

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 25 November 2003

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

Her Excellency the Governor, by message, assented to the following bills:

Authorised Betting Operations (Licence and Permit Conditions) Amendment,

Lottery and Gaming (Lottery Inspectors) Amendment,
National Electricity (South Australia) (New Penalty) Amendment,

Statutes Amendment (Division of Superannuation Interests under Family Law Act),

University of Adelaide (Miscellaneous) Amendment.

NORTH ADELAIDE FOOTBALL CLUB

A petition signed by 825 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to amend legislation to enable the North Adelaide Football Club to continue trading, with a gaming licence, at 255 Main North Road, Sefton Park, was presented by the Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith.

Petition received.

SCHOOLS, PROSPECT PRIMARY

A petition signed by 156 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to reconsider its decision not to fund the redevelopment of the Prospect Primary School, was presented by the Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS

The **SPEAKER**: I direct that written answers to the following questions on the *Notice Paper*, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 4, 28, 32, 118, 135, 137, 140, 156, 158 and 170; and I direct that the following answers to questions without notice be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

HOSPITALS, MOUNT GAMBIER

In reply to **Hon. DEAN BROWN** (16 September).

The **Hon. L. STEVENS**: Based on information provided by the South East region, I can advise that in July 2003 the cost of locum medical specialists was \$37 947 and in August 2003 was \$184 360. I will qualify this by stating that these payments were made not exclusively to specialists brought into Mount Gambier, but also to a number of local existing resident specialists in addition to their existing contractual arrangements.

Additional costs such as airfares and accommodation for this period were \$9 823 for July 2003 and \$14 608 for August 2003.

Total payments for specialist medical services, including additional costs, for these two months in 2003 was \$800 323 compared with \$842 145 in 2002.

HINDMARSH ELECTORATE FUNDRAISER

In reply to **Hon. DEAN BROWN** (15 September).

The **Hon. K.O. FOLEY**: SAPOL received the said information from the Commissioner of Taxation on 8 August 2003.

AGENCY AUDIT REPORT

The **SPEAKER**: I lay on the table the supplementary report of the Auditor-General entitled 'Agency Audit Report'.

The **Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure)**: I move:

That the report be published.

Motion carried.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Consumer Affairs (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)—

Regulations under the following Act—

Liquor Licensing—

General—Gladstone High School

Short Term Dry Areas—Tumby Bay

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

Abortions Notified in South Australia, Committee Appointed to Examine and Report on—Report 2002-03

Institute of Medical and Veterinary Science—Report 2002-03

Southern Yorke Peninsula Health Service Inc.—Report 2002-03

By the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. P.L. White)—

Children's Services—Report—2002-03

By the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Regulations under the following Act—

Native Vegetation—River Murray

By the Minister for the River Murray (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Regulations under the following Act—

River Murray—Protection Areas

By the Minister for Transport (Hon. M.J. Wright)—

Regulations under the following Act—

Harbors and Navigation—River Murray

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. M.J. Wright)—

Regulations under the following Act—

Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare—Chrysolite Asbestos

By the Minister for Tourism (Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith)—

Dairy Authority of South Australia—Report 2002-03

By the Minister for Urban Development and Planning (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Regulations under the following Act—

Development—River Murray.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mr **SNELLING (Playford)**: I bring up the 18th report of the committee entitled 'Inquiry into Supported Accommodation'.

Report noted.

QUESTION TIME

ADVERTISING, POLITICAL

The **Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition)**: Does the Premier still stand by his statement to the parliament in 2001 when he said, 'When we see a politician in a

taxpayer-funded ad, it is just a cheap way of doing the party ads'?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): That was certainly the case back in 2001.

HOSPITALS, INFECTION

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): My question is to the Minister for Health. Has the morbidity rate for new health care related MRSA infections fallen since MRSA closed the cardiothoracic unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in November 2001, and the subsequent review of the infection control ordered by the minister on coming to government?

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, sir. Mr Speaker, is it a requirement of the house that other members be entitled to understand the question, because I do not know what the honourable member is talking about.

The SPEAKER: The perplexities suffered by the member for Unley may not necessarily be suffered by other members and, one hopes, least of all the Minister for Health. The Minister for Health.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I would be delighted to explain the question to the member for Unley. Members will recall that, on coming to government, I ordered an independent review into infection control in our metropolitan public hospitals, and that independent review was done by Dr Peter Brennan. As a result of this review, a strategic operational plan was developed for the control of hospital-acquired infections across the system. This included the provision of link nurses to ensure that proper procedures are in place and to train staff about infection control.

The MRSA report issued by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch for August shows a fall in the rate of MRSA morbidity infections in both intensive care and non-intensive care settings across contributing hospitals. This includes all public and private metropolitan hospitals. The MRSA morbidity rate is a measure of the rate—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS:—just listen—of the new health care related MRSA infections. It is recommended as the primary performance indicator of MRSA infections for external benchmarking purposes, because it is the least likely measure to be affected over time by changes in screening practices, such as additional hospitals implementing increased screening policies.

The morbidity rate for infections in intensive care has fallen from a peak of 40 infections per 10 000 occupied bed days in October 2001 and 25 infections per 10 000 in November 2001 to fewer than 10 infections per 10 000 occupied bed days for each of the last three months. This is very pleasing, and I am sure all members would agree. The morbidity rate for infections in non-intensive wards has halved from four infections per 10 000 occupied bed days in November 2001 to two infections per 10 000 bed days for each of the last three months.

I am advised by the Chief Executive Officer of the Royal Adelaide Hospital that the RAH recognised that the new strategy, which was introduced at the RAH in 2003, increased the detection of colonisation of bacteria on the skin of a patient without symptoms, and this is also reflected in the August report. Increased detection improves our ability to control infections in patients.

The Hon. Dean Brown: Will you table the report?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Yes, I will table the report, absolutely, I said that yesterday. Just calm down, you will get the report. Mr Speaker, I welcome—as should the house—the significant reduction in morbidity infection rates since November 2001, but I caution that MRSA is becoming more prevalent both in health care settings and in the community, where up to 30 per cent of the community may carry the bacteria at any one time. I also acknowledge the interest now being shown in infection control by the shadow minister.

Mr BRINDAL: I have a supplementary question. Would the minister clearly explain to the house: what is MRSA?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: MRSA is methicillin resistant staphylococcus aureus. Perhaps the member, for his homework, could learn to spell the name and perhaps he could look it up on the internet to find the details.

ELECTRICITY CONCESSIONS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is again to the Premier. Given that the Premier said that the government is, and I quote, 'Cutting advertising and public relations to fund schools and hospitals' can he advise the house the cost of the government's current advertising campaign on electricity concessions?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Sir, I am happy to take any question from the opposition about the budget, because one thing this government has done, and will continue to do, is that we can afford the commitments we make. We can balance our budgets, we can make savings, and we can pay for our commitments.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I rise on a point of order. It had nothing to do with commitments the government has made. This is about the cost of the advertising going on at the moment.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I enjoy getting questions from the Leader of the Opposition, who was part of a cabinet that in most cases could never balance their budget, who deficit-funded this state, who had no concept of prudent financial management.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Sir, I rise on a point of order. The question had nothing at all to do with balancing budgets. The question was: can he advise the house the cost of the government's current advertising campaign on electricity concessions? A very specific question and, therefore, debating the question is in breach of standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. What I can say is this: it is a lot less than members opposite spent on privatising ETSA, a lot less than members opposite spent promoting the sale of ETSA, and on all those consultants they used to assist them in selling ETSA. But when we came to office, the Premier and this government slashed the PR budget of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, a budget which from memory—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: An 11 per cent cut to the whole department!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am advised that the Premier's recollection is an 11 per cent cut—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I again rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. I understood you upheld my earlier point of order and the Deputy Premier seems to be defying the ruling from the chair.

The SPEAKER: It appears that the Hon. Deputy Premier does not quite have the figures to hand.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Speaker, as always, I am more than happy to provide information that is requested in this house. But I will conclude on this point: that this government, unlike the last government, will not waste taxpayer dollars, we will spend them wisely, and we will balance the budget. Something members opposite—

Members interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson has no point of order.

MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION SPONSORSHIP PROGRAM

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): My question is to the Treasurer. What are the details of the Motor Accident Commission's 2003-04 Sponsorship Program?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): This is a very wise set of decisions taken by the Motor Accident Commission, as we know. Both governments have done an outstanding job in managing our third party compulsory motor accident scheme.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: You should take over WorkCover.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Take over WorkCover? After the way the members opposite left WorkCover, they should hang their heads in shame. Fancy a comment like that from the hapless member for Waite, who decimated WorkCover and who had an incompetent management structure in WorkCover and a less than satisfactory board.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I rise in a point of order, Mr Speaker. I was never the minister responsible for WorkCover.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport seeks to engage the Treasurer in debate. That comes later. It is now Question Time.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I can understand why the member for Waite would want to distance himself from the last government's efforts with WorkCover. It is pretty understandable. Thankfully, we have a minister who is capable of fixing the mess left by the opposition. As it comes to the Motor Accident Commission, the board of the Motor Accident Commission—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport. The minister will come to the substance of the inquiry.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is exactly what I am doing, sir. The board of the Motor Accident Commission has approved six sponsorships this year. I can advise the house and the public that \$320 000 will be provided to the South Australia Police for the sponsorship of the Traffic, Training and Promotions unit; \$14 000 to the Department of Human Services for the Injury, Surveillance and Control unit's research studies into all motor vehicle crashes involving children aged between four and eight years old and the use of restraints; \$18 000 to Encounter Schoolies Incorporated to provide free bus services to school students participating in the Schoolies Program at Victor Harbor (the member for Finnis will be pleased with this); \$75 000 for the Passenger Transport Board's new year's eve bus services—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —\$55 800 for road safety research to maintain compulsory third party databases for 2003-04 and 2004-05; and \$7 000 to the Compassionate Friends of South Australia Incorporated for the provision of support services to parents who have lost children as a result of road accidents. Sponsorship funds previously committed by the board and committed for 2003-04 under existing arrangements are a \$7 000 grant to the History Trust of South Australia; \$500 000 to the Centre for Automotive Safety Research for a government partnership towards research and automotive safety; and, of course, \$300 000 to the Passenger Transport Board for the Wandering Star bus service, a partnership with Transport SA in delivering late night bus services to the youth market. Any remaining funds are available to support other programs that arise during the year, providing they meet the Motor Accident Commission's sponsorship criteria. I am sure I have the support of all members in what are extremely worthy causes, provided for from the sponsorship of the Motor Accident Commission, a commission that serves our state extremely well.

