency in government. Its own code of conduct explicitly requires all MPs to ensure 'that any inadvertent error or misconception is corrected or clarified as soon as possible'. When this matter was raised at the beginning of question time yesterday, the Attorney-General made no attempt, in subsequent answers to questions given in this house, to correct what was clearly an incorrect fact laid before this house by the Speaker.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I did not mislead the house. I gave the house no incorrect information whatsoever. It was a matter for the Speaker; he returned to the house promptly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader well knows, as I pointed out to the house, that I had not discussed the question of cabinet documents with any member, as I stated. I had asked the attorney for Crown Law opinion on the State Records Act and, as I said yesterday, I guess it does not take a genius to work out why I made that inquiry. The member for West Torrens.

MINISTERS, INDEMNIFICATION

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Will the Attorney-General explain how much the government has spent on indemnifying former ministers for legal fees for defamation actions?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): When a minister is sued for a defamation that may have been made in the course of his or her ministerial duties, they can seek to have the costs met by the government. Under the relevant cabinet guidelines, the Attorney-General may grant the minister an indemnity against the cost of engaging private lawyers for whatever damages are awarded against the minister or for whatever settlement is reached. In February 1996, the former government decided that claims against ministers for defamation should be met from the South Australian Insurance and Risk Management Fund, which is administered through the South Australian Government Captive Insurance Corporation under the auspices of the Department of Treasury and Finance.

I am advised that, over the past five years, South Australians have had to spend more than \$172 000 on legal fees and settlement sums for Liberal Party ministers. Indemnities are still outstanding which will raise this tally further—that is \$172 000 of public money spent on the defamation costs of Liberal Party ministers. This sum is made up of legal fees and settlement sums to former ministers: the Hon. Dean Brown; Mr Graham Ingerson (who can forget him); and two separate sums for the Hon. R.I. Lucas. The Hon. R.I. Lucas's indemnity is still current and we anticipate that more costs will be incurred.

The recent defamation action against a former minister, the Hon. Wayne Matthew, cost at least \$43 944.60 in legal fees. That is before damages or a possible appeal come into consideration. Now we are informed that, in addition to that, a damages award for \$65 000 has been made against the Hon. Wayne Matthew, for which South Australians will have to foot the bill. My government is currently considering its position with respect to the indemnity granted to the member for Bright, which may have been granted inappropriately. We are not confident that all the other previous indemnities were properly granted, but our advice is that it would be nigh on impossible to get the money paid back now, even if the government tried.

Over and above the \$172 000 that I have noted, large sums were paid for legal fees for former premier Olsen, which were not even recorded through Treasury. I have asked the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to advise me as a matter of urgency on the amounts spent by former Liberal premier John Olsen and where that money came from.

One of the most disturbing aspects to come to light since Labor came to office has been the realisation that those who previously occupied these benches abused the trust that the people of South Australia had placed in them. Liberal ministers think that cabinet documents belong to them and that taxpayer funds can be used by them however they wish. We do not agree with that view. We are not a vindictive government but, where abuses of power have occurred, we will expose them and pursue them to the full extent of the law.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition.

MURRAY RIVER FISHERY

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Premier inform the house whether the government will fulfil the commitments made to compensating the River Murray fishermen for lifetime earnings? The opposition has been contacted on several occasions by river fishermen and their families who are uncertain that the commitments for compensation will be upheld. The South Australian Fishing Industry Council has valued the package at up to \$60 million, yet the government has publicly stated that the costs will be only a couple of hundred thousand dollars. The opposition is now aware that cabinet is considering a figure of \$4.5 million, far short of fisher expectations yet many times the previous cost estimates of the government.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): There is an element of *deja vu* in question time, because I have announced repeatedly what we intend to do on this matter. Let me make it perfectly clear, and perhaps I will speak just a little more slowly. Let me remind the Leader of the Opposition that the simple truth of the matter is that the minister will be meeting with fishers on Friday, as I understand it, and, as I pointed out previously to the Leader of the Opposition, he will be getting a briefing on the matter from the minister—as I have told this house on a number of occasions.

GOVERNMENT RADIO NETWORK

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Will the Minister for Emergency Services outline to the house some of the cost

pressures being experienced in the emergency services budget in relation to the Government Radio Network?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Emergency Services): I can indicate to the house that, despite having allocated \$247 million of public funds to the Government Radio Network and despite the fact that this was a very significant blow-out in the original estimate for the GRN, upon becoming Minister for Emergency Services I was very disturbed when a briefing to me from the various departments indicated that, in addition to the GRN, there were unavoidable communication costs relating to the introduction of the Government Radio Network that had to be met over the next four years of \$25.35 million across the agencies, the bulk of these in emergency services, some \$21 million or \$22 million. Mr Speaker, you could imagine how distressed and disappointed I was to find out that, after committing what I had always said in this place was far too much money to a whole-of-government radio network, that was not the end of the story.

The effect of this—in addition to the matters I described to this house before in regard to the emergency services budgets, in particular the Country Fire Service budget—is to place enormous strain on the emergency services budget over the next four years. Despite these great pressures and difficulties, in response to that, as announced by the Treasurer last week (and it was discussed in a parliamentary committee this morning) the government has not sought to increase the emergency services levy, which is good news for the people of South Australia. We are not making them pay through the levy for the failings of the previous government, but instead—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They moan about it. I have a great deal of difficulty understanding how anyone on that side of the house can with a straight face tell me that that is not a failing of the previous government. When you walk in the door and they tell you, 'Oh, look, it's not 247, there's a little bit more, there's another \$25 million we want you to pay for; the budget is not exactly what we told you in emergency services,' if someone in their right mind can describe that as not being a failing of the previous government, I would like to see what this mob think a failure is. However, even though we are protecting people paying levies, it means a further hit on our state budget of roughly \$11.5 million a year over the next four years, each year. That is a big hit on the budget. We have elected to take it and tighten our belts where we can; but we will be addressing the issue of the management of the emergency services, and we will be trying to make sure these sorts of issues do not emerge in the future, because it is simply bad management.

MINISTERIAL DOCUMENTS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Will the Attorney-General inform the house what section of the State Records Act prohibits the use of allegedly official documents? Yesterday, the Attorney-General said:

The use of official documents in this chamber yesterday is a *prima facie* breach of the State Records Act.

He produced Crown Law advice to the effect that official records could not be removed, and he referred to section 17 of the State Records Act. Neither that section nor any part of the Crown Law advice refers to the use of documents, whether in this house or elsewhere. So where is the *prima facie* case?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the Attorney-General, I am contemplating the position in which this places me in connection with the assurance that I have given the house that I am deliberating on those matters and will bring a statement back to the house. Clearly, that was not understood by the member for Heysen or she would not have asked her question. I am reminded of the fact that it is quite out of order to ask for a legal opinion in the chamber. Parliament itself is a court, and the question is directly related to discovering, or it seeks a legal opinion. The question, therefore, is out of order. I invite the member for Heysen, if she wishes to pursue the matter, to come and see if it can be placed in order. The member for Flinders.

WIND FARMS

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Given the government's announcement today that it will purchase electricity from Starfish Hill wind farm and recent statements of support for Sellicks Hill wind farm, will the Minister for Energy assure the house that similar levels of government support will be made available to other wind farm projects in South Australia? The Labor government has emphasised its commitment to open and accountable government. However, in a recent letter to residents, the Treasurer advised that the government would be supporting the Sellicks Hill wind farm project but gave no details of the level of its contribution to Trust Power nor, indeed, of the support that it will give to other developers such as those in my electorate of Flinders where 1 000 megawatts of wind power is proposed.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy): I am perfectly happy to answer this question, and I recognise that the member for Flinders is a great advocate for this industry in her area. However, let me make this clear: in order for wind farms to proceed, they must be connected to the electricity grid—the transmission network. It is not open to the government to make the decision to extend the transmission network to Port Lincoln or Eyre Peninsula. One of the primary reasons why it is not open to us to do that is that they sold it—the opposition, when in government, privatised our electricity assets. So it is open to this government—

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Buy it back, then.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Buy it back, I am told.

An honourable member: Homer's back.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Homer's back: Homer Greenspan is back in. This government is a great supporter of wind power in this state—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I have to tell you that he has finally got something right: we are not going to be buying it back. If that is news to the member for Waite, he has possibly been living in a very remote part of South Australia.

An honourable member: Mitcham!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Mitcham, yes. This government is a great supporter of wind power, and, having discussed this matter with the member for Flinders, I appreciate that her interest is genuine. However, the simple fact is that there is a very expensive cost involved in extending the transmission network. One of the things about wind farms is that you have to over-build the infrastructure because they do not generate at full capacity all the time—usually at only 30 per cent to 40 per cent of the time. I will not go into the technical details because I will probably lose myself. But,

the bottom line is that someone has to pay a very large amount of money to do that.

ElectraNet operates a transmission network and proposes to build it if we pay for it, ultimately through our fees. I understand that ElectraNet has included a proposal in a very big capital program in an application for a reset. But, understand this, too: their entire capital program, were it to be built, would rely on their getting a massive increase in transmission charges. Transmission charges are passed onto consumers.

I point to what the previous government has done to electricity consumers in this state already. The last tranche of contestability for commercial customers gave consumers an absolute hiding, so I am reluctant to do anything which leads to large increases in electricity prices. So, while I support wind farms and we on this side support wind farms (and we support a commercially viable extension of the transmission network), understand this: we do not own it, we cannot build in it and, if it is built by ElectraNet, they will do it for profit, and the profit will come from electricity consumers. That is the simple position.

I take the matter seriously, as the member for Flinders knows. I will travel to Port Lincoln very soon to discuss this, and some other matters, with local people. I certainly support wind farm projects that do not have an enormous impact in terms of the cost of electricity.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We have been talking at Lake Bonney, too. This government will do everything it can to get workable projects up. We have spoken to those people; there has been a commitment today to purchase renewable electricity, and that is a matter involving ongoing consideration. I do not believe that any previous government has done more. We have the only premier in Australia with a solar powered house. No government has done more with respect to renewable energy than this government. We cannot make bricks without straw. While we take the issue very seriously, I caution that in these matters there are many issues beyond the control of the government and that we have to face up to those issues.

ELECTRICITY, RENEWABLE ENERGY

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Premier advise when the government called for tenders for the provision of 6.4 per cent of its electricity requirements from renewable energy, and will he also indicate when the call for tenders closed and how many companies submitted such tenders?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I think that the member for Bright is labouring under a small misapprehension. As I understand it, the announcement today was not in regard to electricity to be purchased in the future with the next round of contestability. It applies to an existing contract with AGL—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Which the government has greened up.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —which we have greened up, as the Premier says. We have converted a proportion of that contract to green electricity at a small premium. If the member has difficulties with that, I am happy to hear them. This government believes that it is a step in the right direction and leaves us open to deal with new electricity purchases into the future.

ARTS BUDGET

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): Can the Treasurer provide to the house details of the transfer of money from the Department of Transport to the arts by the former Liberal government?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I thank the honourable member for her question, because she and the Treasurer share a common passion in the arts. The arts budget was one that I was very keen to look at when I became Treasurer—

The Hon. M.D. Rann interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As the Premier has just reminded me, as from this Friday I will be acting minister for the arts for approximately two weeks. As the acting minister for the arts, I will be a passionate advocate for all things arty for the next two weeks. In going through the bilateral process of the budget—talking through the budget—a lot of information is provided to the Treasurer. When it came to the Department of Transport and the arts, I am advised that some very interesting transactions occurred under the former government and the former minister, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. I was advised, on a number of occasions, of some of these transactions and I would like to share this information with the house because I think it is of interest.

It would appear that the former minister for the arts would have funding shortfalls in the arts department that she met by transferring money from the transport portfolio. Money that I assume was there for roads, road safety, the public transport system or a number of transport functions found its way into the arts budget. I am advised that during the 2001-02 budget year at least 10 transactions occurred ranging from \$18 000 up to \$2 million. I thought I would share that information with the house today.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Premier will have to be patient, because I am going to walk from the smallest to the largest. I am advised that \$18 000 was transferred from the Department of Transport's budget to the arts department to pay for a contemporary music officer for Arts SA to attend a contemporary music festival. The sum of \$45 000 was transferred to the SA Museum for e-glazing of the Natural Science Building. I understand that the former government transferred \$60 000 to upgrade the sound system at the Festival Centre for the screening of films as part of the 2002 Adelaide Festival.

A further \$100 000 was used to complete the funding for the State Library's facade and associated works. So, another \$100 000 was taken potentially from our roads budget to finish off the library. Members opposite, particularly rural members, might wonder why there is a shortage of money at times for some road programs, particularly under the former government. We find that \$100 000 was used to complete funding for the Cabaret Festival, which was supplemented by the former minister by at least \$100 000. The total funding for that festival was \$500 000, with at least \$100 000 of that coming from Transport SA.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Speaker, I have more. This is a very important one: \$110 000 was taken by the minister for the arts from the transport portfolio to purchase the Tiffany windows from Prince Alfred College. I am told that the windows are both exquisite and very important, but they were paid for from the Department of Transport's budget. I am advised this is the case, sir. If I can be corrected, I am

happy for others to correct me on this, but this is the advice I have received.

The Adelaide Festival Centre Trust received \$500 000 as working capital; that is, when there was a working capital shortfall at the Festival Centre Trust, I am told that \$500 000 was transferred from the arts department. Also, \$1 million was provided to the Festival Centre Trust for more working capital. This next item is probably getting near the biggest: I am told that \$1.744 million in additional funding for the Adelaide Festival of Arts for the year 2002—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, it came out of the transport portfolio somewhere. To conclude, \$2 million dollars for the upgrade of the Natural Science Centre at the museum, I am advised, was also provided from the transport portfolio. I am told that there is potentially more sir, but that is what we could find for the moment. I have been sent a note to the effect that the Tiffany windows may have come from Pulteney, not from Prince Alfred College: I am happy to get that clarified.

The reality is that the arts budget was overwhelmingly subsidised from time to time from what normally would have been expenditure for roads, transport services or whatever else may have been a priority of the transport portfolio. This is a very good illustration of the financial mismanagement of the former government, and they wonder why we have such a significant budget deficit in the state when they ran their budgets in this manner.

PRINCES HIGHWAY

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Can the Minister for Transport inform the house when the passing lanes on the Princes Highway, adjacent to the Coorong, provided for in last year's budget, will be constructed? Late last year the previous minister informed me that there were some hold-ups due to native vegetation issues.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): I thank the member for MacKillop for his question. I will have to get the detail of the answer for him but, if Transport SA has not been able to proceed with the overtaking lanes, quite obviously the money has gone into the arts area!

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Good dixer!

The SPEAKER: Order!

BIOLOGICAL SURVEYS

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): Can the Minister for Environment and Conservation advise the house of the progress of the biological survey of South Australia? A survey of the state's biodiversity began in 1984. The information collected is used to assist biodiversity planning and conservation management in South Australia.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the member for Norwood for the question. I know she has a very strong interest in environmental issues. On this World Environment Day, I am very pleased to give the house an update on the biological surveys that are being undertaken in South Australia. Surveys were initiated in 1984 by the then Labor government: I think Don Hopgood was the minister in charge. The survey is a statewide audit of plants and animals across South Australia and to date it has collected data from 15 000 vegetation sites and 4 000 vertebrate sites spread across the state. I must say that I congratulate the former government and other govern-

ments over the years for maintaining this program. This is a 30 year program which has been kept up to date by both sides of the house. The survey to date has produced the most complete database of its kind. No other state or territory has such a valuable resource. The information collected is used to inform biodiversity planning and conservation management in South Australia.

Over a period of some 15 years since the survey was started there has been a 20 per cent increase in the number of vertebrate species known to come from South Australia. The survey plays an important role in the management of our existing protected areas, and the state government is seeking commonwealth government funding for the surveys of the Murray River flood plain, the Mid North and Yorke Peninsula. Surveys that are currently under way and near completion cover West Avenue Range in the South-East, the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands, the southern Mount Lofty Ranges and the Simpson, Tirari and Pedirka Deserts. Surveys in progress include Eyre Peninsula and the Great Victoria Desert.

The Department of Environment and Heritage maintains biodiversity information and digital vegetation maps produced from all these surveys. These databases and maps are accessed by thousands of people every year, including naturalists, environmental consultants, local government, other state government departments and, of course, the commonwealth. The survey relies on the great work of volunteer biologists—and I commend them on this day—and the support of the South Australian Museum and the Plant Biodiversity Centre. The survey is a 30 year plan, which is due to be completed in the year 2015. It was established by a Labor government and I am confident it will be completed by a Labor government in 2015.

DETAINEES

Mr MEIER (Goyder): Does the Premier agree with his federal Labor leader, Simon Crean, and the Queensland Premier, Peter Beattie—

Members interjecting:

Mr MEIER: —just listen to the question—that illegal immigrant detainees at Woomera should not be released into the general community before their situation has been assessed? Over the weekend both the federal Labor leader, Simon Crean, and the Queensland Labor Premier, Peter Beattie, were apparently at odds with the Queensland branch of the Labor Party, which voted for a policy of releasing detainees into the community before their situation had been assessed.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am delighted to answer that question. I am not aware of what was said at the conference, and I do not have responsibility for Queensland. We have not moved in that direction yet; we do not have a state based militia ready for an invasion. I can say that recently I met with Philip Ruddock and expressed my great concern about the Howard government's decision to open a second detention centre in South Australia at Baxter. The reasons I am concerned about it are firstly that, quite frankly, the image that this gives us internationally causes a great deal of disquiet and, secondly, a huge waste of state taxpayers' money is being diverted to deal with this situation, whether it be through child protection, education or health or whether it has to do with the fact that our police resources were diverted up to Woomera.

Not only were these feral protesters throwing urine and other things at our police but at the same time as our police

were attacked by protesters they were also attacked by the federal minister. We are having to cop it sweet. The federal government's vision for South Australia's outback in this International Year of the Outback seems to be a national nuclear waste dump and two detention centres, and we do not want any of them.

Mr MEIER: I rise on a point of order, sir: my question was whether the Premier agrees that detainees should be released into the community and he did not touch on the subject.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: He gave you the answer.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: I said I was not aware of what was said in Queensland.

Mr MEIER: No, you didn't; you just went off at the second detention centre. You're avoiding the truth.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Goyder raises an interesting point in that what he sought was an explicit response from the Premier about the views that might have been expressed by others. I can understand the member for Goyder's frustration but the Premier has answered it in the manner that he thinks appropriate. Can I say about the question nonetheless that he may ask it in a different manner, in a more orderly fashion, than to invite the Premier to comment on someone else's opinion. Rather he should ask what the Premier's opinion is and then by way of explanation state what another person's opinion already expressed has been.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! However satisfactory or unsatisfactory the member for Goyder may find the answer, that is the answer he has received, and I am sure that this matter will exercise the minds and conscience of those people who comprise the Constitutional Convention later this year. In the meantime, I call the member for Mitchell.

WIND FARMS

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Will the Minister for Energy tell the house more about the environmental benefits and impact of the Starfish Hill wind farm project?

Mr Brindal: And who initiated it?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Energy.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: The minister for wind!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy): I think *Hansard* should note that that is the closest thing to a witticism that the Leader of the Opposition has ever got to in this place. I thank the honourable member for his question.

The Hon. S.W. Key: I missed it. What was it?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It wasn't that good, really. I note the interjection of the member for Unley about who initiated the wind farm and, when the program was launched, both the Premier and I recognised the contributions of the former government. I do not know why members opposite find that difficult to understand, but possibly because it is so contrary to the approach they took to us when we were opposition. We barely got an invite to things! In contrast, we have made a point of including the opposition in a meaningful fashion.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: You specifically said no Liberals on this project.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That is simply not the case. When I announced the project at the Festival Centre I praised the Liberal who was there, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I praised Dean Brown. I do not know what he is if he is not a Liberal. Let me go on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Oh, Wayne, do not believe everything people tell you!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer does not need to assist the member for Bright to continue to interject in a disorderly manner. It does not help the Minister for Energy give his answer to the house. It merely distracts him from his purpose.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is an appropriate question on World Environment Day. The recent commencement of construction of the Starfish Hill wind farm project signals South Australia's move into commercial renewable energy projects in a serious way. The wind farm will use 23 wind turbines to generate up to 34.5 megawatts of electricity, providing enough renewable energy for 18 000 South Australian households. It will capture the—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I note that the member for Bright is still more interested in whether or not he got to go to a party than he is in this. Perhaps it was the Leader of the Opposition who elbowed you out of the way, because he was there.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Deputy leader.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Deputy leader, sorry; it is hard to tell. It will capture the environmental benefits of wind farms, and it will reduce greenhouse gas emissions by up to 2.1 million tonnes of CO₂ equivalent during the 25-year life of the wind farm. The project's planning process considered a broad range of issues to ensure that the project optimises energy output while minimising its environmental impact. Visual amenity was a significant consideration in settling the route of the project's transmission line, and a number of changes occurred following community comment, including the decision to underground the wind farm's 5 kilometre connector cable to the Cape Jervis substation.

While noise from the wind turbines is noticeable in the immediate vicinity, it reduces with distance and natural features, such as terrain and vegetation. The wind farm's layout and turbines will meet the noise guidelines and standards of the Environmental Protection Authority and Planning SA. An investigation into the wind farm site concluded that the wind farm is unlikely to have a detrimental effect on birds in the area unless, of course, one is inclined to fly directly into it, and I am sure that will not happen. The operator of the wind farm will monitor effects on birds once the wind farm is commissioned, and will work closely with the Threatened Species Network and Recovery Team for the southern black glossy cockatoo.

On World Environment Day, it is important to note that South Australia offers exceptional conditions for the development of wind power. This industry, currently in its infancy in South Australia, has substantial potential as an alternative energy source, and the government, as I said earlier today, will encourage the development of the industry's potential for the good of the environment and future generations of South Australians.

WEST BEACH TRAFFIC LIGHTS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Will the Minister for Transport explain why a new set of traffic lights to be installed on Tapleys Hill Road, West Beach, at the entrance to the new Brand centre being constructed on airport—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No, but we can put up a mural.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I will start again, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

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

Dr McFETRIDGE: I will start again. They obviously do not care about any decorum in this place. Will the Minister for Transport explain why a new set of traffic lights to be installed on Tapleys Hill Road, West Beach, at the entrance to the new Brand centre being constructed on airport land, cannot be more beneficially and strategically sited at the already very busy intersection of Tapleys Hill Road and West Beach Road? The new Bureau of Meteorology and Brand centre being constructed on the western side of Adelaide Airport will have access roads entering the currently 80 km/h section of Tapleys Hill Road, approximately 200 metres south of the West Beach Road intersection with Tapleys Hill Road. This busy intersection has no traffic lights but is the site of numerous car and car/boat combinations crossing a multi-lane road. Instead of two T junctions, one cross road controlled by traffic lights is what is needed.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Transport): Could I inform the member for Morphett, in case he is not already aware, that there are a lot of roads in the electorate of Morphett. And could I say to all opposition members that if they are serious about wanting this sort of detail in relation to specific roads, they should put it on the *Notice Paper* and we will provide them with an appropriate answer. Quite obviously, the members for Morphett and MacKillop did not listen to a previous answer supplied by the Treasurer. Any shortfall in funding from Transport SA is because the Hon. Diana Laidlaw robbed the piggy bank. She would not run her portfolio the way any minister should do so. When she ran short in the arts area, what she did was to rob the piggy bank.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett has a point of order.

Dr McFETRIDGE: This question is not about money; this is about a strategic choice—where you put a set of—

The SPEAKER: Order! Under what standing order does the member for Morphett—

Dr McFETRIDGE: The minister is debating the question; he is not addressing the question. It involves standing order 198, I am told.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister should not debate the question.

Mr BRINDAL: On a further point of order, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Can I help the member for Unley come to the understanding that I am trying to explain to the house my response to the point of order raised by the member for Morphett? I know that the member for Unley would like to assist me, but presently I would prefer to have a go on my own. I cannot control what the minister says other than that he may not debate the matter in answering a question. As time goes by—and not too much at that—I trust that that will be better understood by ministers and members than it ever has been in the time that I have been here.

Accordingly, I do not uphold the point of order, but I let the minister know that it is not appropriate for him to sport with the motives of other members, particularly in this case the member for Morphett, who raised it, the house must assume, in all sincerity out of concern for the welfare of those people whom he represents within his electorate as well as those who use the intersection but who may not live there. I leave it to the Minister for Transport to properly determine how best to address that inquiry.

Mr BRINDAL: On a further point of order, sir, you may well have partially answered this but the point of order I wish to raise is the matter of imputing improper motives. The minister clearly said 'robbed the piggy bank' in respect of a member of another place, and I think that is improper. I think that you alluded to that in part of your ruling, but I ask you to clarify.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley raises a point which, in my mind, because I was not able to hear what the minister was saying just at that point, is hypothetical. However, I can tell him that the response to the hypothetical question, were it to be a realistic one, is that I will not tolerate quarrels between the houses or members of either house and, if the minister or any minister has reflected on a minister in the other place in that manner, that is highly disorderly. The Minister for Transport.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I appreciate what you said, sir, and I agree with what you said, and I am sure that the member for Morphett, in asking his question, asks it genuinely, and I acknowledge that. But I repeat what I said before: there are a lot of roads out there. There are a lot of roads in Morphett. There are a lot of roads in country electorates. If the honourable member really wants to know the specific answer, he should put the question on the *Notice Paper* and we will provide him with the appropriate information.

I have one more point in regard to the transport portfolio. Since being the Minister for Transport I have met with a whole range of industry groups, as has every other minister in their portfolio. One assurance that I have given them is that the transport portfolio will never be raided while I am the transport minister for moneys to be taken out of the transport portfolio and put into any of my other portfolios, as the previous Minister for Transport did.

HOUSING TRUST

Ms BREUER (Giles): Will the Minister for Housing tell the house what has been done to ensure that the Housing Trust meets its commitment to encourage and facilitate environmental improvements and to minimise the adverse environmental impacts of the work that it conducts?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Housing): I thank the honourable member for her question, and I am sure that her view on environmental issues will be carried through in her role as Chairperson of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. S.W. KEY: A very important position, as the member for Schubert just pointed out. The Housing Trust is currently involved in a number of initiatives to ensure that its homes are environmentally friendly, and is at the cutting edge of environmentally sustainable development. I am delighted to announce that today the Housing Trust has launched its Whyalla Eco-Renovation Information Centre, which is a joint initiative between the trust, Energy SA and the Whyalla council.

The Eco-Renovation Information Centre is a double unit in Whyalla Norrie that has been redeveloped using ecologically sustainable development principles and showcases the simple changes we can make to our homes to create environmentally friendly housing. The alterations include a solar hot water unit, a skylight in the kitchen, a low water use garden, insulated external walls and water tap flow reducers.

Another initiative of the Housing Trust is the installation of 100 solar hot water systems in trust homes in Port Augusta

this month. As the need arises, four different models of heater will be installed to test their performance. The Environment Protection Authority, through funds paid by NRG Flinders under its obligation to reduce greenhouse gases, is contributing 30 per cent of the cost of this pilot.

Another important environmental initiative of the Housing Trust is the demolition waste recycling research project, which found that 85 per cent of the material from old demolished maisonettes can be recycled or reused. Current contracts now require demolition contractors to salvage and recycle as much of the material from demolition as possible. Contractors must also identify where the materials will be sent for recycling or salvage and verify that that has been done. This is important work by the Housing Trust that not only affects tenants but also shows the rest of the community by example that it can be done.

MEMBER FOR HAMMOND

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): Will the Minister for Police confirm that he has not personally, nor has any member of his staff, given any instruction or made any suggestion to police in relation to the members of the anti-corruption squad who are not to participate in the current police anti-corruption squad investigation into matters relating to the member for Hammond?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Police): I will answer this question—although I indicate to the house that the subject of some discussions between the Police Commissioner and me will not be the subject of answers in this house, for very good reasons on occasion. However, I will answer this one. I believe the question asked was whether I, my staff or anyone I know gave any instruction to the police. I can guarantee that the answer is no. If the honourable member wants to explore it further, I invite her to do so. I am refraining here. My answer to the question is absolutely, categorically no.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew: No request?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No request, either.

SCHOOLS, TANUNDA PRIMARY

Mr VENNING (Schubert): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children Services. Will the Labor government honour the agreement between the previous government and the Barossa council in relation to the transfer of the old Tanunda Primary School site at the agreed amended price?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I would like to know what the agreed amended price was. All capital works projects are under consideration in the budget context, and the government is reviewing those. For a number of years, there have been lengthy negotiations between the council and the previous government on that site. The council has gone back and forward in terms of its response to its future use for the site. Fairly recently—and I will have to get the details and the dates, because I do not have them on me—the council wrote to the education department, signalling its intention to turn part of that site into a housing development, which was a change of purpose from the one put forward earlier. So, this is in negotiation with the council at present. Those negotiations are incomplete. I will bring back to the house a more complete answer for the member. However, to summarise, negotiations are continuing, and they are being conducted in

the context of the budget negotiations and in the hope that there will be some conclusion to this fairly shortly.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

GOVERNMENT CHARGES

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): Given the Treasurer's recent claims that the Labor Party had only promised not to increase taxes and charges to fund Labor's election promises, does this mean the Treasurer is arguing that his specific election promise allows the government the option of increasing taxes and/or charges to fund all other aspects of the state budget? Prior to the election campaign, the Treasurer pledged that Labor's funding strategy would not require any increases in existing government taxes and charges or the introduction of any new taxes and charges. This commitment was laid down in black and white in Labor's policy costings document. However, the government has subsequently announced that all fees and charges will be increased by 4.2 per cent. When asked whether the government had broken its pre-election promise, the Treasurer claimed that Labor's commitment not to increase taxes and charges applied only to funding for specific election promises.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): The standard answer to these questions is: you will have to wait until 11 July, when the budget is brought down.

SCHOOLS, PUBLIC LIABILITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Can the Minister for Education advise the house what steps have been taken to support independent schools in South Australia to continue extra-curricular activities and, in particular, work experience? In the *Australian* newspaper recently, representatives of non-Catholic private schools in New South Wales, Western Australia and South Australia said that many extracurricular work experience activities were on the verge of being abandoned due to the impact of insurance liability costs. Non-government schools in Queensland are protected by a state government run insurance scheme for just \$3 each, and the Carr government in New South Wales has introduced a number of reforms which are expected to decrease premiums by 12 per cent.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): The insurance dilemma that strikes South Australia and the whole nation affects the three schooling sectors—public, independent and Catholic—in slightly different ways. The member is right that it is a national problem and that the issue of insurance cover for extracurricular activity and events is being felt in every state. As a consequence of the concerns that have been raised by all three sectors for which I have ministerial responsibility, I have initiated discussions with my education counterparts across the nation. Also, attorneys-general and treasurers across the nation have been looking at not only general insurance issues but also, in particular, those that affect portfolios such as education. This is also a topic that will be discussed at the up-coming meeting of MCEETYA—that is, the education ministers' national forum—in New Zealand in July.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: MCEETYA is the acronym for the ministerial council of education ministers across Australia; I will write it out for the Treasurer.

SCHOOLS, BAROSSA PRIMARY

Mr VENNING (Schubert): Will the Minister for Education indicate whether the Labor government will honour the previous government's commitment to the funding of a new building program at the Angaston Primary School and also at the Kapunda Primary School? It is a trick question.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I would like to know what the trick in that question is, because there is going to be a trick, perhaps, in the answer. The simple answer is that the member does not have long to wait until the capital works program is announced in the forthcoming budget.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: That still is a budgetary issue.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I advise the member to wait for the detail of the capital works forward program in the 2002-03 budget, which will be brought down on 11 July. It is only one month away and the honourable member will not have to wait long.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

ALP PRESELECTION

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I wish to draw to the attention of the house a leaked memo in my possession. I think it has particular relevance to the house in that the people of South Australia will be debating changes to our constitution later in the year in the Constitutional Convention, and a number of members of this house will be participating and we need to understand where some people are coming from. One of the member for Playford's factional opponents has been kind enough to provide me with a copy of a submission by the member for Playford to the Hon. Michael Duffy, the Chairman of the Committee of Review of the Australian Labor Party at Trades Hall, 116 North Terrace, Adelaide—

The Hon. S.W. Key: It is South Terrace.

Mr BRINDAL: South Terrace, I do apologise.

An honourable member: It is 11-16 South Terrace.

Mr BRINDAL: Sorry, 11-16 South Terrace. It is very good how members opposite know by heart the address of Trades Hall. I commend this to the house; in fact, if I have an opportunity, I will table it if members would like me to. It is a very good read and is actually very interesting. It was written on 15 February 1994.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Playford may well have evolved his thinking since that time. If that is so, the member is welcome to tell the house or the Constitutional Convention. The member for Playford's memo is quite long, but it talks about the dealings of the ALP, and one of his key recommendations is as follows:

To encourage the huge trade union conglomerates... of the Kelty plan to sponsor individual ALP candidates by reserving to each of the biggest three or four one vacant seat in the state parliament. This is the model for the British Labour Party and it would compensate

the unions for the lessening of their general power over preselection caused by introducing a local component.

The member goes on to talk about empowering—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It is a brilliant submission.

Mr BRINDAL: The Attorney interjects that it was a brilliant submission. I must say that, were I a member of the Labor Party, I would consider Mr Snelling, as he then was, one of the bright young sparks of the Labor Party. If I was a Labor member, it has a lot of commonsense and practicality and I do not know why it was not taken much more seriously and why Mr Snelling is not sitting higher on the benches than he is currently. Nevertheless, I am sure that his turn will come, because he has time on his side. Mr Snelling says, in part:

The big say that unions have in ALP preselection makes them targets for outsiders with political ambition. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent in South Australian union campaigns in the past five years, notably in the AWU, the Liquor Trades, the AMWU, the VBU, the ETU, Clothing Trades and Timber Workers. Few of these campaigns have had anything to do with deficiencies in the industrial services the unions provide their members. Each challenge was designed to seize the card vote for an ALP faction.

He then argues, I think rightly, that when the unions' influence over preselection is diminished these colossal challenges will themselves diminish. He goes on:

The most celebrated battle was in the AWU where, over five years, about \$250 000 was spent by the factions in a struggle over 9.1 per cent of the card vote for a state convention.

He continues:

If a 50 per cent local component were introduced together with our proposals for seats dedicated to particular unions or groups of unions the AWU/FIMEE would get its own seat in parliament plus a 4.5 per cent input to each preselection.

An honourable member: Table it.

Mr BRINDAL: Mr Speaker, am I able to table this letter in its entirety?

The SPEAKER: No, the member cannot table it. Ministers alone can. You can read it into the record.

Mr BRINDAL: Yes, thank you. I will read bits in over the next month or so.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: It is very good, it is excellent, especially the suggestion, which I will deal with at another time, that the top four places on the Legislative Council ticket should be reserved for ALP union positions. That is a very interesting proposition.

Time expired.

SCHOOLS, ELIZABETH PARK PRIMARY

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): On Monday evening this week I convened a public meeting at Elizabeth Park to discuss the arson attack on the Elizabeth Park Primary School that occurred in early May. The associated issue of arson and vandalism attacks elsewhere in Elizabeth Park was also slated for discussion at the meeting. The meeting was publicised by way of an advertisement in the *Messenger News Review* and a letter from my office to 1 100 homes in the suburb of Elizabeth Park. According to the police, 150 people attended this meeting, which is a clear indication of the level of concern of local residents not only over the destruction of the major asset of their primary school but also with ongoing arson and vandalism attacks in the area. In the five weeks leading up to the fire at Elizabeth Park Primary, acts of vandalism were committed at the school on virtually a nightly basis, resulting in \$17 000 in repair bills over this period.

For the electorate of Napier, with a level of unemployment among the highest in the nation, and educational outcomes in terms of participation in university and TAFE amongst the lowest, the loss of significant educational assets is a real blow to the community. In this particular instance it not only makes more difficult the task of teachers in ensuring that their students attain numeracy and literacy skills adequate for high school study but also it strikes a cruel psychological blow as these children try to grapple with the loss of the most significant building in their school.

What concerned me and the 150 residents at Monday's meeting was the high probability that the school would be targeted with further arson attacks. Not only has the school been subjected to ongoing acts of destruction, which culminated in the total destruction of the building housing the resource centre and the centre for hearing impaired students, but also the Elizabeth Park shopping complex, which is within easy walking distance of the school, has been targeted for vandalism and arson attacks. Recently, a four-wheel drive vehicle parked in the shopping centre was incinerated by arsonists.

I was prompted to call the meeting because the individuals perpetrating these acts of arson and vandalism are known to the community. These vandals and arsonists range in age from eight to 14 years. They are known to the school community; they are known to retailers; and they are known to the police. Unfortunately, the police have been unable to assemble sufficient evidence to bring this rampage of arson and vandalism to an end. For the purpose of the meeting, I assembled a panel of representatives from the school, police, the Housing Trust and Playford council. The panel took suggestions from the meeting and, with the assistance of a police facilitator, worked towards a strategy for protecting community assets in Elizabeth Park.

The meeting gave broad endorsement for a fencing and lighting strategy being developed for the school by DETE. It also supported a police initiative for a better parenting program for the area. The foreshadowed construction of a skating park by Playford council, as part of an eventual youth hub, was also welcomed by the meeting as one means of combating youth boredom. What the public meeting also achieved was that it sent a strong message to the parents of the children involved in these acts of arson and vandalism. The message was clear and unequivocal that the community expects these parents to exercise their clear responsibilities as parents. Children as young as eight and 10 should not be on the streets at 11 p.m. They should be confined to their homes after dark and parents should have knowledge of their children's whereabouts at all times when they are not at home.

The meeting was of the clear view that, if this message was not heeded (and I will be communicating this message to all residents of Elizabeth Park by way of a letter), further police and community action would be required. If further acts of vandalism and arson occur at Elizabeth Park Primary or at the shopping centre, the ante will be lifted considerably in terms of responses to this problem. A small group of uncontrolled children will not be allowed to continue their destruction.

Time expired.

RICHARDSON, Mr R.B.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Today I wish to bring to the attention of the house the passing of Ronald Bruce Richard-

son, in Port Lincoln, on 30 May. I bring up this grievance today because Mr Richardson, as I called him, in many ways represented the many Australians who did so much to make migrants feel accepted and to enable them to fully participate in and contribute to their society.

As I said, Mr Richardson passed away on 30 May. He was born on 23 June 1919, and was a loving father especially of Maryann, whom I know well, and he had 21 grandchildren and 21 great-grandchildren. I got to know Mr Richardson when he came to Glynde for regular holidays to visit his sister, Mrs Marjorie O'Loughlen, whom I refer to as 'my Aussie mum' and who did much to help me with my education.

We often talk about people who make a contribution in Australian society, and we recognise them at Australia Day ceremonies, and so on. However, the many Australians who welcomed migrants long before multiculturalism was in vogue, and long before we had English as a second language programs, did much to help them. This particular family, as I have said, has helped me and the rest of my family to settle in Australia and made us feel welcome.

When I came to Australia in 1959, I had no knowledge of English, nor did my parents. I am the first in the family to go on to undertake a tertiary education. I believe that in many ways it is my relationship with this family that helped me settle. Mrs O'Loughlen, Ron Richardson's sister, helped me with spelling, just as she did with her son, Gavin. I knew that in Port Lincoln in a way: I had a family member there whom I visited on holidays. The members opposite will be pleased to hear that Ron Richardson was really a Labor supporter: he told me so many times. But on election night he was there waiting for Joe Scalzi to come in.

Members interjecting:

Mr SCALZI: Well, that is true. On 11 January 1988, Mrs O'Loughlen passed away in the Italian Village Nursing Home. As she said, she had lived among Italians all her life and did not mind passing away there. I was asked to speak at the funeral mass. I said then what I say here today: that she should have been given the Australian of the Year award, as should have Ron Richardson, because it is people like Ron Richardson, Marjorie O'Loughlen and their families who have contributed much to our society for the 25 per cent of Australians who are not born here, and made them feel welcome. It is important because, as we know, migrants today are basically insecure: they have been uprooted from their customs and culture, and they are trying to settle. Yet people such as Mrs O'Loughlen and Ron Richardson welcomed us and made us feel part of Australian society.

Time expired.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Colton, in the interests of expediency I will give the house some further details relevant to the issue of privilege on which I gave the house my ruling yesterday. Members are already aware that I required the member for Waite to make available to me the documents upon which he relied in raising the privilege issue on Monday. Those documents are not yet complete. It is important for the house to know that I also required advice from the minister as to the documents on which she relied in relation to the same matter. I inform the house that the minister did provide me with a letter just before question time yesterday which I had not read and taken into consideration when I made my remarks to the house yesterday. That letter

outlined the information upon which she relied in answering the question without notice from the member for Waite, which then led to his raising the privilege issue. The letter also outlined the information she obtained and the advice she was given in order to correct her response by way of her statement made on Monday. That letter is available to any member of the house who may wish to see it and discover its contents, even copy it, if that is their desire. The member for Colton.

SCHOOLS, ENVIRONMENTAL INITIATIVES

Mr CAICA (Colton): Today, as it is World Environment Day, I rise to inform the house of some of the environmental initiatives being undertaken by students at the schools in my electorate. These initiatives not only relate to improving the environment in which the school students live and schools exist but also contribute to instilling into the students and in turn instilling into the students' parents, I expect, matters that relate to improving our environment. It does not matter how small or complex these initiatives might seem: they are initiatives that assist in preserving our environment.

One thing I would say before continuing is that these initiatives being undertaken by students in the schools within the electorate of Colton are no different from the initiatives being taken in schools throughout South Australia, and we should recognise that fact. I make the further point that when I was much younger I thought that it would be my generation that made a difference with respect to the environment and that did not turn out to be the case, but I expect that it will be this generation currently at school that will make a difference, with the assistance of those who are now elected to places such as this who have the political will to make a difference.

Some of the initiatives being undertaken by the schools in my electorate include that of the Fulham Park Preschool Kindergarten. It is exciting to know that environmental initiatives are undertaken by preschool children. At the Fulham Park Preschool they have established a native garden as part of a two year project, and this centre focuses on a garden that can sustain itself and is not highly dependent on water. They have planted native species to introduce birds into the garden and have positioned them in places where the children can see the birds. They have implemented water systems that have been incorporated into the garden, and there are two ponds. I am pleased to inform the house that one of these ponds has a turtle in it. The garden provides a natural space for children at the preschool, and the project has been undertaken largely with the assistance and guidance of the parents of the preschool children. The garden has become a focal point for the community and blends in well with the neighbouring properties.

Students at the Henley Beach Primary School are involved in both the Coastal Care program, an initiative of the Charles Sturt council, and the Water Watch program. The school has been involved in the Coastal Care program for about the past four years and at times this has involved the whole school helping to revegetate local dunes with plants provided by the council. Often the school helps with plant hardening. That involves storing those plants and drying them out at the school for several months before they are ready to be planted. In particular, the school has helped revegetate the dunes on the northern side of the Grange jetty. This again is a program that has been adopted by many schools, not just the Henley Beach Primary School. The Water Watch program that I referred to involves the school regularly testing the water at

the outlet of the Torrens River and providing the results to Water Watch. This provides the testing material. Many schools along the Torrens are involved in this project.

At the Findon High School, as a very good example of some of the initiatives they have undertaken that go as far as 10 years back, the school has a series of solar panels, and an alternative weather station has been set up. These solar panels are connected to the electricity grid and run a series of computers and lights in the middle of the technical studies area. Any extra power is fed back into the grid. The weather station that I referred to has a solar panel which charges a 12 volt battery system and a wind generator which also charges this battery and monitors temperature, rainfall, wind speed and direction. Both of these projects make students aware of the environment around them and alternative energy systems.

Henley High School has a focus on recycling and Water Watch, and has a heavy environmental curriculum focus. It is very important that schools are incorporating into their curriculum matters that relate to the environment. The Fulham North Primary School, which my son attends, has established a recycling centre, which is almost up and running, and participates in the clean-up of Australia. Within the curriculum students focus on matters related to water, which is understandable, given that many of the schools are located very close to the beach. They are involved with aspects related to the Murray and Torrens Rivers, water salinity, catchment and other factors related to coastal care. On this very important day, World Environment Day, I am very pleased to be standing up here today and talking about some of the initiatives being undertaken by schools within the electorate I represent. I reinforce the point that these are just some schools among very many throughout South Australia that are undertaking these projects.

INSURANCE, PUBLIC LIABILITY

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I rise today to speak about an issue that is in crisis; I refer to the critical subject of public liability insurance. There has been considerable discussion concerning this matter in the house; however, I believe I need to speak on this again. I have raised this issue previously, but the situation is such that we now have a very serious crisis on our hands. I have many constituents who will fall victim to this crisis if action is not taken quickly. I could give the house many examples if time allowed me, but I have a couple I will give. Templewood Riding School, owned and operated by Mr Michael and Mrs Trish Kalleske at Inglewood for over 30 years, is about to close. They cannot secure renewal of their public liability insurance policy when it expires on 30 June this year. I met with Mr and Mrs Kalleske only last week, when they explained the gravity of their situation. I again telephoned them this morning, and their situation has not improved at all.

These people have built this business from nothing. They not only provide an outlet for recreational activities but they also provide a vital tourism opportunity for visitors to South Australia. Mr and Mrs Kalleske have undertaken an extensive breeding program of their horses so they are calm and quiet, to minimise any risk that may arise from horse riding at their school. As I said, their business has been operating for 30 years. I have been advised that they have had only two insurance claims, for quite small amounts, over that period; yet they cannot secure insurance renewal.

This is one example. There are many more in my electorate—people at Woodside, Carey Gully and others—and no doubt there are others in many electorates who are affected. I have certainly noted the Treasurer's comments made over the past week in this house, and I am encouraged that this issue is being progressed. I have written letters to ministers and the Premier, spoken about this and asked a question in the house. But time is of the essence. The government needs to hasten the process to result in insurance companies being drawn back into the market so that these people can obtain insurance. We will lose these businesses forever if they cannot reinsure, and that will be a disaster for the operators, obviously, but also for this state. I urge the government to hasten its deliberations to achieve some practical and feasible outcomes in order to save these businesses. The government needs to come up with a short-term package by the end of this month to overcome the current crisis and to develop longer-term strategies for a sustainable solution.

I note this week that the member for Mitchell raised an issue concerning insurance company profits. He referred to a report which stated that profits over the last 20 years averaged 18 per cent of premium income but that those profits are due to rise to 35 per cent from public liability premiums. The Treasurer himself has looked at this issue and, in his ministerial statement to the house a couple of days ago, he said that the ACCC will be asked to continue to review and monitor insurers. I suggest to the government that its members need to get across this whole issue as one and come up with a solution so that we do not lose valuable businesses from our state.

SCHOOLS, ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): It seems that the member for Colton and I had similar thoughts today about the need to celebrate some of the activities undertaken in our schools on World Environment Day. Many schools approach environmental issues in a variety of ways, so I want to highlight a few, while recognising at the same time that there is excellent practice in teaching issues relating to the environment in all our schools these days.

One exciting development relates to the Christies Beach High School, and it is being done in cooperation with the Southern Vocational College, where an indigenous garden is being planted. The first major planting will occur on 4 July, during NAIDOC Week, when local Aboriginal elders will be invited to share stories about plants that have significance in their life. The garden is to be built on an area of 0.4 hectares just behind the Southern Vocational College.

This piece of land is often the subject of complaints from neighbours because it is sometimes used as a bit of a storage area, which they do not like. Christies Beach High School and the Southern Vocational College will be making many of the neighbours happy by converting a disused area to a pleasant garden. I particularly want to celebrate the fact that quite a number of Aboriginal families live close to that area of the school, so their young people and their old people will have access in a nearby area to an Aboriginal garden.

It will be planted with species that are native to the area and with plants of cultural significance, as well as those used by indigenous people for bush tucker and medicinal purposes. There will be a water feature, and the garden will become an educational tool for students in the Southern Futures Cluster, which comprises 11 high schools and 60 primary schools. Students will be able to tour the garden with a handbook to

learn about plants, animals and dreaming stories, and they will also be able to propagate plants for their own school gardens. It is particularly pleasing that students will be involved in designing and developing the garden and that the local Kurna community has been really supporting the whole project.

Another interesting development is occurring at the Reynella South Kindergarten, which has obtained a small ecologically sustainable development grant. The grant has been used not only to improve the facility at the school but also as the basis of its teaching program to enable the very young children who attend the kindergarten to explore some conservation issues by looking at what is happening in their school grounds and developing some conservation practices.

One of the conservation practices the children are developing is that, when they play in the sandpit, they are given only a certain amount of water, and they must learn to use that amount of water in the best possible way. They learn about why they are given only a little water to play with, instead of being allowed to splash it all around the place. The children have been learning about why the new sprinkler system is being built and how that will benefit the school, their community and their future. I really congratulate Ruth Oliver and others from the Reynella South Kindergarten who have been successful in obtaining this grant, using it in such an innovative way and incorporating it into the children's education. They are also building a sensory garden on one of the slightly degraded areas at the school.

A number of other schools have had long commitments to environmental issues. I refer to the Morphett Vale East Primary School, which is involved in the redevelopment of Tarnanga Reserve, which is a crime prevention and community arts project as well as an ecological project. Reynella South Primary School has been running a recycling centre for many years. Run by volunteers, the centre contributes to the environment and also contributes much needed funds to the school. Morphett Vale West Primary School has been involved in planting trees on the park between the school and the creek, and I commend all these schools for their efforts.

GAMING MACHINES (LIMITATION ON EXCEPTION TO FREEZE) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr McEWEN (Mount Gambier) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Gaming Machines Act 1992. Read a first time.