SCHOOLS, SHARE COURSE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Why did the Minister for Education and Children's Services claim that she had not received any complaints from parents who have their child enrolled in a share course, as she did on *Stateline* when Mr Reinbott, whose son is participating in the program at Port Lincoln High School, has written to the minister three times outlining complaints about the course? On Friday 24 October, the minister stated on *Stateline*:

To date, I haven't had one parent of a child actually doing the course complain to my office.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): The information I gave on *Stateline* was the information that I had to the best of my understanding. From the member's own information I understand that this parent has chosen not to withdraw their child from the program.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader will come to order.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: This person, who I understand approached my office on behalf of a group—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, honourable member for Bright!

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: —represented themselves on behalf of a group.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, honourable member for Giles!

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: I was unaware whether this person had a son or daughter in the course but, from the member's information today, I understand that, even given the option of withdrawing their child, this person has chosen not to do so. There is something wrong with that story.

HOUSING WEEK

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Housing. What is happening in the current Housing Week celebrations?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Housing): Members will be aware that this week we are celebrating our first ever Housing Week to raise awareness about the range of housing and housing services available in South Australia, whether we

buy, build, or rent homes. Running from 21 to 28 November, the week is a Housing Management Council initiative, with some 60 events across the state. The week is also promoting good practice, house design and housing services and the role that these play in creating safe, vibrant and healthy communities.

I take this opportunity to outline some of the events that are occurring. Last Friday's very successful Housing Trust customer volunteer awards recognised the positive contribution tenants make to their communities and neighbourhoods. On the same day, my colleague, the member for Wright, opened the Housing Fair on my behalf and, in particular, acknowledged the contribution of volunteers in our community.

A display at the trust's regional office, the Parks Community Centre, is promoting community involvement in developing reserves in the Parks' Urban Renewal Project, better known as Westwood. A Housing Industry Association event, entitled 'Mini Expo: Tools of the Trade Exhibition', is taking place at HIA House in Hindmarsh and focuses on new technologies and tools for tradespeople in the building industry.

Last Sunday's tour of Christie Walk in the city, hosted by Urban Ecology Australia, featured energy and water saving designs in the ecological housing development movement. We also had the 25th anniversary celebrations of the Residential Tenancies Tribunal, which included information sessions about the rights and responsibilities of both landlords and tenants.

In the member for Giles' electorate, the Whyalla Eco-Renovation Information Centre is demonstrating ideas for home renovators wanting to make their homes cheaper to run and more environmentally friendly. A public forum, entitled 'Affordable Housing: A Vanishing Dream', is being hosted by Shelter SA, the Adelaide City Council and the Housing Management Council. A housing seminar in Onkaparinga is being presented by the Housing Round Table, and this features information about public community housing, private rental, HomeStart Finance and—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order. Interesting though this answer is, the minister seems to be thoroughly prepared, and would this not be better in a ministerial statement than in question time?

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. The honourable minister.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Thank you, sir. The member for Unley would be particularly interested to know that youth housing and aged housing are also part of that agenda. The Housing Trust and Aboriginal Housing Authority have displays and customer events at Murray Bridge, Renmark, Coober Pedy, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta and Elizabeth. The national awards for excellence in community housing, hosted by the National Community Housing Forum at the Adelaide Convention Centre, will be announced, and the other thing we should be very proud of is that the national housing conference is taking place in South Australia. This is co-hosted by the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute and the Department of Human Services. This is the third such major event, following successful conferences in Sydney and Brisbane. All these events will raise awareness about the initiatives that are occurring in South Australia and, on a statewide basis, these events will coincide with the very high profile national event, the national housing conference, which South Australia is hosting.

SEX EDUCATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): What assurance can the Minister for Education and Children's Services give that material intended only for teachers in the controversial sex education resource 'Teach it like it is' will not be delivered to students in this government's trial sex education program? The education minister has told parents that the resource material 'Teach it like it is' is a reference for teachers to use. In a letter to one parent dated 30 October, minister White stated—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will refer to the minister by her title.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you for that correction, sir. The Minister for Education stated, 'These resource books are not used by students.' However, an incident at a Victorian school sparked an angry reaction from parents when a questionnaire authorities say was designed for teacher education was actually given to students. Students were asked whether their heterosexuality was 'just a phase they may grow out of' and 'if you have never slept with a person of the same sex, is it possible all you need is a good lesbian or gay lover?' The opportunity for confusion over the issue was shown when Victorian education authorities said that the questionnaires were not a classroom tool and were strictly aimed at teachers, and the school's principal countered that it was his understanding that it was suitable for students from year 9 up. Following the incident, the questionnaire has been withdrawn and the school curriculum—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order. I was not going to take this point of order but, given the lengthy explanation, I draw your attention, sir, to a motion on this very subject on the *Notice Paper* in the name of the member for Bragg. It seems to be a lengthy canvassing of the issues contained in that motion.

The SPEAKER: The question as I recall it was whether the minister was capable of giving an assurance that would stick with respect to the use of the handbook for teachers in order to ensure that such material as is contained in that handbook did not get to students. The motion, as I see it on page 8 of the *Notice Paper*, does not go to that matter but rather in general urges the government to withdraw the proposed literature and program pending professional assessment.

Accordingly, I do not uphold the point of order, but I make the point that the explanation given by the member for Bragg is fairly wide of the mark in determining a necessity by alluding to events somewhere outside South Australia and, even though it may be Victoria, it might just as easily be Colombia, and for that reason I call on the minister to answer the question.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): Thank you, sir. I did not quite get the gist of what the member was meaning when she was talking about something in Victoria. However, the facts are as follows. There is a teachers' manual and teachers are trained on what is a very delicate topic. This is not the same as maths or English, this is a very sensitive topic; and because it is a very sensitive topic, parents are involved in the decision about whether their teenagers participate in this trial program being conducted in 15 of our public high schools. In relation to the resource material, what neither the Minister for Education and Children's Services nor the Department of Education can control is the circulation of that material by opponents of the program. Opponents of the program

(perhaps one might say in breach of copyright) are distributing material all over the place, so what responsibility does the government have in terms of controlling that distribution?

It is a very hypocritical question from the member for Bragg, particularly hypocritical when this issue was due to be debated on the last Thursday of sitting, but the member for Bragg deferred that motion so that it would not be debated. Why? Because on the weekend members of this house had received a letter from the Australian Medical Association (SA Branch) endorsing the program. What did they base their endorsement on? They based their endorsement on an assessment carried out by someone of their choice and someone they described as being an eminent child psychologist in Adelaide. The whole campaign from the member for Bragg had been undermined. I wonder whether she has explained the fact that she had deferred the motion which she made such a big deal about debating.

The fundamental principle is that sex education goes a long way towards helping young people have the information they need to make responsible decisions about sexual health and relationship matters. That is important because evidence suggests that—and this is quite plainly so—in countries where there is an absence of this information, there are consequences in terms of the decisions that teenagers make. These are very delicate topics and the basis for this particular program is that the government has moved to increase the hurdles through which parents must go in order for their children to participate; that is, instead of all children being required to participate, unless exempted under permission granted and asked for by their parents, for the first time this is an opt-in system. It is only with the written permission of parents that children can participate in this program.

Parents attend information sessions, they are shown lessons and they are part of the development and monitoring of the system, which is more than we have had in this state before. The result is that over 95 per cent of parents are voting to have their children participate in the program.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: So, this is all about parent choice. The opposition members get up and say, 'We believe in parent choice—but not when it comes to sex education.' The decision rightly belongs with families.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The member for Bragg does not like that; that is the way it is. That is the way it will remain under this government and, if the opposition wants to change that, it should do so.

GAMBLING MINISTERIAL COUNCIL

Mr SNELLING (Playford): My question is to the Minister for Gambling. What was the outcome of the Gambling Ministerial Council in regard to limiting the amount of money that gamblers can withdraw from their accounts at gambling venues?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Gambling): It is a great pleasure to report to the house on the outcomes of the Gambling Ministerial Council meeting in Melbourne last Friday, where we proposed to limit cash withdrawals from ATMs and EFTPOSs by gamblers to \$200 in any 24-hour period. Most people would be aware that the current regime is that there is a \$200 limit, but that applies to multiple transactions, so it can be effectively overridden by

someone continuing to go back to the ATM or EFTPOS machine. This measure goes much further than any other state is prepared to go in addressing this issue. We already know from the Productivity Commission's report that this issue—the access to easy credit and also access to your own debit account in close proximity to a gambling venue—has been identified as one of the issues that has the potential to exacerbate the harm caused by problem gambling.