Mr McEWEN: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It is unfortunate that we are again dealing with the Gaming Machines Act, but that is because we did not capture our intentions in legislation when we last amended the act. At that time members might recall that we intended to put a cap on the number of poker machines in this state. Some people wanted to reduce it. Wise counsel prevailed and we felt that the view of the majority was that we should say that enough is enough and rule a line in the sand.

During that debate, we talked about reducing the number, and geographic distribution, of machines. We were also mindful of the fact, and the Licensing Commission brought to our attention the fact, that our actions could inadvertently

result in a couple of unintended consequences. To make sure that we did not do that, the act includes section 14A(2)(b). Subsection (2) states:

... subsection (1) does not apply—

so this was an escape for some people—

to any of the following applicants for a gaming machine licence:

Subsection (2)(b) states:

an application made by a holder of a gaming machine licence who surrenders that licence so that a new one may be granted to the applicant following—

(i) removal of his or her liquor licence to new premises;

In that instance, we were trying to say that if someone rebuilt down the block, around the corner or on the same premises they had to go through a different process to transfer their liquor licence and their gaming licence. We would not want them now to have a new hotel and to transfer the liquor licence and not the gaming licence. We knew what we meant but, unfortunately, someone is trying to read more into this than we intended. We now need to amend the act to make it abundantly clear to all concerned exactly what we meant.

We meant a provision relating to someone who wanted to remove his or her licence to new premises in the same locale—not somewhere else in the state, in the same locale. It never occurred to us that someone in their own right, or in combination with others, might now attempt to take their licence three, four or 500 kilometres away. But, lo and behold, someone is trying to do that. At the moment an applicant from Whyalla has gained licensing approval to take a liquor licence from Whyalla to Angle Vale but, importantly, to this date, that person has not obtained from the gaming commissioner approval to take the gaming licence from Whyalla to Angle Vale.

I make this important point because some people will try to claim that what we are now doing is retrospective. It is not retrospective. We are aware, though, of an action that is likely to occur in the near future. Before that occurs, we simply want to remind the people of South Australia, again, exactly what we intended originally and to strengthen the act so that it truly reflects our intentions at the time. I refer to the Liquor Licensing Court of South Australia and a judgment handed down by Judge Kelly in respect of an application from Anport Pty Ltd for the removal of a hotel licence from Darling Terrace, Whyalla, to 115 Heaslip Road, Angle Vale. Importantly, where the judgment allows for the transfer of the liquor licence, the judge states:

This does not mean that I endorse the proposition that poker machines ought to be granted. That is entirely a matter for the commissioner and I will leave it up to him.

And, importantly, the commissioner, at this stage, has not dealt with that matter. So, there is nothing retrospective about our now saying and admitting that we failed in drafting to capture what we intended when we last amended the Gaming Machines Act. I am attempting today simply to reaffirm what were our initial intentions, which means that all I need do is seek the support of members to add a few more words. So, after the words 'removal of his or her licence to new premises' we need to go on to say 'in the same locality as the premise from which the licence was removed'. That is what we intended; that was the wish of the parliament at the time. Unfortunately, we did not capture that explicitly in amending the act at the time. We must now capture that because it is not our wish to allow anyone to shift a licence beyond the immediate locale to which the licence was originally granted. That is why I plead with all members to move with some

haste to support what is a very minor amendment; an amendment which, unfortunately, we need now to make to an act, because we did not truly capture our wishes at the time we last amended it. I do not have any explanatory clauses. I think that I have dealt with that in my second reading explanation.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (CANNABIS) AMENDMENT BILL

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Controlled Substances Act. Read a first time.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I could talk about this subject at great length today but I know that the house needs to deal with other business. During the course of the debate, when I get a chance to listen to other colleagues, I hope that I will have their support for this bill. I acknowledge that this bill was supported by members of the House of Assembly in the previous session but, unfortunately, it never got through the Legislative Council. As a private member, I am therefore reintroducing the measure. I hope that the support for the bill shown in the last session will be demonstrated now not only in the House of Assembly but in another place.

I could talk for hours on my concerns about illicit drugs, particularly cannabis. Indeed, I am sure that those members in this place who attend the Drugs Summit will have many opportunities to talk about the outcomes of illicit drugs. But illicit drugs know no bounds. It does not matter whether you come from a solid family background or whether, unfortunately and sadly, you come from a dysfunctional family; and it does not matter how high or low your disposable income may be, because a growing number of people are using illicit drugs.

I commend the government's Drugs Summit. In fact, it complements much of the hard work that our government did—in a holistic way—in respect of a drugs strategy. In fact, if any members in this house want to have a look at a holistic, comprehensive and generally workable package of government initiatives, they need go no further than look at what we introduced over the past eight years to see that the previous Liberal government did its level best to address this issue. However, there is always more that can be done. Hopefully, as a result of the summit, there will come other solutions and opportunities. I have been to the Netherlands and Switzerland looking at injecting rooms and so-called coffee houses (cannabis houses), and I have visited the Netherlands rehabilitation programs and compared them to the programs conducted by the Correctional Services Department in South Australia, and I make two points: first, across the world today we are seeing an increase in illicit drugs, an increase in their use and an increase in crime as a result of illicit drugs, in addition to the breakdown of families and communities and mental health issues.

I do not believe that anyone has the answer. You hear people talk about rapid detoxification, the liberalisation of drugs (freeing it up) and the decriminalisation of drugs, which would be the most scary option. I hope that, as a result of the summit, there is a balance in this debate that looks also at the importance of law enforcement.

Those at the coal face who have to see the worst of illicit drug use are the South Australian police. They, together with the ambulance service, are often the ones called to intervene early, and you have only to go out with those men and women or spend some time talking to those who have been in the job for a while and they will tell you that illicit drug use has been on the increase for the last 15 to 20 years. In 1987 a minister in the then Labor government introduced the expiation notice initiative for cannabis, allowing people to have 10 plants without incurring a criminal offence.

Ten plants back then was a lot of plants, and I am not sure what work or other things anyone would have done if they were consuming 10 plants over the course of a year. I do not think they would have been putting in a normal working week. Nevertheless, they debated that cannabis was not all that harmful. In the seventies, many of our own families may have been involved in the flower power era and cannabis, but things have changed. I would say that the 1987 model was one of the greatest failures that we have seen when it came to issues of social inclusion in this state.

What it did was set up a drug network and encouraged people, because of the profit in that drug network, to bring in people with plant breeding backgrounds and the genetic understanding of plants, and we then saw the THC component of those cannabis plants increase immensely, particularly when they started to get into hydroponics. All the evidence given to me scientifically and anecdotally says that the toxins in the THC are very powerful.

I was speaking to the principal of a school in my electorate who mentioned that they had a lad with behavioural problems, and they were finally able to work through this to find out what was happening. They suspected that cannabis could have been involved, and the bottom line is that, when they took an X-ray of this young lad's brain—and he had been involved in heavy cone usage for less than two years—they saw a major depression or density of a particular compound in the brain.

With alcohol, if you overindulge on an occasion, you might suffer a little the next day but, if you drink enough water, within 24 hours and with a bit of sleep, you have no alcohol in your blood. But that is certainly not the case when it comes to cannabis. It was interesting to read an article entitled 'Cannabis and depression', which featured the actor Garry McDonald, better known as the TV comic Norman Gunston. He featured on *Australian Story* on ABC Television on 11 February this year.

This man had entertained many South Australians for decades and had been a guy you thought could get by, that he was high profile and would have had a good income, was popular, and you would have thought that this man would not have come across a situation where he found depression and drugs involved in his life. In fact, he told how his career collapsed 10 years ago when he became deeply depressed, and he said that his first anxiety attack began after he had smoked hashish. The article states that Melbourne researchers say that they have found the strongest evidence yet that heavy marijuana smoking causes depression—alarmingly, particularly in young women.

A research project was undertaken by the Royal Children's Hospital with a lot of data being gathered for youths for seven years, from the ages of 14 to 21, and the findings were enormously striking, according to the centre's Director, Professor George Patton, who says that the effects are profound, particularly in young women, where the rates of

mental health problems have increased many, many times in daily cannabis users.

We have seen far too often now—and I am sure that no member of this house is proud of the fact—that South Australia is the cannabis capital of Australia. In fact, when I was at an Australasian police ministers' council meeting they put up a worldwide globe and, sadly, South Australia was one of fewer than 20 places in the world identified with one of the biggest cannabis leaves on it, indicating how big the cannabis issue is in South Australia. So let us face it: 1987 failed. We need to show responsibility. We need sometimes to have strong law enforcement to guide people.

Yes, there need to be carrots as well as sticks but, when it comes to issues such as illicit drugs and it comes to the fact that the illicit drug industry is bigger in the world than the whole of the world's tourism industry, then we have a serious problem and we have to start to address this at home. There is a lot that needs to be done, and it is not appropriate for me to talk about non-hydroponic cannabis today, but one of the ways of addressing this is by making it a criminal offence for those people who want to start a drug network through hydroponic cannabis.

We only have to see how many hydroponic shops have been set up—in South Australia they numbered nearly 90 at the last count, and per capita we had more hydroponic shops than any other states, by a long shot—to see how the network was growing. Police would often tell me that they were then either seeing money coming back, large amounts of cash that were involved in illegal or criminal activity, or seeing harder drugs than cannabis coming back.

If you listen to some people in this debate they will tell you that law enforcement is not the way to go; that that component should be pretty well dropped out and we should liberalise it, look at the European model (like that of the Netherlands) and free up the whole thing. That is not the way to go, and we cannot afford to see a situation where the horse bolts out of the starting barrier, because we will never pull it up. It is up to our parliament right now to ensure that we address this very serious issue. We have to understand what cannabis does in the way of mental health.

I cite the example of a 32 year old surfer who had been a daily cannabis smoker for at least five years, who ended up drowning himself after a bout of depression. His mother unleashed a very solid condemnation of cannabis during her eulogy at his funeral. That is just one example. I do not think that any member of parliament who has been in this house for a few years would not have had coming to see them in their electorate offices families who do not have major problems in their family, such as job losses, mental health and people even stealing from their own family to feed their drug habits.

Almost without exception—and I have had a number come to my electorate and a lot more that I saw on files for the 3.5 years I was police minister—cannabis was the root of the evil. I know that some of those people who support cannabis will say that I am back in the fifties, but really they are out of reality and it is time they actually saw what cannabis is doing. When you look at drug overdoses and at drug usage and you look at figures from the ambulance service, most of the time when the ambulance is called out it is poly drug use it is called out to. It is that lethal combination of perhaps six cones during the day and then some amphetamines or heroin on top of that, that type of activity later in the day, and the body simply cannot cope.

If it were not for the expertise of those ambulance officers, a lot of people in South Australia would not be here today.

So, let us get serious about this debate. Let this not by any means be the end of a comprehensive debate. For over 2½ years you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and colleagues who were here last session saw my genuine passion about trying to do more in my capacity as a member of parliament—and we can all be part of this—to address the most threatening issue facing the world and now facing South Australia—

Mr Hanna: It's terrorism.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Terrorism is another one, and let us look at the illicit drug issues linked to terrorism, as the member for Mitchell just raised. But I also know that, if it was not for illicit drug use, we would have a happier and healthier society. I suggest that, with the good work the police are doing these days, we would almost be able to go back to the old days of leaving our cars and doors unlocked, and crime would be at an all time low. But we are not seeing that: what we are seeing is crime trends rising, with illicit drug use and its trafficking (particularly through organisations like the outlawed motor cycle gangs and the network they have right across the world), and that is happening because we are not tough enough.

We have to give the police the powers and the resources. As a community we need to be serious about rehabilitation and education. We need to continue to explore pilot programs such as drug courts, drug action teams in which police are involved and good interagency work. We must do all that. However, it is no good addressing that if we are not tough on the message at law, which is: illicit drugs destroy society and many of its members. In the last 2½ years, I did not get much support from the then opposition on my stance on this issue until just before the last election. I was keen then to engage the then leader of the opposition in this matter.

As I said, I congratulate him on the Drugs Summit. We will approach that summit in a bipartisan way. Indeed, the government has already seen how bipartisan an opposition we can be. We will be bipartisan on this issue where possible because we are a proactive opposition. However, we never had that from the former opposition leader. If members look in the *Hansard* they will see that the former opposition leader was extremely quiet when it came to anything to do with illicit drugs. Now there is the chance to be totally bipartisan about illicit drugs. I urge support for this bill; let all members of parliament see positive outcomes from the Premier's Drugs Summit. I hope that this can be the decade of solid bipartisanship in the long-term interests of the society of South Australia. I am very pleased to be introducing this bill.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (EQUAL SUPERANNUATION ENTITLEMENTS FOR SAME SEX COUPLES) BILL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974, the Police Superannuation Act 1990, the Southern State Superannuation Act 1994 and the Superannuation Act 1988. Read a first time.

Ms BEDFORD: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today I introduce and commend a bill to the house for the third time to remove discrimination for same gender couples in the area of superannuation within state superannuation funds. As I have made three speeches on the bill, I refer members to those speeches in the year 2000: on 2 May, 6 July

and 26 October. This reform is long overdue, as other parliaments in Australia have already moved to ensure the rights of people caught in this predicament.

In the New South Wales parliament, the Deputy Premier Dr Andrew Refshauge's Superannuation Legislation Amendment (Same Sex Partners) Bill was assented to in February 2001. In speaking to that bill, the honourable member said:

As honourable members would be aware, New South Wales public sector superannuation schemes are required to comply with the principles—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! With respect to the member for Florey, it is hard to hear because we have too many contributors on my right.

Ms BEDFORD: I understand, sir. I accept their help, Mr Deputy Speaker, because I know how important they feel this bill is. The honourable member said:

As honourable members would be aware, New South Wales public sector superannuation schemes are required to comply with the principles of the commonwealth government superannuation law. Failure to comply has the potential to jeopardise the significant tax concessions available to the New South Wales public sector superannuation schemes. The Commonwealth superannuation law, embodied in the Superannuation Industry (Supervision) Act 1993, and regulations made under that Act, does not permit superannuation schemes to recognise same sex partners as beneficiaries.

Minister Della Bosca therefore requested Senator the Hon. Rod Kemp, Assistant Treasurer of the Commonwealth Government, to advise whether implementation of the provisions contained in this bill would adversely affect the tax status of the New South Wales public sector superannuation schemes. Senator Kemp has provided written advice on behalf of the Commonwealth Government that there will be no adverse tax effect resulting from the passage of these amendments.

Finally, I indicate to the House the cost of the measures proposed in this bill. The Government Actuary has estimated the cost, in today's dollars, to be in the order of just over \$20 million spread over the foreseeable life of the scheme—that is, approximately 75 years. This represents an infinitesimal increase in superannuation liabilities which, at 30 June 2000, were calculated to be just over \$33 billion.

The ACT was the first parliament to move on many legal issues regarding same sex couples, with the Domestic Relationships Act 1994. The act meant that same sex couples were viewed legally the same as de facto heterosexual couples, including matters of superannuation. In Victoria, the Statute Law Amendment (Relationships) Bill 2000, which also prevents discrimination against same sex couples in superannuation matters, received royal assent (act No. 27/2001) on 12 June that year. In Tasmania in July 2001, a joint standing committee on community development prepared a report to parliament on the need for the legal recognition of significant personal relationships in Tasmania. It was broad ranging and covered many legal and financial aspects of same sex couples, including superannuation. I am told that legislation has since been introduced and passed.

In Western Australia, the Acts Amendment (Sexuality Discrimination) Bill was before parliament and had been there since 1997 in much the same way as my act. Sweeping legislation was assented to in Western Australia, however, on 17 April this year, and includes reform in superannuation. In Queensland, legislation was passed in 1999 which extends the right to parental, family and bereavement leave to same sex couples. Any state awards or State-based workplace agreements which include provisions for employees' partners or families will extend the same rights to same sex couples. The bill also includes broad anti-discrimination coverage which extends the current legal protection against discrimination by

reason of lawful sexual activity to cover a person's sexual preference—the Industrial Relations Act 1999.

I would also like to advise the house that the commonwealth government is finally seriously attending to this matter. Part of the background of my bill is that, at the time we introduced this matter, the federal opposition, under Anthony Albanese, was looking at amending the Commonwealth Superannuation Act. However, that did not go much further, unfortunately. On 17 March this year the following was reported in the *Sunday Mail*:

Laws discriminating against homosexuals by preventing gay partners getting full access to their super benefits will be removed under reforms being considered by the Federal Government.

The moves would give same sex couples for the first time the same superannuation entitlements as married couples.

Assistant Treasurer Helen Coonan is including the groundbreaking reforms in new legislation to give Australians greater freedom to choose and change their super funds.

So, Mr Deputy Speaker, you can see that the move is also on in the federal government sphere. It is important to note that the changes at the federal level will not impact on our state's superannuation funds. It is therefore necessary for us to address the anomaly in this place. Under the current state and federal superannuation laws, a putative spouse or de facto spouse may make claims for a number of benefits under their partner's superannuation—that is, death benefits. 'Putative spouse' is the term used in South Australian legislation to refer to a de facto relationship between opposite sex partners. Under this state's Family Relationships Act, a person may apply to the District Court for a declaration that he or she was a putative spouse or de facto partner of another person, provided that they were of the opposite sex. For superannuation this means that a same sex partner is prevented from accessing death, sickness and other benefits which an opposite sex partner is entitled to.

The bill will amend the four state superannuation acts and will introduce an additional provision to the definition section of each act providing for a same sex couple to be included in the definition of 'putative spouse' for the purposes of superannuation. It will adopt the same criteria as the Family Relationships Act of South Australia for determining putative spouse status. It will provide the same mechanism as the Family Relationships Act for determining putative spouse status, that is, through the District Court declaration.

In closing, this bill has been introduced because a constituent came to my electorate office because he could not leave his superannuation to his long-time partner. His visit and the relationship of an elected member to their constituent is the most basic and personal use of the democratic process and it is a duty that I regard as fundamental to my role as a member of parliament. The visit galvanised my resolve to act because, over my years of service in electorate offices at both the federal and state level, I have seen similar situations many times before and I am now in a position to provide some assistance to these constituents.

Suffice to say, it is time for the parliament in this state to address the situation and to cease discrimination of this sort still on our statutes. Our state is one with a proud history of leading in elimination of discrimination and now needs to examine why its superannuants are so disadvantaged. I urge the house to deal with this matter expeditiously so as not to see this very important issue still on the *Notice Paper* at the end of the 50th Parliament.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

POVERTY

Mr SNELLING (Playford): I move:

That this house directs the Social Development Committee to conduct an inquiry and report on poverty and its causes in Adelaide's disadvantaged regions and in particular examine:

- (i) intergenerational poverty and unemployment;
- (ii) education and training opportunities in these regions.

This motion seeks that the house direct the Social Development Committee to conduct an inquiry into and report on poverty in Adelaide's disadvantaged regions. I am sure that many members of the house are familiar with problems associated with poverty which is concentrated within a particular geographical area, involving certain suburbs—and a number of areas of Adelaide come to mind. These areas have enormous social problems and enormous social costs, with many different consequences.

One of those consequences involves the concept of intergenerational poverty and intergenerational unemployment where there are families consisting of at least two generations and perhaps three generations who have all have been dependent upon public welfare—the parents are unemployed and dependent upon social welfare, the children perhaps leave school early and become dependent upon public welfare and then perhaps their children, as well, go on to become dependent upon public welfare. The costs are extraordinary because these people have no understanding of going to work, of searching for employment and of the various disciplines that that places on people. Unemployment and this sort of welfare dependency impose not only costs on the budget bottom line but also social costs which flow on and affect all areas of society.

This intergenerational poverty becomes a vicious cycle, and I believe very strongly that one of the ways this cycle can be broken is by education and training—by radical intervention amongst these unfortunate people to raise their skills, literacy and numeracy levels and to get them into training in order to break the cycle. I hope that the Social Development Committee, as part of its inquiry, will go into these areas to see some of the programs that have been attempted and look at what is working, what is not working and what other programs could be tried to break this cycle. I think that this is a crucial issue. These disadvantaged areas of poverty and welfare dependency, of course, are not just a feature of Adelaide: they exist in the big cities of Australia and throughout the world. In concluding my remarks, I acknowledge and thank the opposition for its courtesy and its undertaking to allow this motion to pass through the house.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I support this motion moved by the member for Playford and welcome him to the Social Development Committee. The Social Development Committee, as members would be aware, has had before it references involving prostitution, the voluntary euthanasia bill, ADHD and rural poverty, and I believe it is important to look at this particular reference because it is what the Social Development Committee should be about. There is no question that there are areas within the Adelaide metropolitan area and, indeed, other areas in South Australia, as the mover clearly outlined, which have problems that need to be addressed. There is no question that, if we look at the economic indicators, the level of employment, income and crime statistics differ in the different areas, and it is important to look at this issue.

I remember quite clearly, when I was teaching and marking year 12 economic examination papers, that certain areas tended to do not as well as others. As the member for Playford has said, the opportunities for education available to students in the different areas is clearly something that needs to be examined. While the opposition welcomes the government's commitment to raising the school leaving age, these sorts of issues have to be addressed, and the Social Development Committee is the appropriate committee to look at this issue. I welcome this reference and look forward to seeing a comprehensive report that will address these issues and, hopefully, break down the culture of poverty—and everything associated with it—in certain areas of South Australia so that we can do our best to increase the educational and economic opportunities of all South Australians. It would be negligent of us as a parliament if we allowed this cycle to continue without addressing it. For those reasons, I support the motion.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I, too, support this motion. No doubt, it will present the Social Development Committee with a real challenge. It is a great shame that intergenerational poverty and unemployment still exists in our community, and we certainly need to examine the reasons for it in Adelaide's disadvantaged regions.

I remember a few years ago, while walking towards Parliament House, I was stopped by a person just before I got to Parliament House. He said, 'Excuse me, mate, but would you have a \$1 for a cup of coffee?' I replied, 'Look, I am surprised at your request. I feel that I ought to do more than just give you money. I would like your name and address, because, if you are not getting enough money through Social Security, something needs to be done. I am happy to refer this to the appropriate federal minister.' You would think he would have appreciated my offer, but, in fact, whilst he backed away at about 1 000 miles an hour, he said, 'Forget it, mate. Don't worry about it.' He did not want to know me. It pointed out to me that this person had spent whatever money he was getting—whether it be unemployment benefits or whatever—and he was literally begging on the streets for extra money. However, the minute I offered to perhaps correct the problem he had, he did not want to know me, and he certainly did not pursue the matter of my giving money to him.

That experience highlighted that, in this day and age, although governments have probably never done a better job in endeavouring to care for the disadvantaged in our community and ensuring that everyone is provided with sufficient money for food, clothing and shelter, there is still enormous poverty in our community. In my opinion, it is clear that many people do not know how to handle money and are misusing it.

Earlier today, a bill to amend the Gaming Machines Act was introduced by the member for Mount Gambier. It is my view that many people misuse their money on gaming machines in the hope that they will double their money. However, even before gaming machines were introduced, they might have spent their money on horseracing, the lottery or a variety of things. People need to be taught that trying to double their money through gambling invariably will not work 90 per cent of the time.

So, it is heartening that the member for Playford has moved this motion to refer this issue to the Social Development Committee. As I have said, it will be a real challenge and I wish the committee well in its endeavours. However,

I regret that it is restricted to the Adelaide metropolitan area, because there are significant pockets of disadvantaged people in rural areas, too. In fact, statistics indicate that Wallaroo—which is part of my electorate and the area where I live—has some of the highest unemployment in the state and the nation. However, I am not asking that the terms of reference be extended, because I think the committee will have its work cut out as it is. I support the motion.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I commend you, sir, as the member for Playford, for putting this motion to the house. As we have heard, the Social Development Committee has inquired into many important subjects. They have not always brought about an immediate change in society or in government practice but they have, nevertheless, contributed, in the long run, to positive change and, I think, enlightened the community as well as members of parliament about some of the issues which do not normally confront us. I welcome this motion and commend you, sir, for introducing it.

One of the challenges, of course, will be defining poverty and, without taking up too much time, one can talk about relative poverty—and I am not using that in a familial sense but relative to others. So, you may not be starving but you can still be suffering because others around you have a style of life different from your own. The other concept is absolute poverty where people are living below a certain level in terms of income, housing, food and so on. The challenge for the committee and its first task, I would imagine, would be defining poverty.

It is a sad reflection on our society that, collectively, although we have never been so wealthy, we have elements of poverty within our society. Indeed, I believe that we in effect have two populations within Adelaide and the wider community. I think the committee will be astonished to find to what extent we do have poverty.

I agree with the member for Goyder that it would be good if the committee also considered poverty in rural areas. I would be happy to move an amendment to the motion, if the mover is agreeable, that it incorporate country areas. However, I do not want to pre-empt what the mover has already stated.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I understand that the reason that country areas were not included specifically was that that aspect has been covered in the past. On that basis I am quite happy not to pursue that particular aspect.

Some poverty is self-inflicted but much of it is due to external factors. Nevertheless, it is still poverty, no matter what the cause. Importantly, what is encouraging about this resolution is that it is not simply inquiring for the sake of inquiring: it will be looking at possible strategies and mechanisms to deal with poverty. I note in the terms of reference that there is a particular focus on unemployment, education and training, and I think those aspects give a pretty good indication as to what could be contributing, in a negative sense or through lack of opportunity, to continuing poverty. It is important that we do not have two populations, with one being denied opportunity in life, as well as denying enjoyment of the full dignity of being a human. So, if this motion, through the committee, leads to an improvement in the quality of life of South Australians, it is to be welcomed.

The task will be, as I indicated earlier, one not only of definition but also of ascertaining data. I know from my experience in my former life as an academic that many students were amazed to find that people on a low income

were actually quite happy. I am not saying that there is an automatic correlation so that having a low income makes you happy; I do not think that follows at all. But that is a slightly different aspect from what we would normally understand as something defined as poverty: it involves the sort of definitions that have been used by the Brotherhood of Saint Laurence, for example, and others, in their years ago inquiries in Melbourne and elsewhere.

I commend this motion to the house. I am pleased that it has bipartisan support, and I look forward with interest to its progression through the committee and to the ensuing recommendations. Hopefully, it will result in some action to ensure that all South Australians can achieve a decent and productive standard of living.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I would like to support this motion because I think it is important that we identify which communities have the greatest need so that we are able to tailor appropriately the services and support programs that we can offer to people in those communities. In this way, we can break the cycle of poverty which, as other members have said, has been brought about by a history of long-term family unemployment and the social problems that come with that. I am confident that such an inquiry can only be of great benefit to communities in need, to the people who reside in those areas, and particularly to our young people. It will enable us to give those young people assistance and to provide a better, and certainly more fulfilling, future for them through the identification of the services that they need, whether that is improving their level of education, which will certainly go a long way to changing some of the social behaviour that we see, or giving them confidence in their life skills so that they can, for example, manage their finances. I think that is important, and so I support the motion, and I certainly look forward to the committee's report.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I start by congratulating the member for Playford on this motion. If there is one thing this place should be about, it is lifting the living standards of South Australians. In doing that we have to ensure that we do not leave large portions of our population behind. There is no doubt that there are huge consequences to inter-generational poverty and unemployment; we have seen that in a number of areas and it has been identified in a lot of research that has been done throughout our state in the past. I am sure the Social Development Committee will be very busy wading through those huge volumes of research that has already been done. The cost is in a financial sense and also in a social sense, and our community as a whole pays. I know we are all concerned about reports of people living out of the West Terrace Cemetery and in our parks. That is not the standard of living that we want for South Australians, and it certainly impacts on all of us. I am very pleased also that the Premier has established his social inclusion unit, which is looking at a range of factors that fit in with inter-generational poverty and unemployment, at homelessness and at educational opportunities.

Life opportunities are not always determined by the individual, and very often in this place and elsewhere we see a lot of finger pointing about people's individual responsibilities, but the circumstances in which people find themselves are not always of their making or under their control. In relation to young people, it is much harder to get to the top of the tree if you are starting from the very bottom. If you are

starting halfway up the tree it is much easier; you already have lots of support and your opportunities are far greater.

My electorate covers a large portion of the northern suburbs. I know that some years ago at one of the schools out in the member for Ramsay's electorate the children were going to school without breakfast, so the school was running a breakfast program. I do not care who you are; as a child you cannot go to school and learn if your tummy is empty. People may point the finger at parents in that case and say they should be more responsible, but what we are talking about here are inter-generational problems, where people have not had these sorts of skills patched onto them. In many cases they have not learnt how to budget properly with their finances and how to make the dollar go as far as it can in looking after their family's health and nutritional needs.

I well remember a visit to South Australia by a New South Wales magistrate, Barbara Hollborow. She was talking about children and the circumstances in which they grew up and in which they came before her. Her arguments were very forceful when she said that the children of Australia—our children—belong to all of us, not just individuals; we all have a responsibility. She also said that young people who were coming before her with custody orders and who were being taken away from their parents for one reason or another were very often the same young ones who came back before her in the juvenile court. At one stage she spoke about a young mother who ended up in the court for injuring her baby when in fact she had come from an abusive family herself, had not learnt the skills of mothering and could not cope physically or mentally with two young babies.

In those circumstances our community bears a huge responsibility. We do not just automatically know these things; we are not born with life skills. Poverty, however, does not mean that someone is bad: it just means they are dealt a rough lot in life. I think the Social Development Committee will be doing very good work in looking at this whole issue and coming back to this house with the results of its inquiry. I commend the measure to the house.

Motion carried.

ELECTION SIGNS

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hanna:

That by-law No. 2 of the City of Tea Tree Gully under the Local Government Act 1999 relating to Roads, made on 11 December 2001 and laid on the table of this House on 5 March 2002, be disallowed.

(Continued from 30 May. Page 404.)

Order of the day discharged.

TEA TREE GULLY LAND

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hanna:

That by-law No. 3 of the City of Tea Tree Gully under the Local Government Act 1999 relating to local government land, made on 11 December 2001 and laid on the table of this house on 5 March 2002, be disallowed.

(Continued from 30 May. Page 404.)

Order of the day discharged.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

GAS PIPELINES ACCESS (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (REVIEWS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Energy) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Gas Pipelines Access (South Australia) Act 1997. Read a first time.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: 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.

The purpose of this Bill is to amend the *Gas Pipelines Access (South Australia) Act 1997* (the Principal Act) to clarify the time at which the right of appeal arises, expand appeal rights and streamline procedures for the classification of pipelines and make necessary consequential changes.

The Principal Act is the 'lead legislation' that was passed pursuant to the signing of the Council of Australian Governments (CoAG) Natural Gas Pipelines Access Agreement (the Agreement) by Ministers of all Australian jurisdictions on 7 November 1997. Under the Agreement South Australia became the 'lead legislator.' Other jurisdictions (except Western Australia) agreed to apply the uniform provisions of the Principal Act (Schedule 1, usually referred to as the 'Law' and Schedule 2, which is the 'Code') by means of application legislation. Western Australia applies only the Code, but with respect to the 'Law' agreed to enact legislation having an 'essentially identical effect.'

Under clause 6.1 of the Agreement a Party to the Agreement must not amend its Access Legislation (of which Schedule 1 is a part) unless the amendments have been approved in writing by all the Ministers of the other Parties.

In late 2001 Ministers of all Australian jurisdictions unanimously approved the Bill to amend Schedule 1 of the Principal Act. As lead legislator, South Australia is now obliged to introduce the Bill into the South Australian Parliament.

At the same time that they approved the Bill, Ministers also approved amendments to the Code, and minor amendments to the uniform Regulations. The most important amendment to the Code is to provide for a wider range of methods ('Approved Reference Tariff Variation Methods') in accordance with which Reference Tariffs may vary within an Access Arrangement period.

The Bill seeks to correct an anomaly whereby, at present, the Code Registrar is required to record information about recommendations or decisions on the classification of pipelines, but there is no corresponding obligation on the NCC and the relevant Ministers, who make the recommendations or decisions, to notify the Code Registrar of the recommendations or decisions.

The Bill also aims to clarify the point at which the right of appeal arises and closes. It is not currently clear when the 14-day appeal period commences. The effect of the proposed amendment is that the right of appeal will remain open until 14 days after the relevant decision is placed on the public register maintained by the Code Registrar. This will provide a clear date from which the time limit can be calculated.

The Bill expands the category of persons able to apply for a review of a decision of a relevant Regulator to include those who made submissions on an Access Arrangement or revisions drafted by the relevant Regulator. At present only those persons who made submissions on an Access Arrangement or submissions submitted by the service provider are able to apply for a review.

The Bill also provides for appeals arising from decisions of a relevant Regulator on the variation of Reference Tariffs, including a decision to disallow a proposed variation of Reference Tariffs during an access arrangement period or to make or substitute its own variation.

It is also proposed to expand the definition of 'prescribed duty' in section 41 of Schedule 1 of the Principal Act to include decisions on the variation of Reference Tariffs under the Code. This will give the Relevant Regulator power to require persons to provide information that may assist in making those decisions.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Explanation of clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides for commencement on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment of s. 11 of Sched. 1—Classification when Ministers do not agree

The amendment provides that the Code Registrar must be notified of relevant recommendations or decisions by the National Competition Council or Ministers.

Clause 4: Amendment of s. 38 of Sched. 1—Application for review

The amendments fix the time for making an application for review of a decision as 14 days running from the day after the decision is placed on the public register kept by the Code Registrar under the Code.

Clause 5: Amendment of s. 39 of Sched. 1—Limited review of certain decisions of Regulator

The amendment to section 39(1) places a person who makes a submission on a relevant Regulator's draft arrangement or revision in the same position as a person who makes a submission on the service provider's proposed arrangement or revision, *ie*, both are able to apply to the relevant appeals body for a review of the decision of the Regulator on the matter. This is relevant where the service provider has failed to submit an access arrangement or revisions as required by the Code.

The proposed new section 39(1a) provides the service provider with a right to apply for a review of a decision of the relevant Regulator under the Code to disallow a variation proposed by a service provider of a Reference Tariff within an Access Arrangement Period or to make the Regulator's own variation of a Reference Tariff within an Access Arrangement Period.

Consequential amendments are made to the matters that may be considered by the relevant appeals body.

Clause 6: Amendment of s. 41 of Sched. 1—Power to obtain information and documents

Section 41 is amended to enable the relevant Regulator to use the powers to obtain information and documents contained in that section for purposes related to a decision under the Code whether to approve, disallow or make a variation of a Reference Tariff within an Access Arrangement Period.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL DISTRICTS BOUNDARIES COMMISSION

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I move:

That this house:

- (a) draws the attention of the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission (the commission) to:
 - (i) the Constitutional Convention proposed by the government; and
 - (ii) the likelihood that the convention will make recommendations about the number of state districts;
- (b) recommends that the commission should complete its deliberations after:
 - (i) the convention has made its recommendations to parliament; and
 - (ii) the parliament has deliberated upon such recommendations; and
- (c) requests that the due diligence required of the commission pursuant to section 82(3) of the Constitution Act 1934 be interpreted in the context of the government's support for the convention and its possible outcomes:

and it is the opinion of this house that if the commission's deliberations are not unduly accelerated, more accurate and more current demographic information relating to population dispersal and trends potentially affecting the boundaries of the state districts will become available to the commission late this year, which will enable the commission to be better able to decide state district boundaries in accordance with the requirements of the Constitution Act.

On 6 February this year the electors of South Australia voted in a general election. That election did not produce a majority for either of the two main parties in the house.

The Hon. Dean Brown: A clear win for the Liberals in terms of the two-party preferred vote.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The result of the election in terms of votes was that neither party had a majority of the two-party preferred vote because four of the seats were won by people who were not members of either major party. If you calculate the two-party preferred vote between the two major parties in the seats that they won, I have to tell the deputy leader that the Labor Party had a plurality of votes over the Liberal Party in two-party preferred terms and—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens and the member for Finnis will refrain.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The deputy leader, who is not renowned as a numbers man, has to do an entirely fictional rethrow of the four seats, and I refer to Chaffey, Mount Gambier, Hammond and Fisher, to get a two-party result in those seats in order to reach the result he wants, which is a Liberal Party majority on the two-party preferred vote of 50.9 per cent. Given that he was a member of the Liberal and Country League at a time when it governed with about 40 per cent of the two-party preferred vote, I would not have thought he had the chutzpah to come in here to—

The Hon. Dean Brown: That is not correct.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Could the deputy leader correct me? I assert that the deputy leader was a member—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General is not debating with the member for Finnis. He is addressing the chair and addressing the house.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Of course I am, Mr Deputy Speaker. I invite the deputy leader to put evidence before the house that he was not a member of the Liberal and Country League at a time when it won elections with a majority of less than the two-party preferred vote.

The Hon. Dean Brown: I was never a member of this house at that time.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: A member of the party.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have already indicated to the attorney that he is not to engage in a dialogue with the member for Finnis and he should not be provoked.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The deputy leader is provoking me by putting words in my mouth. I said that he was a member of the Liberal and Country League, not a member of parliament, at a time when it habitually won office with less than a majority of the two-party preferred vote. From 6 to 9 February both major parties negotiated with Independent members of the house with a view to forming a government.

One of those Independents, the member for Hammond, acted more swiftly and more decisively than the others. The member for Hammond went to both major parties with a comprehensive program of change that would, first, promote open and accountable government; secondly, improve the democratic operation of parliament; thirdly, establish clear plans to address the urgent need of rural South Australians; fourthly, facilitate meaningful cooperation between Independent members and the new government; and, fifthly, improve codes of conduct for ministers and all other members of parliament.

Both parties agreed to these principles contained in *Peter Lewis's Compact for Good Government*. The aim of this compact is to provide stable government that works productively for the people of South Australia. As part of the compact, the government undertook, within six months of the commencement of the 50th parliament, the following:

To facilitate constitutional and parliamentary reform by establishing a South Australian Constitutional Convention to conduct

a review of the constitution and parliament and to report to parliament by 30 June 2003.

The member for Hammond has since been elected as Speaker and, at the Premier's request, has met me to advance consideration of these matters. Today, we are dealing with the processes by which we will achieve a more democratic operation of parliament. We undertook, within six months of commencing the 50th parliament, to facilitate constitutional and parliamentary reform by establishing this convention. One of the issues before that convention is reducing the number of parliamentarians. Tomorrow I will make a ministerial statement detailing the resources the government has allocated to the Constitutional Convention.

Under section 82(2) of the Constitution Act, the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission is required to commence an electoral distribution within three months of each polling day. Section 82(3) requires the commission to proceed with all due diligence to complete those proceedings. It is possible that the Constitutional Convention will propose changes to the number of electorates and, perhaps, even the manner in which the members of those electorates are elected. Now, I am sure, Mr Deputy Speaker, you will recall that in South Australia until, I think, 1938, the house was elected from multi-member electorates. It is possible that the convention could recommend multi-member electorates. It could also recommend a reduction in the number of MPs in the house.

It is the view of the government that to commence a redistribution in these circumstances would be possibly a waste of time. The motion tries to recommend to the commission that it avoid the possibility of deliberating twice on the electoral boundaries within one parliamentary term. If a redistribution were done on the basis of 47 state districts and the Constitutional Convention were to recommend a reduction in the number of members, the commission, on my reading of the act, would be required to do a further redistribution based on the number of members as legislated by parliament after its original redistribution.

So, it is important, I think, that the commission be alerted to the possibility that parliament may change the system of voting for the House of Assembly, or may change the number of single member state districts sending members to the house. We would not want the commission to find itself in circumstances where it was a necessity to do a fresh redistribution. The motion as framed is merely a suggestion to the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission. It will, of course, be guided principally by statute, by the Constitution Act. It is free to give what weight it will to a motion of the house.

It may reject the motion of the house, should it be passed, because it feels it is primarily bound by the provisions of the Constitution Act to go ahead with its work. The opposition asked today: why does the government not write to the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission and tell it the contents of the motion without putting the motion to parliament? The question was out of order and so I was unable to answer it as fervently as I wished to answer it. However, the answer to that question is that in the new dispensation the government respects parliament and it takes matters to the parliament for the parliament's deliberation.

It seems to me that the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission does not so much need to know what the government's attitude is to a Constitutional Convention and a possible change to the number of members of the House of Assembly: what the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission needs to know is the attitude of the house. So, the

government has brought this to the house with no guarantee that the motion will be passed. We put it to the house because we think it is sensible. We think that the motion is also sensible because it adverts to the probability that the commission would gain superior demographic information if it were to delay its proceedings a little.

It would have the benefit of statistics being garnered through the most recent census and up-to-date demographic information that would enable it to do a better redistribution. I would like to congratulate the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission on its previous redistribution, which led to a cliffhanger result in the most recent state election because the two party preferred votes of the two major parties were so close. I put it to the house that the redistribution that was done was in fulfilment of the commission's statutory obligations and was vindicated by the result of the 6 February general election.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION (COMPULSORY EDUCATION AGE) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 4 June. Page 503.)

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I strongly support this legislation, and I am pleased that it is one of the first bills that our new Labor government introduces to this house. It has been a long-time commitment of the Labor Party to raise the school leaving age to 16. In fact, similar legislation has been brought before this house twice: in 1996 when the Hon. Carolyn Pickles was the shadow minister for education; and also in October 2000 when the current minister was the shadow minister.

This legislation is a real signal to our young people that this government cares about and values them. People very often live up to the limitations and expectations that other people impose on them. Several years ago I was doing some research into exactly that, as well as into the educational opportunities of young people. Back in the 1980s, a researcher did a study on two classes of primary school students—one class out in the northern suburbs and another in the eastern suburbs—and looked at the occupations of the major provider of the family in both instances and, some 10 years later, at the outcome in relation to the young people.

Back then, generally, children had higher expectations for themselves than their parents ever did, and that has always been the case in this country until now: parents expected their children to do better. In most cases, they did. In the northern suburbs, where the children came from blue collar families, they often went on to become tradespeople. There was one exception in this class, and that young person went on to become a doctor. In the eastern suburbs, the children also lived up to the expectations of their parents and very often went on to become doctors and lawyers. The exception was one young person who became a tradesperson.

This bill shows our children that we do have great expectations of them: that it is not about where you come from but about what you can choose; and we as a government have a responsibility to provide those opportunities. Our young people are not just our future: they are part of the here and now and they are very clearly our responsibility. We have the responsibility to ensure that they have the opportunity for a decent future. The labour market can be a ruthless exploiter

of people. If you do not make the grade, you just miss out. We cannot afford for this to continue or for our young people to be paying this very hefty price.

Simply because it is difficult is no excuse. Bold new moves—and this is one—take some adjustment, and this government accepts that. But that is nothing compared to the cost both in dollar terms and in human terms if we do not invest in our young people. It is education in its varying forms that makes the difference, and all the evidence shows just that. The higher the level of educational training a person achieves, the greater their chances of not only getting a job and maintaining that job but of embarking on rewarding employment.

We spend so much of our time at work, and I know that members on this side of the house work very hard. I know that some of those opposite might not work quite as hard and probably do not enjoy their work quite as much as they used to, but it is important that, whatever the work you do, you enjoy it and gain satisfaction from it. In developing the skills and abilities of our young people, it is important to understand that one size does not fit all, and this legislation does not try to impose that. However, what it does is require that those up to 16 years of age be enrolled at a school. And this is very important.

They can undertake their educational training in a range of ways either at school or outside the school. However, they have to be linked to a school. This is important not only in educational terms but certainly in the social development of young people. To become well rounded, healthy young people, they need to be able to interact and socialise with people of their own age. I know a young man who left school at a very early age; he was lucky enough to gain an apprenticeship and has made quite a success of his life. However, in social terms he was significantly disadvantaged, because he worked in an area where he was fairly isolated and worked only with adults, so he did not have that very vital social interaction that young people need.

The latest available data from the transition from education to work statistics clearly demonstrates the weak labour market position of young people with low levels of educational attainment. It shows that 12.7 per cent of people who have the highest level of education as year 10 or below were unemployed, whereas people with year 12 qualifications have an unemployment rate of 8.5 per cent and those with a certificate 1 or 2 have an unemployment rate of only 3.3 per cent.

We should not have any of them unemployed, and I think that goes without saying, but it certainly is unacceptable to have levels of 12.7 per cent and invariably very limited opportunities to progress. Within the education system, we need to provide new and relevant learning opportunities, and the retention rates under the previous government were an indication of that—and they were also quite disgraceful. The previous government was prepared to cut our young people loose.

An example of what I think is quite an innovative step in education is Golden Grove High School, which is in the heart of my electorate and which was recently badged as a school of excellence in the arts. Our education minister recently experienced a small sample of the wonderful things this school is doing in that area when she came out last Friday to open the new multipurpose complex. The standards set at this school and reached by the students are outstanding. I was speaking with the dance instructor just after the opening, and she told me about how they have implemented a range of

initiatives to involve people of all ages, abilities and genders. Interestingly, they set up some break dancing to encourage boys, and were overwhelmed with their involvement. They saw an opportunity to ignite interest, and surely that is what education has to be about. It is not just about sitting young people in a classroom and having them recite their times tables or repetitively read texts: it is about igniting their imagination and their interest.

The dance teacher also told me of a former student who for months has been coming back to the school in her work lunch break to train with the dance students. We are often told that young people are not interested in volunteering, and I make the point that this is a perfect example of providing an opportunity for a young person and their grasping it and getting great satisfaction from it. It is also an example of a young person showing leadership to her peers. This is about good citizenship, and it does not develop if our young people are just cut loose and left to wander the streets.

Education is about learning and about developing life skills and life values. The Golden Grove High School's arts program provides a range of subjects: art, dance, drama, music and music technology. Arts leads to studies in design from year 10, which includes craft design and visual art studies at year 12. Multimedia is a new option to art students in 2003. The dance studies take the students through their PES and SACE dance. With drama, the students can study PES and SACE drama and also undertake VET studies in stagecraft, technical theatre and multimedia.

The music course includes composition, solo and ensemble performance, and in music technology at senior school level there is an opportunity for students to work in conjunction with work-based facilitators to learn all facets of the music industry. Extra multimedia possibilities are to be built in as from this year, and students do multitrack digital recording and master to CD on site.

The school has had some outstanding successes. In 2001 the Rock Eisteddfod team was the winner of the small team division. It has entered teams in every competition since the school opened, taking out numerous awards. Several of its students have had the opportunity to work at the Technology School of the Future, and two of them recently demonstrated their multimedia work to the Queen during her visit to South Australia. Four of the students are currently enrolled in the Animation Academy, learning how to design and construct animations for web and for the film industry working alongside experts in the field. Rock groups regularly win prizes at local and state competitions, and a whole range of music groups have developed, including, as I said, rock bands, jazz ensembles, concert bands, a singing group, a guitar ensemble and a brass ensemble. Two of the students from Golden Grove High School were equal first in an international song writing competition and won a recording contract as part of the prize in the year 2000. Not all students will be able to undertake those sorts of courses, and nor will all of them be interested in that. However, it is a perfect example of relevance in education and of harnessing young people's interests and helping them progress in so many ways.

The evidence is clear: there are benefits from staying on at school and undertaking some form of educational training. You only need to ask anyone who has returned to educational training after a period of frustration in the labour market to find that they generally say they wish they had completed their education or training in the first place. I left school at a time when it was easy to pick up a job. You left school at

15 years of age—and I did—and it was very easy to get a job. It was so nerve racking in my mid 30s rolling up to Adelaide University and applying for acceptance as an adult student. However, the benefits of education are not solely confined to employment. As I have said, the broader an education a young person obtains, the greater their capacity to participate in the wider community. There is a correlation between those at the margins of our community and low educational attainment. While other factors are significant, the overriding factor is the inability to meet the educational skill expectations of the community and employers.

Ask any person participating in a re-entry program or participating in an adult and community education program why they are there, and the answer will be inevitably that it enables them to lead fuller lives and be better placed to influence their own lives and participate most fully in the broader community. That is what we must aspire to for our young people. As I said, this legislation is a strong message that they matter and that we care. This government is committed to improving the economic and social outcomes for our young people, and this is about our responsibility to them. Too often we see examples where those in responsibility do not honour that responsibility and then raise their arms in shock and horror that our young ones seem to get into some form of trouble. I commend the minister for introducing this bill and look forward to the benefits that our young people will obtain by staying longer at school.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): I, too, rise to support this bill and welcome its introduction. This may be the first non-procedural bill that gets passed by the House of Assembly under the new Labor government. It will be interesting to see whether this becomes the first non-procedural bill that passes. It is interesting to note that, now we have reached the month of June—indeed, 5 June—we still have yet to pass through the South Australian House of Assembly a non-procedural bill. That may be a record in itself. It is important to focus on what this bill provides for, namely, school children to stay within the educational system until the age of 16 years. It is important to focus on how many young people we are talking about and what their needs may or may not be. We are already in a stage where 95 per cent of 15 year olds are still within the educational system. Indeed, by the time they make 16 years of age they are still at school, with 94 per cent of 16 year olds still being at school; 3 per cent of them are undertaking an apprenticeship or some other form of study, and a final 3 per cent are either unemployed or unaccounted for. Essentially, this bill is dealing with that 3 per cent who are either unemployed or unaccounted for.

It is important to focus on what needs to be done for that 3 per cent. It is all very well for us as members of parliament to agree that that 3 per cent ought to be required compulsorily to remain within the educational system. However, if that 3 per cent are going to remain within the system, what is it that will be provided to ensure that their extra year within the education system is a year that is gainfully spent and to their advantage? It is at this juncture, therefore, that I must pose the question: does a leopard change its spots? I am referring not to that 3 per cent but to the Labor government as being the leopard. I have been here for 12½ years, and I have seen Labor governments treat four alternative forms of education in a way that I think has been savage and inappropriate, and to this day we suffer the consequences.

I remember the fate of Goodwood Technical School—Goodie Tech—at the hands of a Labor government. I remember what it did to that school. I remember that, despite the protests of the public that it should not be closed, it was closed anyway. I remember what happened to Thebarton Tech. Mr Acting Speaker, as a western suburbs representative, I dare say you would probably like to see that back again, but it has gone. I know what happened to Brighton Boys Tech, which later became Mawson Secondary School, a school that I fought to save from opposition during the days of the Bannon Labor government. The public fought to save it, but did Labor listen? No, it closed that school, as well. Yet another one went.