I am pleased to say that the proposal was met with broad acceptance from the remainder of the states. Certainly, the commonwealth had no opposition to playing a role in ensuring that we have the relevant legislative backing to put that measure in place. We received a preliminary report that discussed a number of the legislative options, and now a final report will be delivered early next year on the precise mechanism that may be necessary to implement such a proposal. It is likely to involve the commonwealth's banking powers, which will be necessary to give us the legislative backing to carry out this change. At the moment, there is obviously massive harm being caused in the community by problem gambling. We are attempting to tackle this issue on a range of fronts.

We are tackling it by encouraging the problem gamblers themselves to take responsibility for their conduct; we are looking at gambling venues, asking them to take responsibility for protecting people; and we are also looking at the question of the number of gambling opportunities there are in the community. Each of those three things will be substantially under way by the end of this year.

CLINICAL SENATE

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Health explain to the parliament why, after nominations for the Clinical Senate closed on 15 August 2003, an employee from the Department of Human Services contacted a person and asked them to submit a late expression of interest for the senate, which was then accepted as a late submission and the person was subsequently appointed to the senate?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: And your point is?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): Good question; and your point is? So what? I thank the deputy leader for his question because, following the announcement on 9 November of the membership of the Clinical Senate, the senate is actually having its first meeting today under the chairmanship of Dr Michael Rice. The Clinical Senate was established as a result—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, I did not ask general questions about the senate: I asked quite specifically why a late appointment was made or a nomination accepted for the senate. That is what I wanted the answer to. The question is very specific indeed.

The SPEAKER: The honourable minister will come to the question.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Certainly, sir. Such a tricky question! In putting together the Clinical Senate, we wanted to make sure that we had the very best representation we could possibly put together—

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Bright to order for the last time.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Thank you, sir, for your protection. I really would like to be able to answer the question the deputy leader so much wanted to hear. The

government, in putting together the Clinical Senate, which was a recommendation from the Menadue Generational Health Review, has gone to great pains to get the very best representation of clinicians from across the state.

We have had to weigh up specialists, doctors, nurses, allied health workers, hospital administrators, country, city—a whole lot of criteria to be weighed up, to get the very best representation on this body, which will provide advice direct to the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Human Services in terms of where we need to go in relation to clinical governance for the short to medium term. I might add that, in saying this, the Clinical Senate is having its first meeting today.

I am really pleased to say to the clinicians of this state that, after so many years and so many meetings with me during the term of the deputy leader when he was health minister, when they said to me time and time again that clinicians were completely left out of decision making in relation to the services they delivered, this government has done something about that and has established the Clinical Senate. The senate has its first meeting today and it will provide excellent advice to the Chief Executive Officer for future services. It is just another example of the deputy leader's mean spiritedness: he did not do it when he was minister and he only complains now.

GRAFFITI VANDALS

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): My question is to the Attorney-General. What is the government doing to prevent graffiti vandals from using the internet to publicise and promote their illegal activities?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): The member for Fisher drew my attention to web sites that appeared to have been constructed by South Australian graffiti vandals. They did this for the purpose of displaying graffiti tags and exchanging information about their illegal activities in this state. Both state and local government try to remove tags as quickly as possible in an attempt to discourage graffiti. The material on these web sites suggests that some perpetrators are now trying to circumvent the removal strategy by taking digital photographs of their handiwork before removal crews arrive and posting those images on the internet.

I sought and received advice on the matter. As a result of that advice, I have written to the Australian Broadcasting Authority, drawing attention to the web sites identified by the member for Fisher, advising it that the web sites appeared to encourage graffiti, which is an offence against the South Australian Graffiti Control Act, and other acts of parliament and, in my view, promoted crime, and may be classifiable RC or refused classification.

The RC guideline refers to 'detailed instruction or promotion in matters of crime'. The ABA has statutory power to require the internet service provider, or chat room host, if in Australia, to remove the material. In the case of an overseas provider or host, the site would be notified to the makers of approved filters so that people who choose to apply these filters can be protected from this intrusive material.

If it can be established that the material is or would be classified RC, or even if it is classifiable R but is not protected by a restricted access system, the content provider (that is, the person who puts the material on the net) commits an offence against our Classification, Publications, Films and

Computer Games Act 1995, carrying a penalty of up to \$10 000.

The ABA has a memorandum of understanding with the South Australia Police to govern such situations, so I have asked it to advise SAPOL whether its investigations disclose any offences against that act so that prosecutions can be pursued. I have also advised the commissioner of my complaint to the Australian Broadcasting Authority. Finally, I have written to the Managing Director of Yahoo Incorporated in the United States requesting that it terminate the five web sites hosted by it that feature offending material—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:—the member for Mawson appears to be amused by my missive—and asking that the contents of those sites be deleted. The government will take whatever steps are necessary to combat the blight of graffiti, be it on roadside furniture, in our suburbs or in cyberspace.

GAWLER POLICE STATION

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): Will the Minister for Police advise how many police officers will be recruited for the Gawler police station during the year 2004-05? I have been advised that the Gawler police station is working under some duress. I have also been advised that, when called into other areas, Gawler is left exposed with not one police officer to patrol the streets and leaving the community vulnerable. I have also been advised that often on weekends only one officer is on duty in the station house, which raises questions about the officer's safety.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): Obviously, as a former minister of the Crown, one would hope that the honourable member would recall that, under the Police Act, that matter is the responsibility of the police commissioner. I will say, though, as the question relates to Gawler, that what we are doing, which the former government did not, is building a new police station in Gawler. And this government is recruiting against attrition, which the last Liberal government did not. We are now recruiting 200 more police officers, something that the last government did not do. The last government cut police numbers, it slashed police numbers, it decimated police numbers. The Liberal Party in government was for fewer police: Labor in office is for more police.

POLICE ALLOCATION

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is also to the Minister for Police, and I hope that his memory has improved. Will the minister advise the house how many of the 200 additional police scheduled to start work in 2004 will be allocated to rural areas? I have been advised that, despite repeated requests from regional stations and constituents, the Minister for Police has already declared that none of the additional police scheduled to start in 2004 will be allocated for permanent placement in regional towns. The police association had identified its highest priority to be placement of police in regional areas.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): I am not sure to what the honourable member refers because, as I just outlined to the house, it is not my job to allocate police in South Australia: that is, by law, the responsibility of the police commissioner. We will recruit 200 more police. We have indicated that a large number of those officers will be put into patrols, organised crime (bikie gangs) and country

relief—a series of categories. But individual allocations for individual LSAs (local service areas) by law is a matter for the police commissioner. If the Leader of the Opposition is suggesting that he does not have confidence in the police commissioner to make that decision—if that is what he is saying—he should stand in this place and say so.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I rise on a point of order, sir. The implication by the minister that we do not have confidence in the commissioner is an untruth.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I have a supplementary question to the Minister for Police. Why has the minister just told the house that it is totally up to the police, when he stated to the media—and I will quote from a local paper in my area:

Although State Premier Mike Rann has promised that the government will recruit an extra 200 police, according to Police Minister Kevin Foley these officers are unlikely to swell rural numbers. Mr Foley said the increase was set to provide extra patrols and staffing for metropolitan Adelaide while only offering more police for relief in regional stations but not for permanent placements.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am not quite sure what the stunning comment is but, again, I repeat: 200 extra police officers, and we indicated in our release the areas where those police will be deployed. But as for the individual police stations, the individual LSAs, the individual functions, that is a matter for the police commissioner.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I have made it very clear. We are recruiting 200 extra police officers. They are for designated functions. It is for the police commissioner to determine exactly what those functions are and where those officers should be deployed.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I have a further supplementary question. Given that the minister said that he could not instruct the police commissioner at all, why is now telling us that it was designated where those police could be used?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Because the police commissioner designated them.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: No, you said you designated them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The decision to recruit 200 officers was a decision taken by the government in consultation with the police commissioner. The police commissioner advised the government where he thought those resources should be allocated. We agreed with the commissioner: if that is where these resources should be deployed, fine. But it is not for the government to hand-pick exactly where these officers should be deployed, or to say this station or that station, this area or that area. We agreed with the police commissioner's determination as to where these should be allocated: LSAs, rural relief, organised crime, criminal intelligence—from memory those are the types of categories that were allocated.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Complain to the commissioner. Go and complain to the commissioner.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Exactly. If you are not happy with the determination taken, complain to the commissioner.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Only the Liberal Party could complain about an extra 200 police officers. They cut police numbers; they want fewer police—

Mr Brindal: We did not, and you know it.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, you did. The Liberal Party cut police numbers, and what they cannot accept and what they cannot live with is that we have done what they could not or would not do. We have increased police numbers and we are proud of it.

PLASTIC SHOPPING BAGS

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Can the minister give details of what assistance will be offered to councils that take up his challenge to remove free plastic supermarket shopping bags from the retail outlets in their areas?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the member for his interest in this issue. I am very pleased to be able to advise the house what is happening in relation to the challenge the government gave to local councils to remove plastic bags from their areas. Earlier this year, as members would know, Australian environment ministers agreed to phase out plastic supermarket single-use shopping bags within five years, but we wanted to begin the phase out as soon as possible, and so I wrote to the local councils.