In relation to Labor governments and technical high schools, it was a case of another one bites the dust, school after school. Schools providing valuable alternatives and opportunities for that 3 per cent on which we are now focusing are schools that went, that got closed down. The question that is appropriate to pose, and I pose it of the minister is: does a leopard change its spots? Will the Labor Party of today be different from the Labor Party of yesterday? Has the Labor Party learnt its lesson? Does it now concede that it was wrong to close down technical high schools? That having been done, is it prepared to continue with the work that was undertaken by the Liberal Party when in government of introducing alternative systems? I pay tribute to my colleagues as education ministers, particularly the member for Light, who presided over the reintroduction of vocational training. I know that, as education minister, the member for Light received numerous letters of appreciation from members of the public who saw the vocational education programs that the Liberal government was introducing as replacing that which had been lost, as replacing the technical high schools, as filling the void that Labor had left. It is important that those programs continue.

I have seen another very successful alternative program operate within my electorate, and the program is known as Youth Pathways. Youth Pathways was introduced initially through the Hallett Cove youth project. It was the brainchild of the then coordinator of that project, Lesley Hogson. Lesley implemented a program which essentially catered for those students who had fallen between the cracks. I have to say that not only was the project successful but also it was successful in spite of the bureaucrats of the education department. That program was particularly successful within the Hallett Cove area. Then the challenge came about as to how to associate it with a school. That is something the educational bureaucrats were not particularly happy about. They did not like seeing youth workers interacting with teachers and coming up with joint solutions.

It is fair to say that the bureaucrats stymied, blocked and attempted to stop this program from being successful but, despite that, there were on this side of the house within the Liberal Party champions of the cause, and I pay tribute to both the member for Light and, indeed, the member for Unley, who at the time was minister for youth, who both saw the benefits that could come from this particular program. So Youth Pathways then became not simply a project of the Hallett Cove Youth Project—which, I point out, is principally funded by the City of Marion—but also a program which was part of the Hallett Cove school—an R-12 school—and a program which, therefore, involved education department input. But it was clear that, in order for the program to become more than that, it needed to grow beyond the Hallett Cove Youth Project and the Hallett Cove school. It then

became part of the Christies Beach High School program for vocational training and alternatives and, today, is located at the O'Halloran Hill TAFE side of the Onkaparinga Institute of TAFE.

That program picks up those children who have fallen between the cracks, who have not been able to cope with mainstream education, and focuses on their difficulties and problems: and the focus has to be very much an individual focus, because there are many and varied reasons for young people falling between the cracks of the opportunities provided by the conventional educational establishments. That program has been particularly successful. Young people who have not been able to cope with school, who have not been able to find work and who are within the age groups that we are talking about have, through the Youth Pathways program, effectively found a new meaning to life.

In many cases, they have finished up going back to conventional educational establishments to continue their education because, as a result of undertaking a Youth Pathways course, they have become aware of their true capacity to learn. In other cases, they have found apprenticeships; in other cases, they have gone on to undertake TAFE courses or involve themselves in other areas of vocational training to find opportunities to prosper and develop their ability; and, in other cases, they have actually found employment. I have been particularly delighted to meet with many of these young people at the start of their courses and, first hand, to hear their experiences, their frustrations and their frustrations with the education system and then see them graduate at the end of their course, hear what they have learned, and understand what they desire to achieve. I have found it further rewarding to meet with some of those young people a couple of years later to see what they have managed to achieve.

So, it is imperative that, if we as a parliament pass legislation to compel that 3 per cent of students who are presently dropping out of the education system between the ages of 15 years and 16 years to stay within that system, we provide them with realistic alternatives. But I have to say that, in view of my dealings with the Labor Party in the past, I am not convinced that the leopard has changed its spots. I have seen it close down too many schools that provided opportunities and I have seen it close down too many courses before providing opportunities, simply because Labor in the past has not understood—

Mrs Geraghty: You closed down schools, too. In 1994 you closed down the Holden Hill school—

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The member interjects that we closed down schools as well. If the member had been listening, she would know that I am not referring simply to closures of schools where student numbers dropped: I am talking about the deliberate closure of technical high schools, which is what Labor did. It deliberately closed technical high schools. It was not a rationalisation of schools in an area because students numbers had dropped. I am talking about deliberate, wholesale closure of technical high schools, totally expunging the curriculum offerings. If the member wants to look at the curriculum offerings in schools today compared with the curriculum offerings in schools under the Bannon Labor government—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order! The member will address his remarks through the chair.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Mr Acting Speaker, through you, if the member wants to take up the public debate of the curriculum offerings of schools today versus those

under the Bannon Labor government, I would happily take up that debate at any time and in any place, because the fact is that the curriculum broadening that has occurred in the last eight years under a Liberal government has provided enormous additional opportunities for school students. Curricula have been broadened to the extent that a vast array of subjects that were not offered before are now possible, with subject offerings which recognise the diversity of talent of students and which help match student abilities against those curriculum offerings.

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: What about your retention rate? No-one is left in the schools.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The honourable minister who interjects spent a lot of time in the western suburbs and, indeed, went to the same school that I went to—Henley High School—and I am sure he well recalls the closure of the Thebarton technical school. And I am sure that he recalls the consequences of that. When Thebarton technical school closed, Henley High School was there to pick up the numbers. Kidman Park Girls Technical High School was the other school in the area that closed. So it was not just Thebarton: it was Thebarton boys' and Kidman Park girls' technical schools which both went, and Henley High School—which offers a good academic curriculum—was forced to pick up the extra numbers. However, clearly, one school was not able to offer the complete diversity of opportunity that was offered by Kidman Park girls' technical, Thebarton boys' technical and Henley schools as individual educational units.

Mrs Geraghty: What about your federal colleagues cutting out money to ITABs—that is a good training—

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The interjections will probably continue, but I have heard nobody from the other side deny the fact that those opportunities are gone, and they must be reintroduced. I am sure, Mr Acting Speaker, as a representative of the western suburbs, you will do your level best to help the leopard change its spots. You might have come in late enough and young enough to be able to influence the old leopards of the Labor Party. I will watch with interest: let us hope so. If you are able to do that, there might be a future for the Labor Party. Although, knowing your views, Mr Acting Speaker, I note that they have overlooked you, and inappropriately so, for the higher office, as you probably could have reminded them so often, you are capable of achieving. I will watch with interest to see whether you are able to influence some of the rabble within the government ranks.

However, I support this bill because I do see merit in it, but I see merit in it only if that 3 per cent who are presently dropping out get support from a Labor government as distinct from the lack of support they have had from Labor governments of the past.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I found the member for Bright's contribution most interesting. As usual, the member for Bright had a great deal to contribute to the debate. Unfortunately, his memory is often incredibly hazy, or perhaps he sees an issue through rose coloured glasses. I would like to have a debate with him about cuts to the funding for ITABS, the great training centres: his federal colleagues obviously do not have much commitment to training for young people. But I am sure that is a debate we can have at some other time.

I support this bill. I believe that it represents a significant change in the way we think about educating our children and looking at their future opportunities. It certainly reflects an

understanding on the part of our Minister for Education and this government of the changing nature of our workplace environment. Indeed, our Minister for Education is a very good minister and has, certainly, in the short time that we have been in government, shown that she has an excellent grasp of the educational needs of our children and a great understanding of the expectations of parents.

I know that many of us in this chamber will relate to what I have to say: it was once the case that, when we left school, the level of our education did not really matter, because we were always able to find work. In fact, I recall when I left school that I had about four jobs from which to choose.

Mr Meier interjecting:

Mrs GERAGHTY: No, I was much too young then. So, we had choices in those days. It did not matter if we made the wrong choice because there was always another opportunity. I may be wrong, but I think my father-in-law's first job was with Holdens, and he had that job for a long time. Years ago, most people expected that their job would sustain them for the whole of their working life. Unfortunately, that is not the case these days.

Although it is not too difficult for young people to gain employment after leaving school, it is increasingly evident that the work is, more often than not, casualised: it is often short term or terminated when they reach an age where they are due for a pay increase, which is particularly relevant when they turn 18.

I support this bill because it is about building a future for young people and providing them with the skills to enable them to obtain lasting and, more importantly, meaningful employment. It is about providing them with a competitive edge in the market place. That is very important, because the face of industrial relations in Australia is changing due to national and international forces. By legislating to raise the compulsory school leaving age to 16, the government is creating an educational environment in which young people will acquire more skills before they complete their studies by engaging them in activities which will give them additional time to reflect on their future direction. It will certainly increase the exposure of young people to the opportunities which are available to them and which will assist them in making the very important decisions that they must make in life.

Unfortunately (or fortunately, depending on which way you look at it), a lot of the important decisions that people have to make are made very early in their life. It was not so important when I was a young person, but it certainly is today. The decisions that are made early in life today are often the ones that lock people into lifestyles from which they cannot escape. Sometimes they are fortunate enough to get assistance or opportunities so that they can make a change.

I have mentioned before in this house—possibly in the supply debate—that in my electorate (and I am sure that many members in this place would say the same thing of their electorates) for a long time parents have been very concerned about their children leaving school too early without the necessary skills to enable them to obtain employment and, without those skills, they subsequently suffer a lack of self-esteem and confidence in their own ability.

Over time, many members in this house have talked about the terrible rate of youth suicides, particularly young males. While I am not saying that this bill will solve all those problems, I believe it will help a number of young people—and that is important.

The bill represents this government's approach to redressing the long-term problems caused by a lack of forward thinking in relation to the education policies of the former government. This government is about providing an environment in which young people receive a better education and, as I have said, a greater means of accessing the job market. Importantly, it is also about investing in their future. Regrettably, a number of families are simply unable to guide their children and provide them with the support that they need. Clearly, while children do not have to be at school, they do have to be registered with the school so that they can be monitored and be able to take up other opportunities, hopefully with good mentors who will provide them with advice about the directions that they need to take.

Earlier today, we discussed a motion that the Social Development Committee examine poverty within the regions of South Australia. I am sure that one of the difficulties the report from that committee will expose is the lack of education and support that young people have.

As I have said, raising the school leaving age will not solve all the problems that young people have, but it is a really good beginning, and I support the minister in her endeavours. The parents to whom I have spoken in my electorate have expressed their support for this legislation. Some parents have said there will be a degree of financial difficulty, but they very much welcome the initiative that their children must stay within the education system until the age of 16. Many children have tended to wander away from school and have left school far too early without skills and direction. The parents of those children are more than happy to know that their children will no longer be congregating in shopping centres without any direction and getting up to mischief.

Some support will be provided for the parents, too, to say to those young people, 'The decisions you make now and the direction that you take will have a huge impact on the rest of your life.' The parents welcome the support that this bill will give them to encourage young people to be mindful of their future and to take an interest in it. It is important because we will be engaging them in thoughts about their future as opposed to letting them wander off to get into all sorts of trouble.

I know from my experience with my own two boys, who are now in their thirties. They both—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Koutsantonis): Order!

Mrs GERAGHTY: Yes, I know that it is amazing to think that I have children that age. I remember when my children wanted to leave school that Bob and I were very concerned, because we felt it was important that they had a good education. One boy left school early, but he returned later to matriculate, but my other son matriculated without taking a break. They both appreciate that opportunity.

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

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I support this bill to increase the school leaving age to 16 years and, in so doing, I would like to congratulate the minister on having persevered with bringing it into the parliament. As one of the most important initiatives in the life of the new government, this will certainly have an impact on the lives of many young people. It is a pity, however, that it was not supported in the last parliament as who knows how many young people have already fallen through the net.

Increasing the school leaving age to 16 will not, in itself, change the patterns of behaviour of students who are at school reluctantly, or who believe that school does not offer them anything of relevance. The school leaving age legislation, in tandem with the work of the Task Force on Absenteeism and the Social Inclusion Unit's examination of retention rates in schools, will be part of a multifaceted approach to ensuring that young people have improved outcomes from their years at school.

We need to give young people the best opportunities possible for future employment, although I would like to stress that education should not just have employment as its focus, and that should apply to education at all levels. Education should make people coming through the system well-rounded individuals, able to think and reason and to take up challenges as they present themselves, and also to be flexible in the way they approach things.

Employers in today's rapidly changing world will generally be biased towards those who have a higher standard of education. Competition for jobs is ferocious and it is quite normal for applicants for what might sometimes be considered the most menial jobs to number in the hundreds. Therefore, all things being equal, the education level of the applicant will usually carry the day. Much has been said by opposition speakers about the negative impact of forcing children to stay in school when they do not wish to do so. What a spurious argument! Surely it is the responsibility of parents, teachers, administrators and legislators to ensure that we provide young people with every opportunity to enrich their lives and with something that will benefit them in the future, even though they might question it at the time.

However, I agree that we must ensure that the education system is a flexible one that also promotes children having options in their choice of subjects. It should not stop here. We must also ensure that teachers are flexible in their approach to schooling and that they are given the required training to enable them to be relevant to those whom they are teaching. The member for West Torrens, in his contribution last night, mentioned a teacher who had an impact on his life by making him understand the importance of having a good education, not because she was forced to do so but because she obviously cared about his having appropriate options for his future. I am sure that we could all recount similar stories about teachers who had impacts on our lives, and that will be the challenge for teachers when this legislation is enacted.

I am sure that most of us have heard people say, 'If only I had my time all over again I would have stayed at school longer.' In today's climate of fast-changing information technology it becomes even more imperative to have as broad a skill base as possible. Statistics show us that students who leave school in year 10 usually count among the long-term unemployed.

The legislation itself deals with the mechanics of increasing participation. There is a lot more that needs to be done. Curriculum and organisational arrangements need to be in place to accommodate the disinclined students. Students who are at risk will be provided with one on one case management through the school. Last year some 1 300 15 year old students left the school with no record of what happened to them. That is a waste of talent and potential so needed by the community. Requiring people under the age of 16 to be enrolled in a school will enable the schools, and by extension the community, to play a role in assisting young people make a successful transition to the wider community. It is about giving young people who are at risk of dropping out of

education or training a helping hand. The new requirement attaching conditions to exemptions from school further reinforces the commitment that the community is making to young people. It will no longer be left to parents and young people to plan and develop pathways in the senior secondary years; schools and the community will assist young people and their families to identify education and career pathways that have meaning.

A particular focus will be on communities where there is a demonstrated low retention of young people in the education system. There are some communities where over 20 per cent of year 8 enrolments are not enrolled in year 10. A public education system that allows that to continue is doing its community a disservice and leaving its young people limited scope in the future. I commend this bill to the house and I hope all members will support it.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I did not intend to speak on this bill tonight, but I am happy to rise on this occasion, because I can really see the benefits of keeping young people on for another year at school. I am the parent of two children, one of whom is now a man in his 20s, but I had great difficulties with him when he was in the last couple of years of his schooling. He wanted to get out; he did not like school any more and had had enough. He was a very bright boy, but he wanted to get out from school. Through psychology rather than discipline I managed to keep him on at school, by various comments about 'all I've done for you', etc. He stayed on and completed year 12, but he bombed out completely; he did very little work, which was unfortunate. Now, he is not an old man, but he is in his 20s. In the past couple of years he went back and did a diploma course in aquaculture at TAFE. He frequently said to me, 'I wish I had paid more attention at school. If I'd known I was going to do this I certainly would have paid more attention at school.' He was grateful I kept him there, because he would have had so much more difficulty if he had pulled out at that early stage, at the end of year 10 when he wanted to leave.

I have heard a lot of criticism about this bill and the fact that we are keeping young people on at school when they are ready to get out, but I believe that if we can keep them there for that bit longer not all of them, but certainly a lot of them, may become motivated and change their minds. They will certainly see the advantages later in life. When the introduction of this bill was first talked about in the media recently, Bronwyn Hurrell, a journalist, made me really think when she said, 'I have never met anyone who said they wished they had left school earlier.' That really is the case. How many of us have ever met anyone who said that? We have met plenty who say to us that they wish they had stayed on. I thought her comments were particularly relevant.

Before I came in here I was a TAFE lecturer for 10-odd years. I worked in the vocational education area, which is the transition area. It is really about people who are looking to go back into the work force, who did not have sufficient education and who left school early but came back in later life. Some of them were in their late teens and some were in their 20s, 30s, 40s and 50s.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Ms BREUER: No, I did not have any ex-politicians, but I would have been very happy to work with them.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker: the member for Schubert is out of his seat, as usual, making irrelevant contributions.

Ms BREUER: Now you've sent him back he'll be worse! I worked in this vocational education system in TAFE, and it was really about people getting themselves prepared to go back into the work force. It was a wonderful part of my life, and I really enjoyed what I was doing there, particularly working with women. Most of their families had got to a stage where they were fairly self-sufficient and they wanted to do something with their lives. I watched those people come back into the education system. On their first day I said to all of them, 'I imagine most of you last night woke up three or four times. You were terribly nervous about coming in here today. You probably didn't sleep very much and you thought everybody else would be much brighter than you are and that you won't cope with what's going on.' I struck a chord every time when I mentioned this to them, because that was exactly how they felt. After two or three weeks, when they had got into the system, they realised that they were not as dumb as they thought they were, particularly for women in the maths field. Most women believe they are hopeless at maths, but after they had got into a course like that and had worked at it for two or three weeks they realised that they were not as silly as they thought they were; in fact, they were quite smart, because they had been using maths all their lives.

Another area where it was really good to see people pick up confidence was in the computing field. Most of them had seen their children working with computers and thought they had absolutely no chance of doing anything with them. For weeks they might work away with no idea. Suddenly, however, everything fell into place and overnight they became full of enthusiasm and realised that they could work these computers. So, it was wonderful to see these people getting into this area of TAFE, where they knew they were achieving and performing and getting themselves ready to go back into the work force.

All these people had left school early for various reasons, because as it was quite easy to do. They were encouraged to leave early by parents at home, by the system or by their circumstances. All of them said over and over again how much they regretted that they had left school early. All of them regretted that while they were at school they had not paid a bit more attention there.

I have heard many members from the other side talk about how they and people they know succeeded without the education that I think is absolutely essential nowadays. What we really have to face is that we now live in a different world. Once upon a time you could leave school at the age of 13, 14 or 15 and you could succeed and do quite well with your life, and a lot of us here are probably in that boat. Certainly a lot of people out there in the work force have done very well, even though they left school early. But we are talking about a different generation and a different world now. From now on our children, our children's children and our children's children's children will need an education—a ticket—if they want to get anywhere in life. They will not get jobs without those tickets, and they will not get those tickets if they do not have that basic education—that time at school—to get them through and get them into that system.

When we talk about children staying on at school longer, some particular issues arise for people in country schools. I am sure that some members opposite would have concerns about that, and I am surprised that they have not mentioned them. In the country, it is sometimes very difficult for young people to stay on at school. A lot of the time, the students who are seen as the academic students who will succeed move away from their communities and go to Adelaide to

school, leaving behind a handful of students. Therefore, the numbers in the schools are not sufficient to enable the teachers to provide classes in the required subject areas. There may be only a handful of students at the school, and a teacher cannot be provided for every subject that students want to undertake. This makes life difficult. They often have to go into open access learning, which is a great thing if a student can cope with it.

However, I know there are severe problems—and this is not sexist but just realistic. Young males in particular do have a problem coping with access education. A lot of young people just do not have that self-discipline to cope with it. I have seen it with TAFE and older and mature students, who can cope with open access, but young teenagers, particularly young boys, who can see a lot more in going out kicking a footy, chasing girls and having the time of their life, find that there is a lot more in life than sitting down and trying to discipline themselves to study. I admire those young people who do get through, but it is very difficult for them. They can cope with it later in life, but at that stage they find it very difficult.

So, when we talk about country schools perhaps we are seeing a bit of a problem there, but by this legislation we will make it a lot easier for these schools, because students will have to stay on. They will not be tempted by the fact that they will probably get a job very easily in their community at that age. They will not be tempted by the fact that they may be needed at home to work on the farm property or whatever. They will have to stay at school, so we will probably start to see subject choices, and so on, being a lot easier for school and teachers to cope with. As a result, the kids can be given the subject choices they need.

I am pleased with this legislation; I think it will make a difference. My daughter is in Year 11 at present. She is doing very well, is very happy at school and has absolutely no intentions of leaving school. Many of her friends are coping with great difficulty. There is a lot more in their life that they feel they would like to do, and they are breaking their necks to get out of school. However, they are not old enough yet. If we bring in this legislation and can keep them there for another year, often their attitude will change, and they will be quite happy to stay on and complete their education. I do not see any harm in it. I do not think it will hurt anybody to stay on for another year at school. I fully support the bill.

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): In a traditional Liberal opposition bipartisan way I also rise to support this bill. In fact it is very interesting—

The Hon. P.L. White interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHERE: If you look at tradition and history, you will find Liberal Party bipartisanship going back a long way, whether in opposition or in government. This bill should get pretty easy passage through both houses, on the basis of the policy announcements. I do not want to get into whether we or they went first, but if you look at the policy announcements on the issue of the compulsory education age and the issue of 16 year olds you will see that it was already agreed in principle last year.

It was agreed to because it is fair to say that all members of parliament and, indeed, just about everyone in the community, are concerned about one single factor with respect to young people, and that is how crucial a good, sound education is to their future. Without going back too far into history, most of us in this parliament are of an age where we could have left school before 16—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Some of us did.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Indeed, I did myself initially. We could have left before 16 and taken on anything up to a dozen career paths at that age anywhere. There was not really much unemployment in the 1960s and 1970s in country areas. A lot of my friends and I wanted to go farming, anyway, so you learnt on the job and you did not really see the importance of education, but of course the whole world has changed so much today. I remember many people pointing out to me that it would be a good idea to get some additional education, which I did. But, again, you could do that much more easily in those days than you can now simply because you did not need to have the skills base that is necessary today and a lot of training was done on the job.

We now know that it is difficult enough to survive even the basic management of your own household structure, let alone the work force, given the requirements of all government agencies, such as taxation, and the like. You need to be able to work through a complex spider web to survive in society today.

Sadly, a small but important percentage of students (about 3 per cent) drop out, and the earlier they drop out of education the harder it is to get them back into it. I have seen some great initiatives and I know that the member for Reynell spoke about FAME, which is a project in the southern area. Although it is now headed locally, it was initially established through a brotherhood of the Catholic Church in Western Australia, and I commend them for that. I have seen some great outcomes.

I have also seen the success of the Hallett Cove Youth Pathways program and I commend everyone involved in that. For the last few years I have enjoyed attending the graduation ceremonies which involved young people who were, quite frankly, formerly on skid row. They had given up and dropped out of school as soon as they became 15 years of age. They were headed for a tough life but, because people cared for them, because people showed initiative, and because there were other education opportunities for those people, not in the mainstream, they succeeded.

That was the problem for some of those young people. It was not that they did not have high IQs. It was not that they did not want to do well in their life. It was that mainstream education did not fit their personality. They did not need to have education rammed down their throat in the traditional way; it did not suit them, so they fell out of the system. So, whilst I support the bill, I am concerned about the funding and the initiatives that will go with it, and there is also the issue of support for the teachers.

We are blessed with very good teachers in this state and members have only to visit the schools in their own electorate to see their commitment and to see how difficult it is already for teachers to do what they have to do. Wirreanda High School is one example. It has 100 curriculum choices, so the management planning processes required to make those curriculum choices available are unbelievable for a start. Then, with society the way it is today, not all families follow the traditional model, so some young people bring those pressures to school as well, and the teachers also have to deal with it, which they are doing. Many teachers have told me to support the legislation but they want to put it on the public record, and further, to make sure, that there is more support for this initiative.

I was very fortunate because I attended one of the best public schools in the state, and it is excelling even more today, and that is Urrbrae Agricultural High School, which

is a magnificent high school. It is a centre of excellence now and when I went there in the early 1970s it was a centre of excellence for its time, but it has grown and maintained that position. I remember people who went to technical high schools at the same time. However, the Labor Party decided in the 1980s not to have technical high schools any more and decided that everyone had to become a brain surgeon, to use a cliché often expressed by the member for Fisher. What a state we would be in if everybody did brain surgery! Clearly that is not the way it needs to go. Instead, we need to provide diverse opportunities.

When we revisit the history of the Liberal government—and I am sure that this government will have some positive achievements in its time—it will show that a lot of emphasis was put into bringing back diversification in education. I am particularly proud to mention a school in my electorate, Willunga High School. It offers vocational education and training, it is linked with the Technical and Further Education Centre at Noarlunga and the Onkaparinga Institute of TAFE, and it has a link with adult education. The school's capacity to deliver people job ready for the wine industry in that area is fantastic.

This morning I attended the Farmers' Federation day in McLaren Vale and I saw hundreds of wine grape growers. I shook hands with many young people who have taken on that industry as a long-term career opportunity, and that is by virtue of what the Liberal government did, together with the teachers, school council and TAFE at Willunga High School. That is just one example, but I know from our community cabinet meetings around the state, whether it was Naracoorte, the Mid North or Port Lincoln, that those models are in use elsewhere.