I can announce that Yankalilla council is planning to be the first plastic shopping bag-free council in Australia from 1 January 2004, and I congratulate that council for responding so quickly to the challenge that was put to them. I know that they have been in consultation with local businesses. Yankalilla has also been chosen by KESAB as the first participant in its 'Good Buy Bag' campaign, which will be launched next week. The 'Good Buy Bag' campaign will be a central point from which councils and community groups can order calico bags for distribution to their communities. The key to the 'Good Buy Bag' campaign is business support. Yankalilla has 36 local businesses that will go bag-free and a further 15 businesses that are already bag-free.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: We will get it across the state. With funding from the state government, Zero Waste SA will assist Planet Ark and KESAB to provide free calico or paper bags to all households in participating council areas. To make sure people understand why the plastic bags have disappeared from their local supermarket, Zero Waste will also assist Planet Ark in distributing the community education material described as the Plastic Bag Free Town campaign. I will be making available in the near future a full list of the councils involved.

WORLD CONGRESS ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY 2002

Mr CAICA (Colton): My question is to the Minister for Science and Information Economy. What are some of the benefits gained from the grants made available from the success of the World Congress on Information Technology 2002?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Science and Information Economy): I thank the member for Colton for his question. As you will recall, the world congress took place in March 2002 and was an event that occupied a very difficult time within the calendar. It had arisen with a stellar

representation around the world including, of course, the ex-president of the United States, Bill Clinton. It occurred, however, very soon after September 11 and the atrocities leading up to an era of marked terrorism and increasing expectation of a war in Iraq. It was through some extraordinary marketing and planning that a profit was made from the event. We should commend those people involved in organising the event, because there were doom-sayers around who believed that it would be an enormous failure. That was not the truth, because it allowed opportunities for showcasing IT companies in the state and our capability in a business sense.

Over and above that, a profit was made and that money was used as a legacy fund for the industry in our state. The Financial Legacy Grant Scheme that was set up had \$171 000 to give to industry and community groups, and the fund was administered by the South Australian IT Council. They developed a process that would allow the growth of the information technology industry and to advantage people who would otherwise be disadvantaged in the global information knowledge-based economy. Two rounds of funding grants were given. In the first grant funding round in August, \$88 000 was distributed and more recently—last week—a further \$83 000 was given out; in toto 15 grants were awarded.

All the funds that received the money in the last round—that was eight organisations—represented collaborative partnerships between industry, learning institutions and community groups. The decision to fund these projects was as a legacy to offer increased employment opportunities and training through the sector. The grants were also instituted as a long-term investment to give us market competitiveness and provide more exposure to IT as an attractive career option. Interestingly, there have been benefits already. From the first round of legacy grants that were given out in August—and this would interest the member from Mount Gambier—one of the more effective programs was an Agricultural and Horticultural Society fund, which was set up to deliver a component called ‘On with the Show: This is it.’

One of the big challenges in our community is to encourage young people to take up science and IT careers. As we know, these areas are under-subscribed. In fact, over the last 10 years, there has been a 50 per cent drop in people with a science SACE presenting to post-school qualifications and employment opportunities. This is clearly a major impediment to the development of the IT and science sectors in our state. One of the interesting areas that this money focused upon was finding ways to encourage young people to go into this sector.

The ‘On with the show: this is IT’ project was a promotion to encourage IT skills development. It was very successful in that there were 177 entries. Given time, I am happy to give members their names.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I rise on a point of order. I ask about the relevance with respect to the question (standing order 98), or is this just talking out question time, Mr Speaker?

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister is addressing the matter about which the inquiry was made by the member for Colton. I remind the member for Mawson and other honourable members that it is in their hands, not mine.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. If I could continue—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright might find it more comfortable to be elsewhere if she persists with that line of behaviour.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Thank you, Mr Speaker—to respond to the question from the member for Colton, who is keenly interested in IT futures and science in this community. The Legacy funds from the World Congress on IT were interesting, and I gave as an example the project in Mount Gambier which, as I said, had 177 entries received from students in nine schools from the South-East. What was interesting was that it was really a pilot project which subsequently won an Education Partnerships Award at a recent South-East Education and Training Association awards ceremony. So, the Legacy funding has already paid dividends in the short term and has allowed young people to fulfil their potential and consider taking up this industry opportunity.

One of the other second round winners (and I will not give the details of all 15 programs) was the Technology Education Network, which was particularly interesting because it was established as a scholarship program to attract young women from secondary schools into the IT industry. Members will understand that there is a ‘geek’ image in the IT sector, whereby young women are reluctant to go not only into programming but into all sorts of computer activities, or to be involved in multimedia projects as well. So, it was an important program to produce gender equity in the industry.

I am also pleased to announce that the other program was from the northern suburbs, namely, the Morella Community House and the Pooraka Farm Neighbourhood House project. This was particularly important, because it attacked those issues associated with the digital divide, whereby many members of our community are disadvantaged in not only using the IT sector, both for private and professional usage, but also are having difficulty getting into the industry and receiving ongoing education. This program has been successful and focuses on the northern suburbs.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, sir, is it possible to appeal to you, as Speaker, for clemency on behalf of this side of the house?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley cannot be suffering. From the substance of the reply, there must be some other malady.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I have every optimism that the second round of Legacy grants will continue to produce benefits for young South Australians. I think that, whilst it may be a matter of hilarity for members of the opposition (and I am sorry for the weakness felt by the member for Unley), they have to understand that we have issues of equity and views that will allow the digital divide to be narrowed to allow women to gain access to the IT sector and include them within this burgeoning industry. We particularly would like the IT sector to benefit from having women in industry and people from those disaffected suburbs who, so far, are not participants in the advantages that IT can bring. Astoundingly, this was a World Congress event, which has produced as a flow-on a whole range of opportunities for ordinary South Australians who had no hope of attending and who were not members of the audience when the event occurred.

MOBIL OIL REFINERY

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr BROKENSHERE: Yesterday in the house, the Minister for Police said:

I would have thought that the member for Mawson, who purports to represent the interests of the southern suburbs, would have shown some interest. We have heard little from the member for Mawson.

On 28 July, I wrote to the Treasurer as follows:

Dear Treasurer, I am writing to ask if you and the Minister for the Southern Suburbs would agree to meet with a delegation of approximately six people to have a briefing on where the task force into the Mobil refinery closure is up to.

In the week beginning 18 August, some three weeks after the request in that letter, I received a phone call from the minister's office asking who the six people were, and we responded, advising that some were from council and some were from business. I am still waiting to get that delegation diary date, and I seek an apology.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

SPECIAL CONSTABULARY

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I raise for the information of the house and for its future consideration the possibility of introducing into this state a special constabulary of the police force, much in the way such constabulary establishments exist in the United Kingdom. A constituent from Greenhill originally raised this issue with me in writing, and my initial response was that perhaps it was not a good idea, because it might lead to vigilante gangs roaming the streets, trying to keep law and order. When I read the information that was supplied to me by that constituent—and I thank him for doing that—

Ms Chapman: Hobby bobbies.

Mrs REDMOND: Yes, apparently they are affectionately called hobby bobbies. I understand that in the UK there are some 43 different police constituencies, and virtually all of them have their own special constabulary. The special police would perform much the same function as our CFS. We have the Metropolitan Fire Service, but this state would be absolutely lost if it did not have a volunteer contingent in the CFS. Similarly we have a paid ambulance service, but alongside those people we have volunteer ambos in the St John contingent. So many of the emergency services in this state are provided by a huge contingent of volunteers.

It is clear from the discussion in the house today during question time that our police force is under significant duress because of lack of numbers, and, while I applaud the government for deciding that it will, at last, after some pressure from the public, increase the numbers by 200, that will clearly not be sufficient to meet the needs of the community. Given what has been going on in the community in recent weeks with graffiti and vandalism, it would be appropriate for this parliament to consider the introduction of such a special police force. Such people in the UK system, at least, are unpaid. They are provided with their boots and uniforms and they are reimbursed for travelling costs or if they have to take time off work to go to court to give evidence, but they are treated similarly to CFS volunteers in this country.

They have to undertake a period of training before they can join the force, and they must be generally between 19 and 50 years of age to be eligible. They have to be reasonably fit, of course and, having undergone the training, just as with the CFS they then have to do regular training weekends and nights to ensure that their skills are appropriate. They have to be trained in powers of arrest and dealing with people and all the other things that the police force would normally deal with. They would not, of course, be given all the powers that police officers have, but it seems to me that it would be a reasonably good function for our police and our community generally to look at.

I know that in my electorate of Heysen there are pockets where we have some problems. I have spoken to the head of the LSA (Local Service Area), and I can appreciate that they need to keep that Local Service Area operating out of Mount Barker but the effect is that after hours there is no police office in Stirling. It is very difficult to get timely response to any problems far away, and with Stirling, of course, you reach out to Scott Creek and even further and it would be of great benefit if we could have a special constabulary to call on to be able to assist the police—not to replace them in any way, but to have the ability to deal with certain things.

Down at Aldgate there is a consistent problem with people vandalising shop fronts. I know that it is not appropriate in the LSA to have police down there all the time patrolling; it simply will not work and it will not resolve the problem; but if we had a special constabulary to encourage the youngsters in that area who are causing the problems to perhaps move along or become involved in other things, and to enforce the law if they were breaking the law, then it seems to me that we would be freeing up the police in the fully trained, fully paid police force to do the work that they need to do but, at the same time, would be addressing some of the issues that really need to be addressed more at community level in relation to small local areas.

It would give us more of an opportunity to have the policeman on the beat whilst at the same time addressing the issue that, in terms of modern policing, a policeman walking around the place is somewhat of a waste of resources.

VIETNAMESE YOUTH FORUM ADDRESS

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Urban Development and Planning): I will complete the reading of the testimony that was given by the young Vietnamese man at the Vietnamese Youth Forum on 8 October 2003. He stated:

Things all changed once I hit high school. There were other people like me. I had finally found what I had been looking for all this time. There are other Asian people after all. I was in heaven. I am human, I'm not an animal. But once again I was faced with a dilemma. After 7 years of denying who I was and where I came from, I had lost my culture. More problems!! So fitting in was back on the agenda. I had forgotten how to speak Vietnamese, all the customs and traditions. Just when I thought that I had come full circle I was right back where I started. But instead of denying who I was and where I came from, I was in search for myself. Now doing the opposite of what I had been doing the last 7 years of my life.

So now all the answers that I was looking for were the opposite of what I was chasing. After 1 year of hanging around with other Asians I was back in touch with myself. I had learned how to speak my own language and learnt the customs again. But this all came at a price, like everything does. I left school and was ready to take on the world. Young and made out of steel, I followed all the stereotyping and labelling that all the other students had placed on Asians. Instead of hanging with the right crowd, I found myself part of an Asian gang. To me I finally found a family, I had finally found home. That's the impression that I had.

I can still remember to this day how it felt being accepted after having my first fight. They all cheered me on. The harder I hit people, the more I felt alive. For the first time I could feel my heart beat. The more I hurt people the more I felt in contact with myself. Without noticing it, the feeling had consumed me and now I was fighting a war of my own. I was hurting people for my own satisfaction. 3 years of being in a gang took its toll. We were known to the police as 'the Salisbury Boys.' We started to sell heroin. That's what Asian gangs do aqua ding to people that stereotype. Cause we were from Salisbury we had problems with another Asian gang from Mansfield Park. At the start it was all just fun and games. As we got older we got bolder. Weapons came into the frame. A lot of people got hurt. This is just 1 newspaper article on what we done.

A lot of my friends and I ended up in jail. I started using heroin, the hill that I was falling down just got steeper. Being addicted to heroin I was getting locked up more often. I never stole off of anyone to support my habit. I would deal drugs to make money. I found myself in jail again. Unhappy of what I had become. It wasn't me. Once again I was lost and in search for answers. Depression kicked in again. I hated myself for what I had become and what I was doing. The feelings that I felt in primary school came back again. 'I HATE MYSELF.' I'm not human, I'm an alien. Vietnamese people suck. I hate where I come from. Lost and confused and more behind than I thought I was. The problems that I thought I had left behind came back to haunt me.

I needed help, but where? I knew that I had to change. There in the yard I spotted this guy doing Tai Chi. I asked him to teach me and he did. He also taught me the Vietnamese way, the right way this time. I was finally at ease with myself and in control. I knew inside that I had done wrong and needed to correct what I had done. The first step was to help people. So I did a peer support course. At first the inmates didn't talk to me much. But as time went on they started to look to me for support. I was at ease. Finally contributing instead of being placed in a corner to do my own thing.

Time started to draw close, my release date was coming. Standing at the front gate of Yatala Labour Prison I knew what had to be done. I now work 2 part-time jobs as a Peer Educator at the VNCA/SA and COPE. I am now the most proud Vietnamese/Australian that you can meet. I am proud where I come from and I love myself and have great honour in my family tree.

OAKBANK-BALHANNAH CFS BRIGADE

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I had the pleasure of attending a number of functions in my electorate on the weekend, accompanied by my wife. One function in particular that I would like to mention in the house was the fiftieth anniversary celebrations of the Oakbank-Balhannah brigade of the CFS, held on Sunday afternoon. My wife and I attended and there would have been about 70 or 80 people attending the celebrations at the brigade headquarters in the main street of Oakbank. As we know, the CFS admirably serves the community. It is a totally volunteer organisation at the brigade level. That particular brigade has a membership of about 50, and I am advised by one of the senior officers within the brigade that it has an active membership—and that does not need too much explanation: obviously, people coming along to training nights and attending incidents, and the like—of approximately 35, which I think is an indication of how strong that particular brigade is.

I have been to a number of CFS brigades in the electorate, but this was the first time that I had visited the Oakbank-Balhannah brigade. We inspected the station and it has quite satisfactory and adequate resources and facilities and, no doubt, the Emergency Services Levy would have had a contribution to satisfactorily resourcing that brigade. It has three units: a 1-4, a 2-4 and a 3-4 unit. For the benefit of members who do not know what those numbers stand for, 1-4 means a vehicle with a capacity of 1 000 litres of water capacity and four-wheel drive capability; a 2-4 has the capacity of 2 000 litres of water and four-wheel drive.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: Don't tell me a 3-4 has 3 000 litres!

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The Minister for Regional Development is exactly right, and he should well know that, coming from one of the major regions in the state.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: What's a 4-2, then?

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: It is a 4 000 litre two-wheel drive, obviously. It was a great celebration. A number of members from other CFS brigades attended this function. Mr Euan Ferguson, the CEO of the CFS, attended, and it was his honour to present a number of certificates to brigade members, recognising their tireless efforts and years of service to that brigade.

I want to talk briefly about what I believe is the significant contribution to the community made by CFS volunteers of not only the Oakbank/Balhannah Brigade but also every brigade in the state. We see them attend incidents day and night, rain, hail or shine and, as the member for Morphet said, on Christmas Day. It not only affects their life. They may well be called out to an incident at 2 a.m., perhaps to a road crash trauma or whatever, and they may spend several hours at that incident. They then have to go home, take a shower, get dressed and go to work. So, it obviously impacts not only on their personal life but also on that of their partner, husband or wife, who obviously has to stay home and look after the household duties whilst they are away—

An honourable member: And worrying about them.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: That's right; and worrying about them. In many situations, they place their life on the line for the overall benefit of the community. For the benefit of some members, I point out that CFS stands for Country Fire Service. Not only do they fight bushfires but also, quite often, SES units are attached to the brigades. They attend to road trauma, road rescue, and so on. When there is storm damage and trees are blown down, they go out to attend to that situation, and other incidents for example.

Time expired.

SAFE COMMUNITIES NETWORK

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Today, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate Noarlunga Towards a Safe Community on its redesignation as a member of the World Health Organisation's Safe Communities Network. Noarlunga is the first city outside Scandinavia to be redesignated to this important world network. Its acceptance for redesignation is based on a comprehensive quality program of action that involves many partners, including organisations such as WorkCover and Arts SA, as well as many local communities groups and the City of Onkaparinga, in delivering grassroots programs to help people think about the way they live, the risks they take in everyday life, and how they can be healthier and safer. The programs also enable people to make changes in their life so that they can look to a healthier and safer life. In this way, I believe it is a real model for action under the Generational Health Review. I very much hope that other communities in South Australia will be able to benefit as my community has from such excellent programs.

I need to acknowledge right up front the leadership and guidance of Mr Richard Hicks, the Director of Community and Allied Health Services at Noarlunga Health Services. Richard has been a true visionary and constant driver and persuader to get many programs of benefit to our community undertaken. I will give a little illustration of some of the types of things that are being undertaken in Noarlunga as a result

of this initiative, but I will first outline the requirements for membership of the World Health Organisation's International Safe Communities Group. They are:

[There needs to be] an infrastructure based on partnership and collaborations governed by a cross-sectional group that is responsible for safety promotion in their community; long-term sustainable programs, covering both genders and all ages, environments and situations; programs that target high risk groups and environments and programs that promote safety for vulnerable groups; programs that document the frequency and causes of injury; evaluation measures to assess their programs, processes and the effects of change; ongoing participation in national and international safe communities network.

These criteria are quite stringent, and the programs I will outline have all met them admirably.

The first area is safe and healthy workplaces in the south. Under this program, a number of training programs have been conducted on site with small business, in such areas as first aid, fire safety, chemical safety, manual handling and eye safety workshops, to enable small businesses, which are often excluded from some of the initiatives about occupational health and safety, to really participate in those programs. Eye safety in small business is a particularly important project to help small business identify appropriate eye safety equipment to work with and to persuade some workers who were a bit reluctant to see the importance of using appropriate eye safety equipment. A program on work and family has enabled the health service to again make itself and its services known to many small business employers in the south and to increase the access of small business to community services.

One project I particularly like is the young men's dental health program. I think everyone knows that young men are not always the best at tooth care. About 1 500 dental resource kits were distributed to workers in Lonsdale and Hackham light industry workplaces. They were given pretty practical guides, such as 'Okay, we know you're going to have those sugary buns, but at least make sure you rinse out your mouth with water afterwards, because that can be important in preventing dental decay.' The resource kit they were given included a directory of dentists, a toothbrush and some extra sugar free chewing gum.

Time expired.

SOCCKER

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Today, I want to pay tribute to the soccer community in South Australia for their contribution in keeping soccer alive for many years back in the 1950s so that we have been able to have a truly South Australian soccer team in Adelaide United. Members may be aware that the first meeting to establish soccer in South Australia was held in October 1902 and was hosted by Mr Frank Storr in his tailor shop in Gawler Place. This meeting attracted great interest, and it was decided to form the first organised soccer association in South Australia, called the South Australian British Football Association. Led by Mr Tom Holford, the committee proceeded to make arrangements for the competition to be played in 1903. Thus, this year we are celebrating 100 years of South Australian soccer, because it was born in 1903. The first competition comprised three teams: North Adelaide, South Adelaide and Woodville.