However, they may not necessarily be the models that will best assist in the retention of all young people who, by law, will be required to stay in school until they are 16. I know that the minister has said that there will be opportunities for doing some schooling mainstream, some work experience, some TAFE, etc., and I support that and I agree with that, but I urge the minister to fight like mad for adequate resources. I am sure that, if we were in government and our shadow education minister was the minister for education, she would be fighting like mad around the cabinet table, because I hope that this government has budget bilaterals that involve all ministers around the cabinet table. I hope that it does not have a budget subcommittee that is made up of two or three people.

If that is the case, we will go quickly down the wrong track. I hope that the Minister for Education gets support from her colleagues, because she will certainly get it from everyone on our side, to ensure that there is an adequate budget to bring in more school support officers, who will be needed—make no mistake about it. Even for students who will go into a mixture of mainstream high school, training, that is, work experience, and TAFE, the system will need more school support officers. For that small percentage of students who really find it difficult, who will need a lot of initiative, strategy and support, there will have to be dollars to go with this.

If there is no resourcing of this scheme, in a couple of years' time enormous damage will be done to an education system of which at present no member in this house would say they are not proud. We have always led Australia in education, and I have one child at private school and two at public school, so I can compare the two systems. One reason for that is that now I am not a minister and my salary has

reduced immensely, but for other reasons, as well, the other two children will stay in public school because they are not suited to private school.

I have said to many people who talk to me that, as a father, when I compare public and private schools the teachers are the same. They have all come through the same system. They are all committed educators. In many areas of the public system the infrastructure, in terms of the computer banks in schools, is far superior to some of the private schools. Whether you talk about public or private schools, we have a great record in this state. Let us hope that this initiative, in which, I am sure, we all have heart, is for the right reasons: so that we can see more people in the work force with more disposable income, feeling good about themselves and being net contributors to South Australia.

For all that to occur, I again reinforce the fact that if several million dollars—not just peanuts, Treasurer—is not dedicated to extra SSOs and to support programs, such as FAME and the Hallett Cove Youth Pathways Program, teachers and the Education Department will have a big problem within two to three years.

Mr SNELLING (Playford): I support the bill. Of all the factors that determine a young person's future, the greatest indicator of how well they will do in adulthood is the level of education they have achieved. Young people who leave school early, on the whole, fare far worse than their contemporaries who go on to complete their school education up to year 12 and those who go on to further study. I notice that, under the current law that requires students to stay at school until their 15th birthday, a significant proportion of those students are leaving school at year nine, which is just not a sufficient level of education to enable a young person to go out into the work force.

In the modern economy, education to only year nine level is nowhere near sufficient. I think that this bill is a very welcome move by the government, and I am very pleased to see that it is in fact one of the first things the government has done. Secondly, I point out that, in my own electorate, Para Hills High School has an excellent program which enables students to remain at school and to begin their trade certificate. That school has a fantastic program and I commend the quite visionary principal at Para Hills High School. He initiated this program whereby students who are not necessarily academically inclined can begin their trade certificate, remain at school, and adopt more or less standard work practices.

They are required to work a normal working day as they would in the work force. They start to acquire skills which will enable them to complete their trade certificate and move quickly into the work force. The effect of this program has been that many students who are not academically inclined and who previously were either disruptive or just not turning up to school are gladly going along to school and enjoying their schooling—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SNELLING: —and enjoying their—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr SNELLING: May I continue my remarks, sir?

The SPEAKER: You may when I find the phone that has got to find its way into a bucket. That is highly disorderly. The member for Playford.

Mr SNELLING: This program has had a significant effect on these students. These students will go into the work force with a head start because they will be able to continue

their education and their schooling beyond what they otherwise would have. With those brief remarks, I indicate my support to the house.

Mr CAICA (Colton): I had not necessarily intended to speak to this bill but, certainly, I rise in support of it. What prompted me to speak to the bill was the contribution made by the member for Mawson with respect to technical schools, and the fact that it was implied that that was something that was done some years past by this side of the house when we were in government. I would like to reflect on the honourable member's comments for just a few minutes. The first point I would like to make is with respect to technical high schools. At the time that Goodwood Tech closed it was a technical high school. It was very unfortunate for the students in that school at that time because they were exposed to what was a very small campus. In addition, they were exposed and subject to using resources that were well and truly out of date.

It is interesting because the comments made by the member for Mawson were little different than the comments made by my wife the other night when we were having a discussion at home, namely, the lack of technical high schools that exist within our system today. We were sitting around talking about this with my son James who attends Henley High School, and he did not know what a technical high school was.

He asked the question, I gave that explanation and my wife supplemented that explanation. James said, 'Well, that makes Henley High School a technical high school.' It is a fact that the students of that school have access to all those aspects that were available to students who attended a technical high school. Students at Henley High School have access to courses and classes in woodwork, engineering, electronics and metalwork—all areas which today we would call technical aspects and which will assist students to gain employment in those particular fields.

I would argue that the present system is probably far better than it was in the past because it is exposing students at schools, such as Henley High School, to those aspects, and I appreciated the contribution made by the member for Playford earlier. It is exposing those students to aspects of a broader curriculum that were never available to students at high schools unless they had the opportunity of going to what were in those days technical high schools.

I think that the bill which is before us today and which every member in the house supports looks at ensuring that there is a greater ability to have students stay at school for that additional period of time so that they can be exposed to all those aspects of a broad curriculum, and that can be only a good thing.

The other unique aspect of this bill is that it does not limit students to spending their time at school. We all understand that certain students are ready to leave school earlier than others. This bill allows the opportunity for students to look at and be involved in other aspects of what are clearly part and parcel of teaching and learning, that is, to be able to involve themselves in a contract of training, that is, school-based apprenticeships, similar to the program mentioned by the member for Playford, and involving themselves in other outside activities whilst still enrolled at that school.

I do not intend to speak for any length of time but, again, I reinforce the importance of this bill. This government has brought forward a very important bill in its first period of sitting as the government of this state.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): In closing the debate on this bill, in the few minutes that I have allotted to me rather than go through all the arguments in support I would like to respond briefly to some of the issues raised by honourable members. First, I would like to thank all members for their contributions to this bill and for their support, because this is a very important piece of legislation.

The member for Unley referred to the bill as tokenistic. I think it is quite a significant move forward when you look at the fact that only one other state in Australia has taken this step and when you look at the impacts that the current government is aiming to have on our education system with this move. Many members said that more is required than simply a legislative change. That was a statement with which I prefaced the introduction of this bill and something that the Premier has firmly stated. It is a first but very necessary step, which sends a strong message to schools and the education community about its responsibilities to the educational welfare of all young people, particularly that group of young people who will be most directly affected by the bill.

While I thank members for their earnest contributions, I must say that there were some mixed messages in some of those contributions. A number of members opposite said that we did not need this bill. I strongly disagree with that. In supporting their arguments, they pointed to what they saw as achievements of the previous (Liberal) government and said that all these things are happening in schools. Certainly, a lot is happening in schools in terms of vocational education options. Some schools are doing a very good job in looking after students who are at risk of leaving school early. Equally, a number of schools could improve the service that they give young people, and there is a huge amount of variety across our education system in the support that this group of at-risk children face.

Another point that some opposition members made was that this affects only a small number of students. It is the aim of the current government to see all students complete their schooling. The numbers dropping out of school as 15 year olds may not be immense, but this first step in the government's agenda is really that—a first step in a process of looking at students who not only leave school early but are also disengaged from their schooling.

Our statistics show that we have a significant issue in our schools when it comes to absenteeism, and there is a whole range of reasons why students are absent from school. They are not all truants: there are a lot of family background reasons why students are not in schools. However, there is a significant issue in our schools in relation to absenteeism, and there are some quite direct links between those schools where there are high levels of absenteeism and high levels of students who eventually drop out of school before completing their high schooling to year 12 standard.

There is also a significant issue of engagement of students in their learning. Some of the processes which will be put in place and which address some of the issues relevant to those young people who currently leave school at 15 and are directly impacted by this legislative change will also be to the benefit of a much wider group of students; I make that point.

There was also a line of argument coming from a number of members that we are not ready to go down this path. I say it is time that we took this legislative approach because, quite frankly, both major parties of this state have been talking for quite some time about raising the school leaving age. I appreciate that the Liberal Party has come to this policy later

than has the Labor Party; nevertheless, there has been talk of this move for quite some time. If we are not ready now, you really have the right to ask: why not? This has been on the cards for quite some time.

Perhaps the legislative change is just what is needed for some of the support mechanisms and options that need to be provided to these young people to get them moving. A couple of members opposite mentioned statistics. Indeed, the member for Hartley tabled some statistics. The member for Schubert referred to those same statistics, and for the record I would like to point out that there are statistics and there are statistics. The statistics that were tabled were retention rate figures for year 10 to 12 students in this state.

One of the whole points about those figures, which show a slightly different picture from the year 8 to 12 figures, is that many young people have left school before year 10. Because of our recent changes to the age of entering school at reception level, people are often turning 15 in year 9 rather than, as they used to, in year 10. To simply quote statistics that look at just year 10 to 12 retention is to miss a good core group of the very people whom we are talking about—the 15 year olds who leave school before they turn 16.

Speaking of statistics, something was released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics today, I believe, in a report called *Australian Social Trends*. There is a particular statistic in that report that I would like to share with the house, because it is quite telling. In a national comparison of post compulsory education in Australia—and the age group is 15 to 64 years—of those who did not complete the highest level of secondary school—that is, year 12—South Australia ranks second worst in the nation. That group that did not complete year 12 in South Australia represents 41.7 per cent of the population. That is surpassed only by Tasmania, on 45.5 per cent, and is well above the national average of 36.1 per cent. Those statistics came out today for 2002 and show that our year 12 completion rates look pretty pale compared to what is happening nationally.

Finally, I must correct the record with regard to two of the member for Unley's points. First, he said that this legislation compels a student to attend school. That is not correct. This legislation compels a 15 year old student to enrol in a school. That may mean attending a school or attending some sort of program beyond the school gate; it may mean being involved in an apprenticeship or a traineeship; or it may mean being involved in a TAFE course. Secondly, the member for Unley said that this legislation precludes alternative programs. It does not. Those programs are still available to 15 year olds under the mechanisms of this legislation.

This bill is but a starting point in what needs to be put in place for future options for this group of students. The measures being implemented will have impact not only on the group of students who currently leave school early but also on students' engagement in their learning, and a range of measures will be put forward over coming months to support that. The whole idea of this legislation is to ensure that responsibility is taken for providing individual students with the support they need to engage in their learning and to keep them in education or training until the age of 16 years. I probably have missed a couple of points that were raised. However, if members feel that I have not addressed issues they have flagged, I invite them to raise those issues in the committee stage of the bill.

Bill read a second time.

The SPEAKER: Before the house moves into committee and without wishing to either influence the debate or

participate in the debate on the second reading or in the vote taken at the end of that debate, let me make it plain that, wherever and whenever I think it necessary for me to do so, I will state my own position. In this instance, I do not support the measure. I believe that it goes in the wrong direction. Children of 13 or more years of age—young people—should be required to prove their interest in and commitment to continued learning in order to remain in school. If they do not demonstrate competence at study, it is better that they then do the things which most other members have suggested they will otherwise do, that is, involve themselves in activities off school campus in traineeships, in community service, or in work where they are unlikely to be tempted to disturb and otherwise distract those students who wish to study in the normal way in which schools were intended to provide for learning.

I also believe that none of those students, having left school before they are 18 years of age, should be eligible for the dole without full-time participation in some sort of community service such as cleaning up weeds in national parks, cleaning up rubbish, trapping feral cats, and the like. School is not and should not be used as it is too often used, according to the remarks made to me by distressed parents and teachers, as a simple social experience involving no formal learning. At present, the legislation provides no penalty whatever for those children or young people who, having enrolled, do not attend. Notwithstanding that, truancy will become an increasing problem, and in that respect a bad example. It is for that reason that we will find too many people acting as an oaf on a loaf, or a Jill on a pill for a thrill that ought not to become part of the mores of our society in those teenage years most important to personal development.

Experience in Norway and such places, as the member for Fisher indicated, ought not to be ignored in that respect. Too many of our young people, in my judgment and in the judgment of parents I talk to, and many teachers are, to use an Irish metaphor, punching well below their weight in their commitment to it. To my mind, it is wasting money to simply require people who are not motivated to nonetheless enrol. I thank the house for its attention.

Mr VENNING: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, and I would like clarification. I have been in this house 12 years, and I have never seen the Speaker deliver such a speech—in fact, join the debate—from the chair. I am not saying that what you said was not appreciated, sir, but I should have thought that you would normally go to the floor of the chamber to debate an issue before the house.

The SPEAKER: It will neither save time nor make the words any more meaningful to do it from any other place.

Mr VENNING: Sir, it is just that you create a precedent for that to be an accepted practice for every other Speaker.

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

Ms CHAPMAN: A student presently at school could attain the age of 15 years—say, tomorrow—and would still be aged 15 years on 1 January 2003. If such a student elected to cease to be enrolled for the last six months of this calendar year, with the passing of this bill would that student be required to re-enrol for up to six months of the following academic year until they reached the age of 16 years?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Once the legislation is passed, it will be a requirement to re-enrol if an exemption is not sought. However, a communication strategy in schools will be immediately put in place whereby people in that predica-

ment, and their families, are included in a negotiation process with the school about what they want to do and, if they want to be exempted from that—if, for example, they have already left school—individual circumstances will be worked through.

Ms CHAPMAN: Given that circumstance, is the minister then indicating that any child who has ceased to be enrolled at school for the remaining part of this year and who has attained the age of 15 years will automatically be given exemption so that they will not be required to return to school next year, having already left school?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: There will not be any automatics: it will be an individual process. However, there is a recognition that some people will have left before the end of this year, and some of them will have taken up employment; some of them will have taken up other options (they may be in training) and others may have started employment and fallen out of employment or started a training course and fallen out of a training course. Obviously, those cases will be looked at and negotiated individually. But, certainly, a fairly positive attitude will be taken in this transition period in recognition of the fact that this is a new law that is coming in and some people will have left under the current law.

Ms CHAPMAN: Given the general notice indicated by the minister, will the minister ensure that all children who attain the age of 15 years between now and the end of this academic year will receive a personal advice of the obligation that they will have—independent of educators, teachers and parents—of the necessity to enrol and/or apply for exemption?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The plan is that schools will have a communication strategy for those who are aged 15 years and who are caught up in that transition process, so a communication strategy will be aimed at those young people, yes.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Previously in the debate I heard the member for Bragg talk about compulsory attendance, and the minister said in her closing remarks that that was not quite accurate. When the minister says that students will be required to enrol in a school or a course, how is that defined? Will it be defined in the act? For example, is a WEA course defined as educational, or could it be some sort of apprenticeship or something else?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: There is a current requirement on a number of people who are not physically in schools to be enrolled in schools—for example, those who are in a home school, for example. So, the requirement for enrolment where children are not physically attending a school is not quite new. However, the intention of having those students enrolled is that it is a mechanism by which support for the student can be administered. I assume that is a good enough answer.

Mr VENNING: This will come into operation on 1 January 2003. I am concerned that this bill will become law before 30 June and that we will lose a whole intake of students. If this is worth doing, I do not know why we cannot bring it into operation sooner. Why can we not consider bringing it in sooner? I know that there will be students who are planning to leave school this year at the age of 15 years. If this is brought into operation sooner, the bill will ensure that those students latch onto one of the exemptions that will make sure they are not lost to the education system, so that they will consider a further education option, rather than just walking out of school. Could the minister consider an amendment to bring this into operation, say, in October this year?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: All those things are possible. The reason why 1 January was chosen is that it lines up with the school year. It aligns very well with school planning, ongoing needs throughout the year and enrolments for the next year. This legislative change has been signalled now by both major parties for some time. The question is when it starts: 1 January next year is a convenient starting point in terms of schools' planning and in terms of people's understanding of changes of law. Are they not good enough reasons?

Mr VENNING: I wouldn't die in a ditch over it, but I do not agree with that. I would be very keen to see it amended to include this year so that those 15 year olds leaving school this year would, rather than just walking out of school, have at least to consider the options that are available, or asked for under this bill, particularly if they then enrol in a TAFE course or anything else that might get them exempted from going back to the school that they are currently attending. I do not want to see a whole year's intake of students wasted, and there are thousands of them. I appeal to the minister to consider that. I do not think it is worth our dividing over it, but I ask that the minister consider the option to lock those students in.

After all, we are doing this to make sure that these young students, rather than walking out and being lost, anchor themselves into another leg of the education system. As most members have said in their second reading speeches, there is more to education than sitting in a school, and there are many things in which a student could enrol at 15 years and still be in the education system.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: With respect to the member, if the member and the Liberal Party had supported the Labor bill back in 1996—or, indeed, the Labor bill in the year 2000—to raise the school leaving age to 16 years, we would have saved six or so years of student intakes, in the parlance of the member. So, it is a little strange that the member is talking about wishing for more haste than is provided for by this bill when his party's actions meant that something that could have happened six years ago is being passed through parliament only now.

The other point is that appointments of teachers to classes and allocation of resources in the education system are very much attuned to the start of the school year. Therefore, to me, it makes perfect sense to bring in these sorts of changes at the start of the calendar year. Many of the programs the government is planning to put in place to support these students are not yet in place. To have an immediate start date would mean bringing forward a lot of planning which is presently aimed at the January 2003 start date.

Mr McEWEN: There seems to be some confusion in either the mind of the member for Schubert or that of the minister. I am prepared at this stage to put my money on the minister, but it might be a long-term bet. Will the minister clarify what happens to someone who is under 16 on the date this legislation is triggered? What impact will it have on them if they are not attending school, or registered at a school, on the day this legislation is triggered? This is the point where there seems to be some confusion.

The member for Schubert talked about students over the age of 15, but the bill does not talk at all about students over the age of 15. The bill is far more specific in that it talks about students between six and under the age of 16. It says nothing at all about being over the age of 15. The bill actually works back from the age of 16 and says 'under the age of 16'. Does this catch everyone under the age of 16? If that is the

case, the question asked by the member for Schubert is completely off the mark, because the bill obviously captures them. Do I understand that correctly?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The bill clearly states that the compulsory school age will be between six and 16, so anyone between those ages must be enrolled as of that date.

Mrs MAYWALD: I feel that there is still a little confusion in the minister's answers. If a student turns 15 this year and leaves school at the end of this year, when this legislation comes into effect on 1 January they will still be under the age of 16. Therefore, will the legislation require them to re-enrol?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Technically, that is the question the member for Bragg started with. The answer is yes. However, the exemptions that are available will be used and there will be a communication strategy through schools that will be aimed at the people affected by this measure. Given that it is a transition period—of which I am very mindful—and that young people might have undertaken a whole range of other courses, such as study, training or employment, that is something that will be dealt with via exemption.

Mr BRINDAL: To follow the line of questioning of the three previous members, the minister's second reading speech and most of the contributions from members in this chamber have waxed lyrical about the imperative for children to remain at school until the age of 16. However, because this bill will be implemented by the government on 1 January, there are children who could be one month over the age of 15—

The Hon. P.L. White: Any date.

Mr BRINDAL: Any date—but the point is that this is so imperative that it must be brought in straightaway. It is the greatest thing since Weet-bix was discovered in Australia, if we listen to the minister. Nevertheless, all those kids who are aged 15 but under 16 will miss out. Everyone needs to do it in the future—no-one will have a choice—but when this is brought in a whole class of children, because they have left school, will be exempted. If it is good enough in the future for everyone under 16 to attend school, why is it not good enough on 1 January to require all those children under 16 to be back at school? Because the minister is introducing the bill now, everyone is being given due notice and should know that, if they choose to leave school, now on 1 January the government will implement legislation and considers it important enough to keep them at school until the age of 16. My question is: if this is so important, why are you going to exempt kids merely not to cause yourself a political problem?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: One of the things I clearly stated is that there will not be an automatic exemption for anyone. There has to be a start date, whether it be when this bill is passed or a nominated date, such as 1 January. The date of 1 January makes sense in schooling terms, because it is the start of the school year. It is the time when changes are made to teaching staff, resourcing of schools and when enrolment numbers move the most, certainly at the secondary level. It is a convenient date, and, so far, I have not heard an argument for a better date.

Mr RAU: My question really follows on from the questions just asked about the school leaving age. I understand that the scheme that is envisaged contemplates the act coming into operation on 1 January, as the minister has explained, with the provisions that we are debating tonight becoming operative on—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I advise the member for Schubert that there are no exemptions granted here by the

chair, and that he should be listening to the member for Enfield.

Mr RAU: As I understand the provisions, the act will come into operation on 1 January next year and, once the act becomes operational, the amendments to section 5 of the act require that anyone between the age of six and 16 years must be in attendance at school. The matters raised by a number of the members who have already spoken, as I understand it, go to the question of what happens as a transitional arrangement in the case of individuals who are aged 15 prior to 1 January 2003 and have left school and are then, by force of the act, required, it would appear on the face of it, to return to school. As I understand the minister's response to those questions, she indicates that she will be able to take advantage of the provision contemplated in section 81A, which deals with the provision of exemptions.

It would appear from the wording of section 81A that exemptions, as contemplated, must be issued on an individual basis and not in a generic fashion. So, would it be the case that any 15 year old individuals who had left school as at 1 January 2003 and did not wish to fall foul of this provision would specifically have to draw themselves to the attention of the minister's department in order to avail themselves of the protection provided by section 81A? The second question, which is part and parcel of the first one, is whether there is any thought about a transitional arrangement for those individuals separate and additional to that provision?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: This measure affects an individual whether the start date is tomorrow or 1 January; it just affects a different group of students. If this legislation came into operation tomorrow, there would be a group of students who were 15 years of age and perhaps had already left school at the end of last year. So, no matter what the start date is—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Yes, and the law changes. No matter what start date we put down here, the same issue arises. So, it is not a function of this particular start date, if you follow the argument: it is just a different group of 15 year olds, depending on when their birthday is. There is a very good reason for not having the exemptions as a broad rubber stamp, and that is that the whole intention of the legislation is to offer 15 year olds support. There is a recognition that there will be some young people who have already left school, did not find out about the law and are caught in this transition period. They will be examined under the exemptions, but it will not be a blanket exemption. I think the point that the member for Schubert, or perhaps it was the member for Unley, was trying to raise was that there might be some different treatment of students at this point, leading up to 1 January next year, than there would be at some other time. Not really: it is just a different group of students.

Mr BRINDAL: My second question is this: just about everybody whom I have heard speak on this matter said, in one form or another, that this measure is a desirable outcome in education—and I believe the Australia Education Union has said this strongly—provided it is properly resourced. Since the government has chosen to fix a starting date in this bill, I seek the minister's assurance, on behalf of the whole house, that this measure, when it comes into effect, will be properly resourced as has been asked for by every member of this house as a condition of passing the bill.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Mr Chairman, perhaps I will answer that under an appropriate clause. We will be here all night if we are going to take all questions on this clause.

The CHAIRMAN: I suspect that the reality is that a lot of the subsequent material will be dealt with under this clause anyway.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Okay. There are two things to point out about resourcing: firstly, there is a resource implication. In the lead up to the state election, the Labor Party did attach some funding to this issue. I do point out to the house that the Liberal Party, which had the same policy to raise the school leaving age to 16, attached no funding to its election commitment. Indeed, the former minister said that the funding would come from existing resources, so I point that out while we are talking about funding. So there was that promise. I think you will be happy to see the funding commitment in the budget, which is one month away.

Mr BRINDAL: On this matter—and I am sure the minister will correct me if I am wrong—I seem to remember that in the Labor Party's policy document the figures of 43 full-time equivalent teachers and \$2.5 million were cited. I also remember, from the statistics provided by the minister, or in some statistics that I have seen, that something like 300 students in that age cohort seemed to be unaccounted for. There is something like another 500 students who are accounted for. So, by my reckoning, the approximate number of students whom this will directly affect is roughly 800.

If I did my mathematics correctly, then dividing 800 students by 43 teachers gives a ratio of something worse than 1:25 for this resourcing provision, and that is not taking any account of the unequal spread of these students across all non-government schools in the sector. So, while I will concede that the Labor Party did make promises, and there are not figures quoted here, I repeat my question and that is: will this measure be adequately resourced in the next budget? I am not asking for a figure: I am asking for a guarantee of adequate resourcing because, if the numbers and figures I have seen from the Labor Party are worked out, they do not provide adequate resourcing. It would be a great shame to introduce, in the minister's own words, such an important measure and then under-resource it.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I thank the member for Unley. His commentary is a little rich, given that the previous government promised no resources. However, I will tell you where that \$2.5 million in the Labor Party's election promise came from: it came from an initial figure from the former minister. That was initially what the former minister had said it would cost to implement this measure. Subsequent to that statement by the former minister, he revised that figure and latterly said that the measure would be resourced out of existing funding, so he revised it down. The Labor Party took that figure to the election based on clear public statements made by the previous minister based on the number of students, the salaries—I believe the salary that was used by the former minister was of the order of \$58 000 per teacher—and the figure of 43 teachers. They were the minister's figures that the Labor Party took to the election. I might say that that is not the budget figure that you will see in this coming budget. You will have to wait one month to see what that figure is, but I do not think you will be disappointed.