Unfortunately, I was not here to commend the member for Newland for her motion to congratulate Gordon Pickard of Fairmont Homes on his timely financial support to enable the soccer community to establish the South Australian soccer team, its automatic entry into the National Soccer League and

the maintenance of South Australia's rightful profile in Australian soccer. We are all aware of the contribution made by Adelaide City, the premierships it won and, equally, the profile of West Adelaide. Soccer would not have survived without the support of the multicultural community and the clubs that really took it upon themselves to keep it going in those early years.

I know because I used to work at the Hindmarsh Soccer Stadium and, indeed, at Croydon at the Polonia stadium. I would like to congratulate all those who have worked and contributed to the formation of the Adelaide Football Club. It is truly a multicultural club, which has its roots in South Australian Soccer Federation clubs. Those clubs have worked at the grass roots level to grow the game in our state, and those inaugural multicultural clubs and their chairmen deserve special attention. I mention some clubs from an Italian background: Azuria/Adelaide Blue Eagles, founded by Angelo Rossi in 1958; Adelaide City Force/Adelaide Juventus, founded by Mario Bailetti in 1946; Campbelltown City, founded by Domenico Mitolo in 1964; Northern Demons, founded by M. Pasculli in 1952; and, Port Pirie City, founded by A. Balice in 1949, along with two newer clubs founded in 1995, MetroStars and Western Strikers.

I also mention clubs from a Greek background: West Adelaide Hellas, founded in 1962 by Mr S. Savvas; Adelaide Olympic, founded in 1979 by P. Papadopoulos; a Cypriot club, Adelaide Cobras, founded in 1973 by E. Nicolaides; a Polish club, Polonia/Croydon Kings, founded in 1950 by Mr Gongolski and Mr H. Lewicki; a Croatian club, Adelaide Croatian/Raiders, founded in 1952 by F. Seric; and, a Serbian and Montenegro club, Beograd/White City Woodville, founded in 1950 by Ika Ilic. And so it goes on with Budapest, Enfield Victoria and other clubs at different leagues that really put a lot into soccer.

We must not forget that many of our soccer players are playing around the world and they are great exports. These clubs are truly pioneers in our state. As members can see, many clubs were established in the 1950s and 1960s following the wave of post-war immigration to our state, which has seen Australia develop into a truly multicultural community, enriched by people from around the world who have made their home here and who have contributed enormously to the economic cultural life of the state. In reflecting on Adelaide United's inaugural game, which saw over 15 000 fans pack out Hindmarsh Stadium on 18 October, I would like to acknowledge the role played by the former Liberal government and the then minister for tourism, Joan Hall, in bringing to fruition a project which has prepared such a worthy home for our new national soccer league team.

Time expired.

FIRST HOME OWNERSHIP

Mr SNELLING (Playford): I have spoken previously about the dramatic increase in residential property prices; I think that it was during the debate on supply. I rise today to note the Reserve Bank of Australia's submission to the Productivity Commission, which is conducting an inquiry into first home ownership. While increased house prices have been good for state coffers, property speculators and for those people who hold property and who do not wish to buy a more expensive property, the greatest victims of this dramatic increase in house prices are young couples who want to establish a home and a family.

Such couples are either being priced out of the market entirely or being forced into mortgages of more than \$200 000, and that is for a very modest home. These young couples wanting to establish a family are the future powerhouse of the state's economy—they actually create wealth. Barriers put up in the way of such young families are barriers to the future of our state, indeed, of our nation. The Reserve Bank submission indicates that house prices have doubled in the past decade. The submission also states:

The ratio of the price of the average home to average income has risen sharply, as has the cost of servicing the mortgage if the home is acquired, making it increasingly difficult over recent years for first home buyers to achieve home ownership.

This situation also puts our economy in a very fragile position if there is even a small increase in interest rates; and, to a larger extent, because of international factors, domestic interest rates can often be out of our control. The Reserve Bank's submission states that the main cause of this dramatic increase in house prices has been driven by investment in housing. Housing attracts a disproportionate amount of the investment dollar. The Reserve Bank states that the cash yield on residential property is about 2½ per cent. This compares with 7 to 10 per cent cash yield for residential property overseas, or 8 to 9 per cent for Australian commercial property.

However, the combination of the favourable tax status for residential property investment and Australia's relatively low cut-in for the top tax bracket makes residential property investment highly attractive. It therefore detracts a disproportionate amount of the investment dollar and, as a result, drives up house prices disproportionately. The Reserve Bank addresses the question of how we are to help first home buyers. The bank points out that financial assistance in the form of first home owner grants generally just get passed on in the form of higher prices.

The Reserve Bank recommends changes to the property investment regime which disproportionately favours residential property as an investment vehicle. In terms of its recommendations and what we should be looking at, the Reserve Bank's submission states:

- i. the ability to negatively gear an investment property when there is little prospect of the property being cash-flow positive for many years;
- ii. the benefit that investors receive by virtue of the fact that when property depreciation allowances are 'clawed back' through the capital gains tax, the rate of tax is lower than the rate that applied when depreciation was allowed in the first place;
- iii the general treatment of property depreciation, including the ability to claim depreciation on loss-making investments.

Families with children receive little or no government assistance or recognition. Often, one or one and a bit incomes are supporting a larger number of people, but without children our state and, indeed, our nation, has a very bleak future. We cannot continue to allow young families to be priced out of the market by investors (who often are financially established) seeking a tax break.

PARLIAMENTARY PRIVILEGE

The SPEAKER: I have to report to the house that, earlier this week, I received a letter from the member for Unley—

indeed, it was yesterday—to which I responded yesterday. In the letter the honourable member drew attention to events which were of grave concern to him and about which he was unsure as to whether or not they touched on parliamentary privilege. In my response, I advised the honourable member that the chair could do nothing about the matter until and unless he formally requests that something be done. I outlined some of the options that might be available to him in the circumstances, to which he replied earlier today.

In order to expedite the matter, and rather than read all the correspondence, for the purposes of ensuring that the house understands the background of the matter, I will read the substance of this letter. The letter states:

Mr Speaker,

I believe that the anonymous action taken by a person or persons in providing *The Advertiser* with an unsigned statement, attributed to one of my previous students, Mr Ian Nicholas Blain, was specifically designed to impair my capacity in this specific case to do my public duty, without fear or favour. I further believe that the hope of adverse publicity, which could be thought to have motivated my detractors, was calculated to compromise my pursuit of the matter in the public interest.

I am most concerned, not only for myself, but for all members of this parliament that there appears to be an emerging problem, little different to blackmail, which is being used to prevent members of parliament from investigating matters which they believe to be in the public interest.

In consideration of the above, I request that a Committee of Privilege of the Parliament be established to investigate this matter.

Given matters that have recently arisen, Mr Speaker, I ask whether it might serve an ongoing purpose. With this in mind, I would suggest that the parliament elect from amongst its members a panel of interested nominees. As the occasion arises, I suggest that the Clerk draw, by lot, the names of four members to serve as the committee for that purpose decided by parliament. I believe there is merit in considering the notion that the Chair itself should preside over the committee.

I believe that, as a matter of natural justice, any member with a direct/personal interest should be excluded from being a member of the committee.

Mr Speaker, if the parliament is of a mind to investigate the matter which I have raised, I will of course be prepared to provide to the committee the names of people, by class or description, to fully inform its deliberations.

As a final note, Mr Speaker, the ABC broadcast was aired on Tuesday 11 November.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

I now have to inform the house that I will give precedence to consideration of the matter to establish such a privileges committee and to make such amendments as may be necessary in order for the house to be able to do that. The chair shares the concern expressed by the member for Unley. This is not a matter which one hopes arises as a dispute between two honourable members, but, rather, it is a matter of even more serious gravity in that it may well be that the motive of the people making the remarks and/or publishing the material of which the member for Unley complains, was to prevent him from doing his duty as a member of this place.

That, I think, is more serious than a simple dispute or an instance of where one honourable member has misled this place, in that it prevents this place from doing what this place decided it ought to do, in keeping with the privileges that were brought to this place by the adoption of the Constitution Act of 1856, from that period in the history of this institution of parliament of the 1600s, which culminated in the Bill of Rights of 1688, and the other determinations that were made, finally, through to 1712. Altogether, if honourable members share my concern about what the honourable member for

Unley has had to say, they will support any such proposition.

EDUCATION (MATERIALS AND SERVICES CHARGES) AMENDMENT BILL

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

No. 1. Page 4, after line 22 (clause 5)—insert:

(12a) The Director-General must, at the request of the school council, make services available (free of charge) to the school council for the recovery of outstanding materials and services charges.

No. 2. Page 5, after line 7 (clause 5)—insert:

(15) This section will expire on 1 September 2005.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (EXPIATION OF OFFENCES) BILL

In committee.

(Continued from 24 November. Page 865.)

New clause 10A.

Mr MEIER: This could be the longest speech I have ever made, I think, because I started before the tea break last night, then went on briefly after the tea break, and I now continue. So, we will have to look at the record books on that, but I am not going to seek any record.

As members would be aware, last night I started speaking to the member for Stuart's amendment and I think, as I said then, that there was no doubt that the member for Stuart is endeavouring to make a very legitimate point through this amendment. I echo those remarks again today. I do not want to go into too many details; I think the sooner we get on and consider this the better.

There is no doubt that it has reached a stage—as I think I alluded to yesterday—that so many people are being hit by speeding fines, and we use the stick to try to bring them into line. This amendment is one way of saying, 'If you do the right thing over, say, a ten year period, we are going to hand out the carrot. We will not use the stick on you if you have been able to adhere to the law, or have not been caught transgressing the law, over that period of time.' I guess there are other ways that we could look at it too and, maybe, another way would be a reduction in the cost of a driver's licence.

These things can be considered in due course. Let us make a start down this track, and I think it is a very noble gesture and one that, hopefully, will lead to drivers wanting to endeavour to get that magical 10 year period, where at least there will be a little bit of leniency shown. I certainly would love to see that, even though I will admit that it probably will not help me at all, for the foreseeable future. That does not mean to say that I cannot support something in which I can see benefits for many responsible drivers in this state. So, with that, I am happy to support this amendment.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The amendment provides that, in effect, if an alleged offender has held a driver's licence for 10 years or more and not been convicted of a speeding offence or issued with an expiation notice or issued with a formal caution during the preceding 10 years, then the person is entitled to provide a statutory declaration to that affect to the police commissioner. If the commissioner is

satisfied with the truth of the statutory declaration then the commissioner must withdraw the expiation notice or summons and instead issue a formal caution. If the commissioner fails to withdraw the notice or the summons, then the person may elect to be prosecuted. In any prosecution, the onus will lie on the police commissioner to prove that the statutory declaration was, 'false in a material particular.'

I spoke to this amendment yesterday, but before I spoke, I did not have a good opportunity to study it closely. Having examined the amendment since yesterday, I am pleased to find that offences of exceeding the speed limit by more than 15 kilometres per hour, or speeding in a school zone or a shared zone, are not to be the subject of the proposed caution. That means that one of the concerns that I expressed yesterday was not relevant. However, the remainder of the amendment is more seriously flawed than it first appeared to be.

Under the amendment, many people caught exceeding the speed limit by less than 15 kilometres per hour, at any time in the next 7 to 10 years, would be able to deny ever receiving an expiation notice or a formal caution. The police commissioner would not and could not be satisfied with the truth of that assertion. That is because police do not maintain records of formal cautions or even expiations dating back 10 years.

The honourable member for Stuart challenged that statement. He said yesterday:

If the records do not exist, how do you compile driving demerit points? Tell me that. I say to the Attorney-General that is a nonsense and a reflection on the administration of the whole system. If the records do not exist, he will need more than a bit of green paper. It is an absolute outrage if the records do not exist, and gross negligence and incompetence on the part of those who administer the scheme.

The words of the member for Stuart. To satisfy the honourable member, I sought clarification from SAPOL and from Transport SA. I have been advised that about three years ago, to coincide with the introduction of new penalty enforcement procedures, SAPOL introduced a new system of maintaining expiation notice records. Records from before this time have been archived and can be retrieved only one at a time with assistance from EDS, at some expense. They are, therefore, not accessible to SAPOL, and SAPOL has no need to access the records. Therefore, to save taxpayers' money, SAPOL does not require the maintenance of an expensive database for which it has no use.

Records of formal cautions are kept by SAPOL, but this practice has been in place for only about the past three years. Likewise, I am advised that records of demerit points that have accrued are not readily accessible for more than the past three years. That is because these records are not relevant after three years have elapsed. Although some information about demerit points has been retained over the years, Transport SA advises me that there has been no consistent archiving policies for the system that stores demerit points information. The Brown and Olsen governments: how often we come across their legacy.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order, the member for Mawson!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Therefore, the government would not wish to rely on the accuracy or completeness of any information retained. Therefore, I say again that there are no accessible records of expiations or formal cautions dating back 10 years. This would lead to some odd consequences if the honourable member's amendment were to succeed. Apart from those who have been caught in the past three years, the police commissioner would have no records of other expi-

ations or cautions. Therefore, for those who complete a statutory declaration claiming a clean driving record over the 10 years, the police commissioner could not possibly be satisfied with the truth of that assertion. Therefore, the police commissioner would be obliged by this amendment to send a notice proposing to enforce expiation notices against absolutely everyone who tried to claim the benefit of this proposal. All those persons who received an enforcement notice—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Member for Mawson, do you support this police commissioner, or not?

Mr Brokenshire: I support him more than anyone.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: More than anyone? More than the member for Stuart—not that that is saying very much. All those persons who received an enforcement notice would then have the choice of either paying up or electing to be prosecuted. Here the proposal gets even more odd. If they elected to be prosecuted, the onus would shift to the police commissioner to prove that the declaration was false in a material particular.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Bragg says, ‘Hear, hear,’ that the burden ought to be on the police commissioner to prove the unprovable. Let us just explore the consequences of the member for Bragg’s assent to this amendment. The police commissioner would be able to prove the declaration false, only if an offence had been detected in the past three years. He would not be able to prove it false if an offence had been expiated or cautioned any earlier than that.

Ms Chapman: I know that.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Bragg says that she knows that. Let us just explore the member for Bragg’s support for this. Let us explore it down that avenue, because, remember, this is the member who said there was no need to DNA test the multiple murderer Bevan Spencer Von Einem.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Mawson has been cautioned before.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Therefore, for most persons, the prosecution would be abandoned. Word would quickly spread that anyone who had committed a driving offence before, say, the year 2000 or thereabouts, could elect to be prosecuted and would escape with only a caution, because the police commissioner could not disprove any claim to the contrary. The police commissioner would not have the records to prove it false. So, as far as the member for Bragg is concerned, nearly all expiation notices issued for speeding would be a dead letter. The member for Bragg is willing to embrace that consequence and says that I am selfish for blocking it legislatively.

Ms Chapman: Offenders should sign a declaration.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Sign a declaration. Yes, sign a declaration that no-one, including the police commissioner can disprove, and then the onus is on the police commissioner to disprove it, when the member for Bragg well knows he does not have the means.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! The member for Bragg has had the right to interject. It is against standing orders.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The offending driver could be caught out under the Oaths Act. How would he be caught out?

Ms Chapman: Someone would disclose it.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Someone; and who might that person be?

Mr Snelling: Maybe they will ‘fess up.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes, maybe, as the member for Playford says, the offenders will confess. I do not think so.

The honourable member suggested that the police commissioner should have kept records of expiations and cautions dating back more than 10 years. He said that it was ‘an absolute outrage, if the records do not exist, and gross negligence and incompetence on the part of those who administer the scheme’. Records of past expiations are of no use to SAPOL because section 15(4) of the Expiation of Offences Act provides:

The expiation of an offence under this Act (or an application for relief under this Act)—

(a) does not constitute an admission of guilt or of any civil liability; and

(b) will not be regarded as evidence tending to establish guilt or any civil liability; and

(c) cannot be referred to in any report furnished to a court for the purposes of determining sentence for any offence.

As I mentioned earlier, that data is not presently accessible by SAPOL. I am advised that it might be possible, at considerable expense, to retrieve this data, to install a database, or somehow to combine it with the existing database, and to rely on this data for the purposes proposed by the honourable member. Therefore, in theory it is possible that records of expiations older than three years could be relied upon to satisfy the commissioner as to the truth or otherwise of some of the claims that might be made in a statutory declaration. However, these records could not be used to satisfy the commissioner about formal cautions. Therefore, this would do no good at all, because a person who had previously been cautioned should not be getting the benefit of another caution. If the honourable member were to confine his amendment so that it operated only for the past three years, it would still be impossible to ascertain that the persons who had expiated offences in previous years were offending drivers, rather than merely owners who had paid expiation notices for family members, employees or acquaintances who had used their car.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Bragg says that we ought to invalidate the whole speeding enforcement apparatus because it is Christmas and we should be jolly! So, the member for Bragg is happy to go on the record.

Mr Brokenshire: You want to get 40 000 more motorists this year, but you won’t put money into the police force.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Well, there is the game-keeper turned poacher! When the member was police minister, he had the bag extended like a bookie at the races: ‘Put the money in, put the cash in.’ He was all in favour of expiation notices but as soon as he gets into opposition he is the friend of the speeding motorist.

Mr Brokenshire: No; that is not right, Mr Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN: Order! It is not right to interject, and the Attorney should not encourage the member.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: It would be an outrage, to use the honourable member’s words, if persons who had committed multiple driving offences over previous years (either three years or 10 years) were able to claim the benefit of this amendment just because other persons had paid their expiation notices for them. However, the most important

objection to this proposed amendment is not based on databases, record-keeping nor even upon the impossibility of distinguishing between offending drivers and those owners who have expiated. The main objection is a principled one concerned with road safety. Even if it could be assumed, contrary to the evidence, that a person with a clean driving record over 10 years or even three years could be identified, it would be inappropriate to provide that person with a legislative licence to speed, which is, in effect, what the amendment proposes. Under this amendment, those who have not previously been cautioned, nor expiated nor prosecuted for speeding over the previous 10 years would be able to do so with impunity, safe in the knowledge that they could neither be prosecuted nor issued with an expiation notice. This would have an alarming effect on road safety, because any increase in speed has been shown to reduce road safety.