Mr BRINDAL: I want to clarify something. I am not really wanting to argue about whether he said this or you did that or anything. I just asked a simple question: I want your assurance that it will be adequately resourced: that there will be enough money. That is all I am asking.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: It depends on your definition of 'adequate', of course. In South Australia we have declining enrolments. The previous minister's stated intention was to

fund this measure out of those declining enrolments. That is not the attitude of the Labor Party, but I will say that there will be additional budgetary funding for this measure.

Mr MEIER: I note that this act comes into operation on 1 January. Having listened to your answers in relation to some of my colleagues' questions regarding extra resources and also going back to what some members said in their second reading contributions, I reiterate that it is so important to have the extra resources for this 3 per cent of the school population who do not continue their education through to the age of 16. Recently I asked a year 11 student, 'Do you like school?' The student said, 'Nup; hate it.'

An honourable member: How old was this kid?

Mr MEIER: Year 11, so I assume 15. If this student was there next year they would be affected by this legislation. So, it was pretty obvious that this student is not being catered for adequately at present. If that student was forced to stay an extra year it would simply add a burden to the school; it would probably prove nothing, result in greater failure for the student and lead to more problems rather than solving problems. So, I follow on from the member for Unley, who was asking for extra resources, and specifically ask what measures are being undertaken to introduce additional subjects. It seems to me that for the student I was talking to and hundreds of other students it will be a fruitless exercise keeping them there and will probably create more truants and more difficulties for school principals and teachers—especially if we keep them there with the same subject choices. It is not just a matter of adding extra resources such as computers or whatever. So, I ask whether the minister has considered introducing extra courses into our schools to cater for these people.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Subject choice is an issue that impacts on not only students at risk of leaving school but also a whole range of students, and it is something that I am considering for all students, particularly country students. The member talked about 3 per cent of students being the cohort directly impacted by this bill. I give a word of caution in the interpretation of statistics, because it is apparent that we do not collect good enough statistics to tell us what happens to 15 year olds who leave our school system. Roughly 2 000 15 year olds leave the school gate each year, and we do not know what happens to more than 50 per cent of them. Of those whom we do know go into training, TAFE and apprenticeships, we do not collect sufficient statistics to know in all cases how many remain in those options for any amount of time.

So, I do give a word of caution about referring to a definite 3 per cent of students, because we just do not know what happens to a good portion—more than 50 per cent—of those students. Part of what this bill aims to achieve—having students enrol at a school—is to track what happens to those students so that, if they falter in the course of action they take and they leave school to work part-time in a job and that job falls through, there will be a support mechanism in place around them to pick them up again and help them on another track. So, that is just a word of caution on the statistics. Yes, we are considering not only subject offerings but also support mechanisms in schools, alternative programs and alternative pathways—a whole range of mechanisms. It is clearly not the intention to force children who do not find the current school environment appropriate or inviting into an environment that is unsatisfactory to them. The whole aim is to find alternatives for them and to support them in those alternative options.

Mr McEWEN: In my second reading speech I raised some other issues not only about resourcing but also about the question of classifications within a school that would be used to manage these people, or even the relevance of using a school and whether or not it is something that could be delegated back to a regional office and dealt with in quite a different way. I think you have already said this. Many of these students will never be seen at the school, or they will be managed notionally by an agency that you are calling the school. It is not the role of a teacher; it is not something you would see in a traditional job and person specification that you would see in a school.

The students will not be there and the people who traditionally perform that function in the school will not be providing the service. Also, we are only dealing with about 300 people across the state. Of the 650 who came into this category on 1 March last year, 350 were quite clearly going to get an exemption and, of the other 300, some of them might. I cannot see teachers and schools now providing vehicles and a lot of other things associated with dealing with people away from school. We need to rethink the model that we are going to use to provide this service.

As I said in my second reading speech, I totally support the notion but I do not think that we have thought through the methodology to service this very discrete need to a dispersed group of kids who are quite mobile. The notion of attaching them to a particular school is not workable on a number of fronts.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Something must be cleared up. A number of members have the conception that we are talking about a very small number of children. In our system, a number of children, even younger than 15, are not in our schools. They are of compulsory age but they are not in school. A lot of the measures being planned to coincide with the introduction of this measure to raise the school leaving age will help those students, too. I want to clear up the conception that the resourcing that will go into schools to coincide with the raising of the school leaving age benefits only one particular group of 15 year olds. That is not the case.

Some of the resourcing will be aimed at engaging students much earlier than when they reach 15. I am referring to the middle school years, and even earlier than that, which is the stage at which a number of students turn off their learning. I want to make that point clear: that a number of students are out of school, sometimes for reasons that we do not know about, and we should know why those students are not there. We should know why students are not engaging in their learning. We should address that issue. With the raft of measures being put in place, some of those students will benefit also. I just want to be clear on that. If I understand what a lot of members have been saying, they believe that this involves only a small number of students, but it is much broader. The impact of the measures that will be put into schools as a result of this change, or coinciding with this change, will benefit many students.

Turning to the role of schools, it does mean a change, but I do ask members to consider who else is looking after some of these students. The solution to this problem is a cross-government requirement and that is why the issue of children leaving school earlier and our declining retention rates in South Australian schools are references to the Social Inclusion Unit. That is a mechanism by which the South Australian government can provide solutions in a cross-departmental, cross-agency way.

Mr McEWEN: I take on board what the minister has just said, but what she has just talked about is way beyond what we are addressing here. This is a very narrow and specific mechanism that addresses 650 people based on the briefing that was given by her own department to me last year. I do not have the numbers in front of me but I believe that, of the 20 150 15-to-16 year olds, 650 of them were not in school. Of that 650, 350 were not in school for an acceptable reason, prenatal and postnatal—all sorts of reasons that I went through last night. This particular measure is addressing 300 people only. The minister is shaking her head. It may be in combination with other measures to deal with truancy, underperformance, etc., but this bill does not talk about that.

This bill says that where young people could legally leave school at 15, now they cannot, so for another year we have to provide them with a service. We may do that in combination with a lot of other underperforming or inappropriate measures within the school system, and bulk it up in terms of resourcing, and I take that point, but that is quite clearly way beyond this particular amendment in the bill. You can shake your head, minister, but this bill talks quite clearly about the compulsory education age and about one mechanism only.

The Hon. P.L. White: What is your point?

Mr McEWEN: The point is that you cannot keep saying that within this bill you are going to deal with all those other issues. You have to deal with those other issues anyway. How do you intend to deal with the matter raised by this bill? I do not believe it is appropriate to be tagging this particular group to a school. It is not the appropriate mechanism to deal with what I agree is a matter that must be addressed. But please do not try to capture all the others and imply that they are caught under this bill. They are not.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The clauses of the bill are quite specific. I have been asked about what measures will be put in place by the department and I have attempted to answer that for the honourable member and I have spoken about some of the programs and approaches in broad terms that will be put in place. The honourable member is insistent that this affects only 300 people and in a sense it is irrelevant how large the figure is, but my point about the accuracy or inaccuracy of that 300 is that, first, those figures were revised by the former minister after the briefing that the member was given and, secondly, those figures included people in part-time jobs, and goodness knows what happens to them after that point. The point I made in answer to the member for Goyder's question is that we do not keep sufficient statistics to know what happens, we do not track a lot of school leavers, and I think we should. The point that the member is trying to make is that schools are not the appropriate agency to do that tracking. Is that the member for Mount Gambier's point?

Mr McEWEN: I am suggesting to the minister that there are other more appropriate mechanisms in terms of the classification of the individual, the resourcing of the individual and the basing of the individual, and maybe it would make more sense to deal with this at regional level rather than individual school level. But that is only a suggestion and I do not know how you are going to deal with it. I have not had a satisfactory answer as to how you intend to achieve what is set out here. I agree it is a good idea but I will leave tonight having no better understanding than at the start of this debate as to how you intend to do the job.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I point out that the member for Mount Gambier has had four questions, but the chair is

exceedingly tolerant tonight because it is our first committee stage.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have had questions on this clause and I wonder whether it is appropriate at this point, because of the stage we are at with the bill, for me to foreshadow a proposed amendment, only to the extent of including a transitional clause arising out of the fact that the act will come into operation on 1 January 2003. So, procedurally, sir, I seek your guidance on that. I am happy to read out what I have in mind so that all members are aware of it, given that this has come about as a result of the answers provided by the minister. I indicate that I wholeheartedly agree with the minister. It is irrelevant for the purposes of how we deal with the 15 year old who will be trapped in the interim period. Whether we start this tomorrow or in January 2003, a group of children may be affected in that, during the last six months, they may have left school and will be required to come back. If we have a commencement date at some other later date there will be a transitional period in which these children are captured. I just foreshadow a motion that a transitional clause be included, which I suggest be after the commencement clause and which reads:

Any child who is under the age of 16 years and over the age of 15 years at the date of the commencement of this act and has ceased to be enrolled at a school then such child, on application pursuant to section 81A herein, will be granted exemption, provided that such child is—

- (1) in employment; or
- (2) enrolled in vocational educational training.

I would like briefly to speak to that just to explain, or do you, sir, want a seconder?

The CHAIRMAN: I was trying to listen but I was being somewhat distracted. Does this relate specifically to clause 2 as an operational—

Ms CHAPMAN: That is right. I am happy for the drafters to look at this. It would be an additional clause. It can be new clause 2A.

The CHAIRMAN: In that case we would need to deal with it subsequent to this clause. You will need to move it and put it in writing, but that is your prerogative.

Ms CHAPMAN: I hear what you are saying, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: Is it an amendment to clause 2 or is it, in effect, a new clause.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am suggesting, just for drafting purposes, that it will be a new clause but, if it is going to be accepted, it should properly be inserted after the commencement clause before we move onto the substantive clauses of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN: The honourable member is, in effect, foreshadowing a new clause 2A. I will deal with clause 2 as it stands. We will then deal with her foreshadowed amendment as a separate amendment. Member for Bragg, it will need to be in writing and you will have to move it formally. We are still on clause 2, member for Goyder.

Mr MEIER: I follow on from the minister's answer to my first question, sir. I acknowledge what the minister said, namely, that the 3 per cent perhaps should not be taken as gospel. I was simply using that figure because other members had used it. I had not heard it corrected; in fact, I have not heard a figure other than 3 per cent. However, the minister has pointed out that it is much broader than a small impact and that she hopes to carry out appropriate statistical surveys in the next few years to look at that. In fact, from that point of view, and following on from the member for Mount

Gambier's question, as the minister said, it is much broader than a small impact.

I just hope sufficient resources are being put into it. I am always a little concerned when the answer keeps coming, 'Well, you wait one month for the budget and you will see what we are putting in.' I guess that we do not have a choice, and that is that. The enterprise bargaining agreement was recently signed off with the Australian Education Union. I believe that some 200 extra teachers were committed by the government in that enterprise agreement.

What provision was made in the recent enterprise bargaining process—which was signed off with the Australian Education Union—in relation to 200 extra staff? Are 43 of those staff committed to the extra time that students are expected to stay at school? In other words, is it really only 157 extra staff, or is it 43? In fact, the minister did not identify 43 staff. The minister said, 'We will have to wait and see.' Will they be in addition to the 200 extra teachers who have been promised to commence from 1 January next year?

The CHAIRMAN: There is a point of order. The member for West Torrens.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Clause 2 is about when the act will come into operation. I understand, sir, that you have given members a lot of latitude in this debate, but I would have thought that this question was out of order on this clause.

The CHAIRMAN: I have been quite tolerant because, to a large extent, the subsequent clauses relate to the substance of the operation of the act. If the act is coming into force, presumably you will need resources, etc., to make it operational. I have been tolerant in that respect. I do not think we need to get bogged down too much by being pedantic.

Mr MEIER: I am certainly not being pedantic, sir; however, I respect your guidance. Surely, if we are going to have it from 1 January I want to ensure that it is appropriately resourced. I also want an answer about whether the 200 extra teachers include the extra teachers for this new measure being implemented by the government—either they do or they do not.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The member for Goyder is talking principally about junior primary teachers, who have no bearing on the raising of the school leaving age.

The CHAIRMAN: There is a point of order. The member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: Sir, could you just clarify something for me and other members in this chamber. This bill seeks to amend the Education Act 1972. My understanding is that that means that the Education Act 1972 is laid on the table for the purpose of amendment and, should this opposition choose to do so, I believe it is appropriate to amend any or every clause in the bill if questions are not answered as we want them answered. We could open and amend or seek to amend the appropriate clauses—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I am asking for a ruling from the chair, but the problem is that every member here could open every clause in the legislation and we would be here for three months, if that is what members want.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! I do not believe there is a point of order. We are dealing with the Education (Compulsory Education Age) Amendment Bill 2002. I do not believe it is appropriate to consider every aspect of the principal act.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Well, if the member for Unley wishes to be here all night, we can oblige him.

Mr MEIER: I want to apologise unreservedly. I was under the impression that the 200 extra teachers were across the board. I did not realise that they were only for junior primary. The minister just said that they were only for junior primary. I am sorry. As I read the paper, they were across the board. Is that correct, minister?

The Hon. P.L. White interjecting:

Mr MEIER: The minister just said that they were only for junior primary. She said, 'How can I be bringing that in?' So, I assumed that I was wrong and I am happy to apologise if I was wrong.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! We do not want to get into a debate. The minister can respond to the question if she wishes, if you can call it a question. It was a fairly loose question.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: It was a question about Labor election policies, principally about junior primary teachers, which is not the subject of this bill. The clause that we are on provides a start date in the bill. Members of the opposition have been pulled kicking and screaming into support for this legislation, that is clear. They opposed this legislation once, in 1997, and they refused to support it again in 2000-01. They were dragged kicking and screaming into an election promise to raise the school leaving age but they do not seem to want to do it. They are trying to frustrate the passage of this bill.

If they do not want it, there is the option of voting against it. I did preface my remarks by thanking the opposition members for their support of this bill, but I am not seeing support of this bill in this debate. Members opposite are asking all sorts of questions that have no bearing on this bill, and they know that. There are some questions about enterprise bargaining negotiations that are going on; there are some questions about Labor election promises; and there are some questions about teachers, principally junior primary teachers. They are all over the shop.

I ask you, Mr Chairman, to keep debate to the subject of this bill, which is pretty clear. There are only a few clauses in it. It is about raising the school leaving age, and the clause that we are on provides the operation date for this bill of 1 January 2003.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr SCALZI: A number of these students may well be under the guardianship of the Minister for Human Services. What action will the government take to ensure that these young people will be covered by the act?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Again, this clause is about changing the compulsory leaving age from 15 to 16 years. I do not see why there is any difference in this clause's effect if the child is under the guise of the Guardianship Board.

Mr SCALZI: My understanding is that the passing of this bill would require that a school coordinate students up to the age of 16 years. If these students are not at school but are under the guardianship of, say, the Minister for Human Services, would it be a requirement that those students be coordinated under a nominated school? In other words, will there be provisions to make sure that they comply as well?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: This bill applies to all 15 year olds. The only impact of clause 3 is to change the compulsory school leaving age from 15 to 16 years. This clause does not change the way the law currently impacts on children who are under the care of the Guardianship Board. Federal legislation does not affect children who are in state care. They still

qualify for the same common youth allowance. I cannot see that the changing of the compulsory school age from 15 to 16 years as provided for in clause 3 will change the legal requirements of these children in state care.

Mr SCALZI: So all those requirements will just be uplifted to 16.

Mr BRINDAL: The amendment is to section 5 of the interpretation provision, as the minister knows, and the proposal as it is before the house is to strike out the words 'six years who has not yet attained the age of 15 years' and substitute them for 'six years but under the age of 16 years'. I understand that, but all the work—and the minister would know this—that has been done by the AEU and others suggests that basic skills are best acquired at an early age, that most children, in fact nearly all children, enrol from the age of five and are allowed to enrol from the age of five, some before the age of five.

My question is simply: since the minister has opened this and since this clearly deals with compulsory school age, why has the minister not considered starting compulsory school age from the age of five (or younger), since every educator would say it is more important to have a five year old in school than perhaps to have a 16 year old in school? Quite simply, why six to 16? If the minister is to amend this act, why does she not look at the useful end where children are developing skills and compel children from the age of five?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I do not really want to comment on 'useful ends', but goodness gracious, member for Unley, it has taken our party six years to get the Liberal Party to even come this far; that is, to raise the compulsory school leaving age from 15 to 16. Yet the member for Unley is now trying to suggest that what the Liberal Party really wants is to make the compulsory years of schooling start from five years. It is just too much for one member of parliament to take this shock change in policy from the Liberal Party in one session. It has taken the Liberal Party six years to agree, I think, if the slow progress of this bill tonight is indeed an indication that it will support the first step in addressing the 15 to 16 year compulsory age. I am surprised that the member is suggesting that the Liberal Party has shifted its policy at the other end.

Mr BRINDAL: The minister would do well to remember that I stand here as the member for Unley, not as a member of any political party, and I do not remember in my contribution at any time saying it was a Liberal Party position. I stand here as the member for Unley, and the minister has never bothered to ask me what I think about the compulsory school leaving age, so I find it a bit churlish and childish and otherwise rude to try to ascribe my question to the entire Liberal Party or anything else. I make the point as someone who has been involved in education that, indeed, there was a whole primary first campaign, which I seem to recall the then shadow minister at the time vigorously supported and which, incidentally in my own caucus, every member can say that I supported.

I am saying that, because this compulsory school leaving age is in front of us and because it uses the words 'six to 16', in view of the minister's previous support for primary first and in view of the media's previous statements on early childhood education, why has the minister not changed it from five to 16? I do it in the light of not what the Liberal government has done for the last eight years, but for no other reason than the minister is the minister. The minister is on record as saying that primary education and junior primary education are important. The minister has a chance before this house to change the compulsory age from five to 16.

Therefore my question, which the minister is yet to answer, is: why is she, the minister, not changing the compulsory age range for school children from five to 16 years?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: One good reason might be that, despite the fact that most five year olds are in education in this state—in fact, most four year olds are in kindergarten programs (I think well in excess of 94 per cent of four year olds are in education)—we do not seem to have much of a problem getting six year olds, seven year olds and eight year olds into school. However, we have a very large problem keeping children of the age of 14, 15, 16 and 17 years in education. The member may try to prolong the debate as long as possible, but let us deal with the issue at hand, and that is the raising of the school leaving age from 15 years to 16 years.

Mr BRINDAL: This is my last question on this issue.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Sir, could you remind members opposite that they should not interject? I seek your protection, sir.

The CHAIRMAN: The member for West Torrens will not provoke the member for Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: Thank you, sir. I am not seeking to unnecessarily prolong this debate. The minister, in fact, makes a good point, but I ask her to consider it from the other point of view, namely, that longitudinal studies also show that on occasions children are not enrolled—they are not compelled to be enrolled, as the minister said—until they are six. And she is quite right. Most four year olds are in kindergarten programs and many five year olds are in school. But I recall that the member sitting next to her in her contribution to the debate talked about disadvantaged families, and I know that the minister herself represents some people in this category in her electorate.

There is a considerable body of good scientific study to show that people who are socioeconomically disadvantaged for all sorts of reasons tend not to value education and will enrol their children later. The children who start later, that is, at an age over five years and towards six years, attain a much lower level of education. This means that by the time they are 15 years or 16 years they are the very ones that the minister is seeking to keep at school to get their levels of attainment up. Sir, I know that you went through a lot of different experiences in education. I know where you went to school, and I know that you will know that addressing the problem as early as possible—

The Hon. P.L. White interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I can make a statement or ask a question—is paramount. If it is a matter of resourcing, I would not mind if the minister said, 'We cannot afford to do it at this stage; it is a matter of resourcing.' But I would like some acknowledgment, on behalf of the teaching profession, that the matter of the fullest participation of children from the age of five years is an educationally sound principle and that we should perhaps consider this.

Mr WILLIAMS: I apologise to the minister, because I was unable to be here for the first part of the debate. Some of the matters that I raise may indeed have been covered and, if that is the case, I apologise. However, I am sure if that is the case the minister will dispense with my questions very quickly. The minister said that the Liberal Party is supporting this. If she had heard or read my second reading speech, she would realise that I do not support this measure. I think it is an absolute nonsense, to be quite honest, and I have some very serious reservations about the minister's introducing in this parliament a measure which will have serious ramifications.

tions for the budget when she is unable to answer questions about the amount of resources that will be needed to manage this change to the Education Act. Indeed, she has said that we will get all those answers when the budget comes out. If that is the case, I suggest that the minister should not have introduced this bill, and certainly not have attempted to take this bill through its stages of the parliament, until the budget is handed down. I think it is most unwise for parliament to be discussing this matter on the promise of the minister that all will be revealed in the budget. Basically, we are being asked to approve a matter which will have serious ramifications and which does, and will, require significant resources, not only in a monetary sense but also in specialist resources.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for MacKillop should be addressing clause 3. He can ask a total of three questions or make statements, but they should relate to clause 3 and not recanvass the second reading debate.

Mr WILLIAMS: I take your guidance, sir. Clause 3, by increasing the time at school of a number of students by 12 months, will have a serious effect. I doubt whether the financial resources are available. I doubt very much whether the specialist resources to handle these very special students are available. My concern revolves around the impact it will have on those students who wish to remain at school through the latter years of secondary education, and the disturbance which will be caused by a small number of students in our schools.

I am asking what resources will be made available. We have heard it is estimated that it will take an extra 43 staff. We have heard that the government has negotiated with the union for an extra 200 teachers. There is some confusion, certainly in my mind, as a result of the answers I have heard. Does the extra 200 teachers include the extra 43 for this purpose—or does it not? I understand that the member for Goyder has asked this question several times and still does not have a clear answer to it. I do not have a clear answer to it. Can the minister tell the committee whether the 43 teachers she believes will be necessary to meet the requirement of this clause are included in the 200 staff negotiated with the union; or, following the budget, will there be 243 new teachers in our schools?

The CHAIRMAN: I think the member for MacKillop was ploughing old ground.

Mr WILLIAMS: Am I still not going to get the answer?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The minister will answer how she wishes.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

Mr BRINDAL: This is a repeal of section 77 of the act. Section 77, which covers the power of exemption by the minister, provides:

(1) The minister may exempt any child from attendance at school during any period specified in the exemption.

(2) The minister may, at any time, revoke the exemption granted under this section.

If this power of exemption is revoked, does that mean—and I presume it means—there is no power of exemption and, therefore, there is no longer a power under section 77? Is there any other section of this act under which the minister continues to have the power to exempt a child from attendance at a school—or is it completely out?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: If the member had paid me the courtesy of reading the second reading speech, he would know that this repeal clause should be read in concert with

new section 81A, which is the replacement of this repealed provision.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I simply stood up to apologise—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Unley will make his statement or ask a question.

Mr BRINDAL: I am, sir. I simply stood up to apologise to the minister for not reading the subsequent clause.

Mr VENNING: In relation to the onus of proof in relation to the age of 16, I believe that it is normal that when a child is enrolled at school a birth certificate has to be supplied. However, if there is some debate as to whether or not the student is in fact 16, is an onus of proof involved?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Is the member asking whether there is an argument that a child is aged 16?

Mr VENNING: My question is that if there was some debate whether the child was 15 or 16 does the child or the child's parent have to prove age by providing a birth certificate?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I think that is an argument that would have occurred 10 years previously when the child was six, seven, eight or nine years old.

Mr VENNING: Is that something that would be automatic?

Ms Thompson interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Reynell is out of her seat and out of order by interjecting. The minister.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: All across government people are asked to prove age. The member is talking about students who would have been enrolled compulsorily for 10 years since the age of six. It is not likely that there would be a different approach to verification of records than there would have been for that same student for the previous 10 years.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

Ms CHAPMAN: This clause, as it currently stands, involves section 78 of the principal act, which provides that no person shall employ a child either during school hours or, indeed, outside of school hours in any part of the day or night in the event that it causes the child not being able to get the proper benefit from school: in other words, that the child is working all night and does not get any sleep, etc. Subsection (2) is a very specific provision and relates to the minister being able to grant an exemption in this circumstance. I suggest that the reason it is in the principal act, that is, to provide the exemption here, is that, to the best of my understanding, nowhere else in the act are there obligations on persons externally other than educators, teachers, councils, parents, children, etc.

We are talking about a specific prohibition on any person employing a child, and there is a specific exemption to protect a potential employer by virtue of having this exemption. Indeed the minister can grant that exemption under this clause in respect of a child, which implies that the child or any party can make that application. The reason I raise it is that I seek some clarification as to why the minister considers it is no longer necessary to have a specific exemption clause in this section, separate of course from the general exemption clause where a child or parent or the like may make an application for exemption for the myriad of reasons why that would be made.

Whilst I appreciate that new section 81A, if passed, will give general protection if the application for exemption is granted, why, given that the parent act has a general clause

and a specific one in this clause, are we now moving just to a general clause?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The effect of this amendment is picked up in clause 6. What does not change is the requirement that no person may employ a child of compulsory school age in a way that interferes with their schooling, which is the import of section 78(1). That does not change at all; in fact, it remains. The change is picked up in the general exemption power.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Government Enterprises): I move:

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

Motion carried.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will move to a supplementary question, because the minister suggests that—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, I will leave it as a second question. I am happy for it to be declared that. Whilst the provision for the exemption clause under new section 81A may cover what would otherwise be in section 78(2), that in fact is exactly the same situation that occurs in the principal act, which already had a general clause in section 77 and a separate section in 78(2). The same argument would apply that subsection (2) was not directly necessary, because of course anybody could apply for an exemption under section 77. But specific provision is made in the principal act to enable there to be a protection against usually an employer who may not be a parent from prosecution because that is a specific prosecution clause. So, I just ask what the new element is that justifies removing that separate clause, other than to simply say that it could be covered under the new 81A, because it was clearly covered under the previous section 77.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: There was some background noise, but if I heard the member's question correctly she asked why subsection (2) of section 78 has been removed, and whether it is indeed picked up in clause 81A. I believe the answer—

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Can members on my right please show courtesy to the minister. If they want to talk, will they please leave the chamber.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I believe that the answer to that question is yes, it is indeed picked up in new clause 6, which is new section 81A to the act. It is new subsection (1) which provides that the minister may, if the minister considers it to be appropriate, grant an exemption from a requirement of this part, in relation to a child conditionally or unconditionally. The part consists of sections 74 to 81.

Ms CHAPMAN: That is exactly my point. Section 77 of the principal act, which we are just proposing to repeal, also makes provision for just that. If you have a look at section 77(1) it says that:

the minister may exempt any child from attendance at school during any period specified in the exemption.

It is already there. So, my point in raising this question is to ask why we need to remove section 78(2) because it was already covered in the previous section 77.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: It is just to in drafting, to tidy it up.

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, that is fine.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: It is just in drafting. The same power and the impact of the old section 77 is still there, but it appears in the new section 81A.

Ms CHAPMAN: Actually, it does not have the same effect as section 77, because we are just about to repeal that. It is going.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Section 77 plus section 78(2) are going. There is a new clause, 81A, that incorporates both those powers. So, the new drafting puts two parts that appeared in two separate sections into a new section. It is done in nearly all of the pieces of legislation that come before this house. There is nothing sinister about it.

Ms CHAPMAN: I want that to be removed and I ask the minister to withdraw. I have not at any time asserted that there was some sinister motive. I sought an explanation as to why general and specific clauses should be amalgamated when there had been no mention of it in the debate.

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the minister whether she is prepared to withdraw.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I did not say the member was sinister. I did not imply the member was sinister. I do not think the member's motives were sinister. I apologise if she took that interpretation. This is a replacement of two existing sections with a new section, which has just been drafted in a different way. There is nothing more to the aspect of the topic she is questioning than that.

Mr BRINDAL: With due respect for my colleague, the member for Bragg, it would not be the first time that a minister has come into this house with the so-called best parliamentary drafting available, and this house has discovered some error. I think that is what the member—

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Well, explain the error then.

Mr BRINDAL: I don't know that there is an error, but the member for Bragg is asking—

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Well, what are you going on about?

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Bragg is asking a question and I would like to follow it through. She points out, absolutely rightly, that section 77(1) is a penalty which is imposed on the employer, whether the employer be a child or a parent—that is correct, isn't it?

Ms CHAPMAN: Section 78(1).

Mr BRINDAL: Section 78(1) is a penalty imposed on an employer, whether that employer be a child or a parent. This section is going to be struck out in favour of section 81A, and the minister has read that, which will grant an exemption from a requirement of this part in relation to a child. Is it not true to say that if the court interprets 'in relation to a child' as being an exemption for the child then you will not be able to grant an exemption to an employer who has committed an offence because, with this struck out, it will be an offence for the employer, whether the employer be an adult or a child. If the exemptions under this part—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Whether the employer be a child?

Mr BRINDAL: That is what it says in the act. If the Attorney would give us the courtesy of having read the act before he comes in here he would know that it says—and now the member for Torrens gets up—

Mr Koutsantonis: The member for West Torrens!

Mr BRINDAL: I will read:

Section 78(1) No person (whether or not he is the parent of the child) shall employ a child of compulsory school age.

That is going to remain and the penalty is going to remain. But the new clause says that the minister can grant an exemption from this requirement in relation to a child. It does not say that she can grant an exemption in relation to an offending employer. The member for Bragg makes the point, quite rightly, that if the exemptions can be granted only in relation to a child, perhaps the employer will suffer automatic penalty, whether or not the employment was justified.

It is an important issue, sir, as you and I know, because we are of an age, that this was the clause that was used particularly in hardship cases, where sons and daughters of horticulturalists or people on the land were needed for genuine reasons to assist with family income or family support. That is the purpose of this clause. If, in fact, no exemption power will exist in the new act, perhaps—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No, perhaps Vietnamese parents, who, really needing their children occasionally in the family business for genuine reasons and not being able to be granted an exemption, will face a fine of \$500. That was the genuine purpose, I believe, of the member for Bragg's line of questioning, and that is why I continue that line.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: Part of the old section 78(2) that is removed and finds its way into the new clause 81A is exactly the same in that respect, in that the section previously provided:

The minister may grant an exemption from all, or any, of the provisions of this section in respect of a child. . .

It already provides 'in respect of a child'. The new clause 81 provides:

The minister may. . . grant an exemption from a requirement of this Part in relation to a child—

So, it says that, instead of 'in respect of a child'.

Mr BRINDAL: I absolutely accept what the minister says. I accept her bona fides in this matter, but she, like I, is not a lawyer. I point out exactly what the minister said: that the wording is different. In section 78(2), as it exists, the exemption can be granted to the employing person 'in respect of a child'. In the new clause, the exemption can be granted—

The Hon. P.L. White: No, 'in respect of a child'.

Mr BRINDAL: No, new clause 81A provides that an exemption can be granted from this part 'in relation to a child'. The courts may interpret the two differently. All I ask the minister—

The Hon. P.L. White: 'Respect' or 'relation'.

Mr BRINDAL: Yes. I ask the minister respectfully: will she, between this place and another place, have this clause checked to ensure that she still has the power to exempt parents, or others who legitimately employ children, to whom the minister might consider granting an exemption? The member for Bragg and I ask that she checks this between the houses.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: To satisfy the member, I will do so. You seem to be asking me (and I have already checked this with parliamentary counsel, who is sitting beside me) whether the words 'in respect of a child' have the same meaning as 'in relation to a child' in the new clause. I am advised that they have. But to satisfy you I will ask another legal mind whether they concur in the legal advice I have just been given.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Who will be paying the fine? Will it be the person who is in breach or the parents of the child? Hopefully it will not be the local member.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: It will depend on the terms of the exemption. This clause provides for either conditional or unconditional exemptions. That concept of a conditional exemption is new to this bill. Its purpose is that a child can be exempted for the period of time in which they are complying with the education plan that has been negotiated. So, to give a hypothetical example, you might agree to an exemption for a student who takes up an apprenticeship, but the condition on that exemption may be that, if they fail to continue until the age of 16, the exemption is then void so they make contact again with the school. That is the reason for the conditional exemptions to that.

Mr BRINDAL: In concluding the second reading debate the minister claimed that I was wrong in a couple of my assertions. In her speech thanking members for their second reading contributions the minister pointed out that this act requires children only to be enrolled in schools, not to attend schools. That is what the minister said, and I think it is in *Hansard*. I point out that section 76(1) of the act provides that a child is required to attend a school at which he is enrolled on every day and for such parts of the day as instruction is provided at the school for the child. So, with great respect to the minister, given that I said that this is a compulsory attendance requirement, because enrolment presupposes attendance as provided in section 76(1), I would be interested to see how the minister can come in here and tell this house that I am wrong, when the condition of enrolments is attendance. We come now to the gist of this matter, which is exemptions. Will the minister grant wholesale or specific exemptions? If the minister looks at the general—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Unley has the call.

Mr BRINDAL: If the minister looks at the general definitions in the front of the act, some of which we canvassed tonight, she will see that a school is defined under this act. A TAFE institute and many of the other specialist organisations that have been referred to in this debate are clearly by definition not schools. They are not defined as schools in this act; they are not schools in this act. I ask the minister the following question. If a child is required to be enrolled between the ages of six and 16 years in a school; if the requirement for enrolment then requires attendance at the school for instruction, as provided in section 76(1), how does she presuppose that they can be enrolled at a school and at the same time not be attending instruction at that school but at a TAFE institute, or in some specialist educational institution which is not defined in this act as a school? How will that work? Will they have to be granted general exemptions, or will she defy her own act?

Additionally, as part of the same question, if a child is enrolled in a school but is in fact attending a TAFE institute, where do the resourcing provisions go? The minister knows full well that the resourcing provisions given to every school are based on enrolments. If I have a child of 15 years, whom I enrol in the TAFE institute but who, because of this exemption has to be first enrolled in the high school and then attend TAFE, the enrolment of the child at the school counts as part of the resourcing provision. If I have 24 children at Morialta High School, all of whom are attending TAFE institutes but are enrolled at Morialta High School, the school will get one full-time equivalent teacher and all the ancillary

resources that go with it, despite the fact that those young people are only technically enrolled in the school. I simply ask the minister how I was so wrong and how all these provisions will work.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I will explain the member's query on attendance. The member referred to section 76(1) of the act, which provides:

(1) A child is required to attend at the school for which he is enrolled on every day, and for such parts of every day, as instruction is provided at the school for the child.

If he reads down further, it says that that subsection does not apply in respect of a child exempted from attendance in accordance with the provisions of this part. If the child is not required to attend because they are exempted, section 76(1) does not apply.

Mr BRINDAL: I realise that, but the minister is not answering my question. They have to be enrolled for some reason, but the minister will then exempt them from attendance because they are in attendance at a TAFE college. They will still appear as an enrolled person, so will they get the resourcing provisions because they are an enrolled person? Secondly, how does the minister intend to exempt them? Will she exempt them in blanket form or will she have to exempt every individual child who wants to attend TAFE at 16 years, but is required by law to continue to be enrolled in the high school? First, how will schools be resourced for students who are phantom students? Secondly, will the exemption be granted in a blanket form or will it have to be done on a child by child case?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I have already stated that there will not be blanket exemptions because the individual circumstances of each child are considered. With resourcing, many situations currently exist where children are doing TAFE courses or parts of university courses while still at school. There are aspects of vocational education and training—face to face, on site, off school site and by open access—and funding arrangements differ in all those cases. Arrangement of funding to cope with the variety of vocational educational and training pathways that are and will be available in the future for these students is nothing new.

Mr BRINDAL: As I am a bit slow on these things, will the minister explain subsection 75(1)(b) relating to a child exempted from attendance in accordance with the provisions of this part: what are the provisions of this part that give the minister cause to exempt?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: New section 81A, which is in this part, grants conditional or unconditional exemptions.

Ms CHAPMAN: New subsection (3) is really complementary to the fact that there will now be conditional exemptions, which were not previously available to you as minister. I am concerned because the member for West Torrens raised this point, and it is quite a valid one. Subsection (3) introduces a penalty for someone who might contravene one of the exemptions, but a person can be anybody. Let me give an example. In your capacity as minister, you may grant an exemption to someone who is 15½ years of age, who seeks and obtains full-time employment, and you grant the exemption conditional upon the child giving notice to you in the event that they become unemployed. Assume that is the condition.

What would happen if the parent of the same child makes the application for exemption, and you again grant that exemption conditional upon the parent advising you of the event of termination of that full-time employment, which is the basis on which you have granted the exemption? Does the

minister appreciate the examples that I have just put? In each example, one would be the child applicant and the second would be the parent applicant. In each example, a different person would have the imposition of the condition on them. In the first example, the child would be obliged to advise you and, in the second example, it would be the parent.

Rather than the provision stating that a person must not contravene, perhaps it could be the applicant who then becomes the subject of that condition who is the person who is liable for this penalty. It seems to me that, unless you serve the notice of the application for exemption on another party, that is, the parent, a teacher or some other employer, they could hardly be in a position where they would be potentially liable for breach of a condition if they had not been party to the application. Can the minister clarify that to ensure that, as to the problem hinted at by the member for West Torrens, it is only the applicant who would have the condition imposed upon them who could be subject to that penalty?

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I have sought legal advice and I am advised that the penalty would apply only to a parent or an employer, an adult person, because a child is not considered to have the required legal capacity to form criminal intent. I am not a lawyer, but I see the member for Heysen, who is a lawyer, nodding, so I hope that that legal advice is accurate.

Ms CHAPMAN: I do not want to get into a debate about the legal competency of a child to be responsible, because a 15½ year old is different from a 10 year old or a 13 year old, and the law treats them differently. It is not a question of distinguishing between whether a child or a parent would be liable, as against a parent or employer. I happened to use those examples. The point is that, if an application comes before you for exemption and you impose a condition on it, that condition can only and justifiably be on the applicant. Otherwise, if you are imposing a condition that should require some other party who is not party to that application to do something—if you want me to use a different example—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Members on my left will remain quiet.

Ms CHAPMAN: We can use the same situation of a 15½ year old finding employment and you grant that application to a parent on behalf of that child who is making the application, but you impose the condition of notification of losing the job on the employer; in other words, a party who is actually not a party to the application. I am not distinguishing whether an infant can be prosecuted under this; it is the applicant only who should be liable for a condition being imposed on them, and therefore subject to the opportunity of being exposed to the risk of having a penalty. That is all I ask you to consider, something other than 'a person' must not contravene, because there are other persons who could interfere with that and should not be exposed to that risk. It is 'the applicant' I am seeking to be inserted there, especially if advice is being given about the liability of children.

I think what the minister is saying is, 'I never intended that a child be prosecuted under this.' A child could actually be the applicant before you, as there is no definition of who may make this application. But if you as minister impose a condition, it should only be able to be put on the applicant, and it is only the applicant who could therefore be prosecuted for a failure to comply with that condition.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: One condition that the minister might put on an exemption might relate to a case where the student goes into some form of employment or part employ-

ment-part training, and part of that condition might be that the hours of work not interfere with whatever else is in that education plan—it might be a training course, some school attendance or whatever. In that case, that would refer to the requirement on an employer, which is already picked up—

Ms CHAPMAN: That is the very reason I raised it. The employer in that situation may not even know about the existence of that condition for the exemption. Do you see my point? You are actually potentially exposing to the risk of a prosecution under the act and a fine of up to \$500 a party that is not a party to the application, who may know nothing about the application and is then exposed to that risk because of the conduct of another party, that is, the child not telling the employer, or thinking, ‘You beaut, I could earn a few more dollars this week, I will work 15 hours but I will not tell the boss.’ Do you see what I mean?

It places that third party at risk, because we have just ‘a person’ who might contravene that condition—in other words, someone who might inadvertently interfere with a condition you have imposed. So I am really asking you to consider in that circumstance confining the exposure of risk of penalty to someone who is the applicant, and therefore who must know about the condition that you have imposed.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The honourable member has asked me to consider that case more thoroughly and I am prepared to do that between the houses.

Clause passed.

New clause 7.

Ms CHAPMAN: I want to be brief in speaking to this provision. It has been redrafted, and I assume this to be the wise additions of the parliamentary draftsman. The amendment now reads—and I add this as a caution—as an imposition on the child. Nevertheless, it provides:

Any child who is under the age of 16 years and over the age of 15 years at the date of commencement of this act and has ceased to be enrolled at a school shall, on application pursuant to 81A herein, be granted exemption provided such child is

- (1) in employment; or
- (2) enrolled in vocational education training.

Can I just say something about the format of this provision?

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It has been an interesting evening. I think that Parliamentary Counsel, as I understand it, has developed a polished version, without reflection on the honourable member. Does the honourable member have that copy?

Ms CHAPMAN: No, I have not.

The CHAIRMAN: I seek the indulgence of the committee. I ask for those amendments to be circulated.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am pleased about that, because I was concerned that this is now an imposition on the child, and that is not what I intended. The word ‘shall’, under legal drafting, is not commonly used these days but, if we are going to impose anything, of course it has to be on the minister, not the child.

The CHAIRMAN: If the honourable member looks at the redrafted version, she will see that Parliamentary Counsel has, hopefully, reflected her intent but the wording is significantly changed.

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, I think that covers the matter. I thank the draftsman for his assistance. I therefore now move:

After clause 6 insert:

Transitional provision

7. The amendments effected by this section do not apply to a child who has, before the commencement of this act, attained the age of 15 years if the child—

- (a) has ceased to be enrolled at a school; and

(b) is—

- (i) in employment; or
- (ii) enrolled in vocational education training.

The purpose of this proposed transitional provision is, of course, to cover the children who will be caught by the introduction of this measure in January and who will, between now and then, turn the age of 15 years, leave school and, of course, still be aged under 16 years as at 1 January. As the Minister had previously pointed out, even if the proposed bill were to come into effect tomorrow, a group of children would still be caught by this, and this would be for at least a six-month period predating the implementation of the bill, because those children will still be at risk. Of course, this is of the group of 15 year olds who elect to leave school.

The reason why I raise this particularly is that there is no doubt that there is some notice to the general community that this bill will come into effect. There may be some 15 year olds who think, ‘You beaut, I’ll get out now before I have to stay in school,’ and in fact it might encourage them to go early. I think it is clear from the minister’s answers to the original questions with respect to the commencement date that, whilst it was proposed that there be no blanket approval of those who might have left school and who have a job and are secure in employment, and it is not her intention that she will want to rip these children out of the work force and make them go back to school, she does not wish to have some automatic provision. And I understand that. But I think it is fairly clear that a child who has left school and is in employment, or who has established themselves in some other training, is in the very category of children that we will not want to make go back.

There will be a second category of children (with a number of subcategories) who will leave school between now and January, and who are not yet aged 16 years, because they are pregnant, need to care for a parent or are sick, or whatever other reason: they may, on the application of those special circumstances, apply to the minister and she will consider it on a case by case basis. This is really to cover that group of children who we now acknowledge really should not be having to go through all that process and be at the discretion end. This should be something that is, to use the minister’s words, automatic in those very defined circumstances.

I have included in the proposed new clause ‘in employment’ or ‘enrolled in vocational educational training’ without identifying whether or not it should be full-time. I think there is some merit if others take the view that, if it is employment, it is full-time employment; or if the person is enrolled in vocational educational training—some qualification to that—it is not something that is half a day a week but is of some substance. So, I have not proposed to add to that. But I think the intent is clear, and I am happy to answer any questions about the proposed clause.

The CHAIRMAN: To make sure that everyone is quite clear, this is new clause 7(1). It is the typed version, not the earlier handwritten version, and it reads:

New clause.

After clause 6 insert:

Transitional Provision

7. The amendments effected by this section do not apply to a child who has, before the commencement of this act, attained the age of 15 years if the child—

- (a) has ceased to be enrolled at a school; and

(b) is—

- (i) in employment;
- (ii) enrolled in vocational educational training.

That is the amendment moved by the member for Bragg: 7(1).

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: It is listed here as 7(1), so I am guided by parliamentary counsel as to whether or not we need the (1).

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I see two problems with this amendment, so I am inclined to oppose it. The first problem is that there is no definition, or concept, in this act of vocational educational training. The second issue is that there are many categories, apart from employment or the intention behind the member's amendment under subparagraph (ii) relating to vocational educational training, that crop up under current exemption provisions. They are, for example, temporary incapacity; physical psychiatric, intellectual or learning difficulties; prenatal and postnatal conditions; recent full-time job loss; inability to secure an appropriate place; caring for another; major personal crisis; instability of residence; major disruptions at home; substance abuse; refugees; community service orders; job seeking; and case management. With this amendment, the member is seeking to choose a subset of those that may reasonably be considered for exemption and to make them automatic. My preference is to consider each individual on their own merits, and it is the intention of the government to move towards a more case management system of individual students on this and a whole range of other measures. For that reason, I oppose the amendment.

Mr BRINDAL: I commend the member for Bragg on her amendment, which is in absolute accord with the undertakings that the minister gave to the house, and I would respectfully ask the minister to reconsider at least some of what she just said with respect to the member for Bragg. She did not deny any of the special cases. She said rather that there are two classes of cases, and they are the classes here in this amendment in transitional provision—not forever, but just in transition. She even conceded that between the houses the minister may seek to insert the word 'full-time' before employment and in fact do some polishing up on vocational education and training in terms of time requirements.

I agree with the member for Bragg: I am sure that no-one in this house would be very happy if someone enrolled in TAFE for an hour a week (being 15 and under 16) purely to get out of being enrolled in school. But the proposition put by the member for Bragg was not that the minister should not have the right, in all those other cases she listed, to grant and to continue to grant an exemption or to consider on a case by case basis between now and forever. It was merely to say that in the transitional provision there will be a group of people to whom, being in full-time employment, the minister has already said she would grant an automatic exemption.

The Hon. P.L. White interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Sorry, the minister implied or was sympathetic to their case. I do not want to misquote the minister. In due deference to her—and I know she uses the word 'sympathetic', too—I doubt that she would deny someone in full employment their job to force them to go back to school (I accept that she will do it on a sympathetic basis); and similarly that, if they were enrolled in vocational education and training, she would move otherwise to take them out of there and back to school.

All the member for Bragg's amendment does, with greatest respect to the minister, is try to put into the law (so that this house has some greater certainty than the minister's intent) that this fairly small group of people whose future is

somewhat more certain, who have started on a contrary path or know where they want to go, have choice. They have made a choice to leave school at 15: they are either in full-time employment or in vocational education and training, and the minister has said that she would be sympathetic. All the member for Bragg is asking this house to do is simply say, 'This is what the minister said she is sympathetic to: let's put it in the law so there is greater certainty for those people.' I respectfully ask the minister to reconsider her opposition.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I do not wish to support the amendment in its current form. The member for Bragg has talked about the fact that this will include part-time and full-time employment. I have already raised the issue that there is no definition of 'vocational educational training' in this act, nor is this a definition used in the VEET act, which is the other act that could have been referred to, so in its current form it is problematic. If an amendment is moved in the other house, we will consider it, but, in its current form, the member for Bragg's amendment refers to some inadequacies, and I do not think we should proceed with it in this form tonight.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Bragg put forward a handwritten legitimate proposition. It was then taken away, and I believe that those who have expertise in the drafting of parliamentary law—in, I think, the words that you, sir, yourself used—tidied it up. I can only say that the minister's reason for objecting to this amendment is—to reach a logical conclusion from her statement—untidy in law, and I cannot understand why the minister will not accept this because somehow she feels that it is untidy in law when it has been drafted by people who tidied it up in law.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The member for Unley took a potshot at parliamentary counsel earlier. Now he has taken two opposing positions in one debate, but I guess that is not unknown in this place. What I offer the member for Bragg is a discussion of her concern between this house and the other house, but I do not think that, in its present form, the amendment is adequate even for her intentions. So, I respectfully suggest that she and I have a conversation on this matter in between the bill's passage between the houses, and we can deal with it in the upper house if that is acceptable to her.

Ms CHAPMAN: I think we are at a stage now where the question of what will be automatic exemptions—if I can use that word—as distinct from keeping open the option for discretionary determination of all of the others is no longer an issue for the minister. What we are left with is some support provided we have a clear definition of 'employment' and 'vocational and educational training'. The principal act does not define either of these terms. So that the record is clear, I think the colloquial use of 'employment' is pretty clear from our point of view, and I propose that it refer to full-time employment.

As I said, it is not defined in the principal act. With respect to 'training', I have used the term 'vocational and educational training'. I may be wrong, but I understood that that would cover students undertaking a VET program. However, I foreshadow that students are to be enrolled in full-time training or study. None of these words are defined in the principal act or anticipated in this bill. Unfortunately, the current act does not help us, but I am happy to tidy that up. I think that, if I can have some understanding that otherwise that will meet with the consent of the minister, I will welcome her idea that we confer over this during the course of the passage of this legislation between here and the other house.

New clause negatived.
Title passed.
Bill reported without amendment.
Bill read a third time and passed.

DAIRY INDUSTRY

The Legislative Council passed the following resolution to which it desired the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

- I. That, in the opinion of this council, a joint committee be appointed to inquire into and report on the impact of dairy deregulation on the industry in South Australia and in so doing, consider—
 - (a) Was deregulation managed in a fair and equitable manner?
 - (b) What has been the impact of deregulation on the industry in South Australia?

- (c) What is the future prognosis for the deregulated industry?
- (d) The significant number of opportunities available to the dairy industry as a result of modern techniques, value adding and marketing including those in the proposed industry plan.
- (e) Other relevant matters.

- II. That, in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the Legislative Council be represented thereon by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.
- III. That this council permits the joint committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it thinks fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the council.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.52 p.m. the house adjourned until Thursday 6 June at 10.30 a.m.