In enforcing speed limits, police practice currently allows a generous tolerance. Therefore, any person who receives an expiation notice for speeding would be travelling well above the prevailing speed limit to come under notice. There would be few occasions when it would be justified in exceeding the speed limit to this extent. Where justification exists (for example, in cases of medical emergency), it would be a matter for police to withdraw or argue before the court. The proposal would remove a discretionary power from the police. This would be an interference with the duty of a police officer in determining how an individual offence should be addressed.

In summary, this amendment is unacceptable for three reasons: first, because records have not been kept for more than the past three years it would enable anyone who had committed an offence before that time to claim, falsely, the benefit of having a clean record for 10 years, and the member for Bragg is now on the record as endorsing that. Secondly, even if the first problem could be overcome, many of the wrong people would get the benefit and many of the right people would not. Any driver with a clean record for 10 years or even three years would be prevented from relying on it if he or she had ever paid an expiation notice for a relative, an employee, or others. Anyone who had had an expiation notice paid for them would be able to claim, rightfully, that he or she had not paid it. Finally, and most importantly, even if both those problems could be ignored, it would encourage speeding, thereby reducing road safety. Therefore, for a combination of practical and principled reasons, the government opposes the amendment.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The minister obviously wants to provoke people such as I. For the past 12 or 14 hours, they have run to the architects of this legislation and those who are setting the policies—those who have no regard for the manner in which this policy has been enforced on certain occasions, namely, in a draconian, unreasonable, unjust and harsh manner. The Attorney-General failed to tell this committee that, in the very near future, people who are issued with an expiation notice will lose demerit points. We are in a completely new arrangement and set of circumstances. I say to the Attorney-General—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Diana Laidlaw congratulated us.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am not concerned about that comment: I am concerned about fairness and commonsense. In the course of their occupation, some people in this state travel tens of thousands of kilometres a month, but the Attorney is not one of those. Some of the things that are going on are an absolute nonsense. I say this to those who

have tried to cast aspersions upon me with the prepared document that the Attorney read quite well to the committee. I make this very clear, and I hope that the Attorney passes this comment on to them: they are on notice. They had plenty of time to prepare that response, but they have not had any time to answer the other questions that I asked the Attorney in the second reading debate in relation to the administration of this bill.

I say this to them: I am not a bit deterred from my resolve to see that the average citizen of this state is treated fairly and justly. We will pursue this without fear. Do not worry about the work! We can make a lot of work if we want to, but I would sooner not do so. I suggest to rural members of parliament that, every time they see one of these cars, they make a note of the time and the number of the car, and put some questions on notice. We will go after them, and I have said this before. Because the Attorney and the bureaucrats would not provide the information to me last night, the questions on notice are already being prepared—and we will prepare more.

At the end of the day, what is the role of the government, its agencies and its instrumentalities? Is it to make life as difficult as it possibly can for the average law-abiding citizen? Why, Mr Chairman, I have heard you complain on many occasions how unfair the current arrangements are! People are being slugged with these expiations and have difficulty paying them, but they have never had an offence. Your complaint, Mr Chairman, was one of the reasons that I brought this amendment to the parliament. The Attorney-General has said that they do have not the records, but if the government of the day wants to undertake a particular course of action—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Your government of the day in this case.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: If the government of the day wants to carry it out, it can (a) find the resources and (b) institute a scheme or arrangement to do it. Because someone has had the effrontery to challenge the people running this scheme, they do not want to do it. That is what it is about: they do not want to do it. That is unfortunate. Whether they like it or not, one of the things that this parliament allows is for members to question and challenge the administration of acts of parliament. Obviously these people do not want to bend an inch. That is fine, but I put them on notice that they will be challenged on a regular basis. I can do other things with my time, and so can other rural members of parliament.

I disagree with *The Advertiser* this morning that it is not a right but a privilege to drive. For many people it is a necessity. It is a necessity to be able to drive a motor vehicle to get yourself between point A and point B. There is not one person who uses the road regularly, not even the police themselves, who would drive from Port Augusta to the border and not exceed the speed limit. I challenge anyone to disprove that statement. I have seen it with my own eyes. I have seen them go past me. If that is the attitude or the response from SAPOL, we will take the number of those vehicles from now on and put some questions on notice. It has annoyed me considerably that the response has been a backhanded whack at me because I have had the effrontery to challenge these people in parliament, which is my democratic right.

On behalf of the people who live in rural areas outside Adelaide, and the people I represent, SAPOL has not responded to criticism I made about a disgraceful act at Tumby Bay. I would like to hear what the commissioner has

to say about that, where they hid a speed camera, never put signs up, and took \$18 000 out of that little community. What good did it do? What did they achieve? Absolutely nothing! This amendment would give those people some recourse to be treated fairly and reasonably, which they are entitled to in a decent society.

One of the hallmarks of a decent society is how well people are treated. It is obvious that some people do not want to treat people fairly and reasonably. We know the ground rules. The Attorney might think that I am waffling on, so be it. I will spend more time this afternoon drafting some questions on notice. I look forward to your comments, Mr Chairman, because I know that you were involved in the past. It was your criticism that drew this matter to my attention, so I look forward to your support in this matter. I know from discussion in the corridors that plenty of people agree with me, but the whip has been around and members will have to toe the line. When their constituents start accumulating demerit points because of this unreasonable action, I wonder if they will confess and say, 'We had a chance but we did not have the courage of our convictions to do something about this because it was regarded as being too hard.' I am disappointed and annoyed at the response because I regard it as a criticism of me. They have taken affront because I have had the audacity to raise this in the parliament.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It is a critical analysis of what you said.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No, there was more to it than that. One unreasonable act always generates another, and I will be very pleased to respond. I commend the amendment to the committee. It is common sense, it is based on the premise of treating people fairly and reasonably, and not wanting to extract every possible dollar out of their pocket.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: So you are immune from criticism?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I am not immune from any criticism. I do not mind fairly and reasonably based criticism, and never have. I would have not stayed in this place for 33 years if I had not. I must have done something right by sticking up for rural people or I would not be here still. I look forward to pursuing this matter, as will my colleagues, to see that people are treated fairly. If the Attorney-General thinks that, in the interests of justice, it is fair and reasonable that someone who has driven a motor car for 20 or 30 years, has never been convicted of any offence in their life but suddenly gets one of these tickets, as happened in Tumby Bay, I would be surprised. I would be interested to hear from the police commissioner if he thinks that is fair and reasonable, if he thinks that is doing something to stop criminal activity in South Australia. Of course it isn't; it is a bloody nonsense, and he knows it. It is only because they do not have the wit or the wisdom to treat people fairly.

I know from talking to some police officers in the field that they know it is unreasonable. I understand that police stations are judged on the number of tickets that they issue and senior officers are telling other officers that they are not issuing enough tickets or enough on-the-spot fines. I know that for a fact, and we will find it out. We will dot every 'i' and cross every 't' by putting questions on notice until we get to the bottom of this. I look forward to the budget estimates committee.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: The Hon. Graham Gunn has said what he wanted to say about his amendment, and I will not touch on those comments. However, with respect to his amendment, I want to qualify a couple of things on the public

record. First, relevant very much to this were the comments of the Attorney-General. Twice today in this house I have seen the police minister and the Attorney-General, in a flippant manner, make comments about whether or not I support the police commissioner. I find it offensive that ministers of the day make those comments in the first place, and I will put these points on the public record because they are important.

I had the privilege and the pleasure of taking the submission to cabinet to renew the police commissioner's contract. I believe that the police commissioner is an exceptional officer, and I am proud that I had that honour, and of course he has my support. The point I want to get across is that I support that facet of the member for Stuart's message to the government, as I see it, that this government is all about taxes and charges and increasing revenue, and that it is all driven that way. The Attorney-General said that, when I was police minister, I was happy to see—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You had the bookie's bag wide open.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Exactly. He said that I was happy to have the bookie's bag wide open. That is a nonsense. I am on the public record time and again saying that I would be happy if the police never caught one person speeding because that would mean that our roads would be safer. I have a good record of recruiting additional police, contrary to what the police minister throws around parliament, which is not correct. I have a good record in that, and I stand proudly by that record, also. Yesterday I said that I understood partly why this amendment has been put, because it was brought to my attention late in our last term of office. I have already said that I support that element, and I reinforce that.

However, where this government is missing the point is that in the budget papers it has estimated an additional 40 000 motorists being caught for speeding this year, and I know that the Treasurer expects those 40 000 motorists to be caught for speeding because he wants a return on his investment for the 18 mobile radars which he approved—that is what that is about. What we want is safety on our roads. One way of achieving that is possibly the carrot approach—not the big stick approach that this government continually takes to people in the community; the so-called big tough on law and order statements that it comes up with. Years ago, there were incentives for good driver behaviour. We have a situation at the moment where road rage is completely and utterly out of control in South Australia. We had another example of that only last night; it is an appalling situation.

Where are the initiatives from this government on road safety? Where are the initiatives for improving our roads, and particularly our rural roads? Why does the government not look at the thrust of what the member for Stuart is saying? That is, give recognition and incentives to people who have good driving patterns and who use good behaviour on the roads. Regularly I hear people on talkback radio saying, 'Why do we not implement some sort of reward system for people who do the right thing for years and years?' This government bungled the 50 km/h speed limit introduction. I know that you, Mr Chairman, agree with me on this matter, because I have heard you talking about it. As a result of this government's bungling, we have seen decent citizens who do not want to break the law driving at 62 km/h on a road which they think ought to be 60 km/h only to find out that the speed limit is 50, and they are hit with a significant fine of between \$180 and \$200 (I think it is), yet the Minister for Transport does nothing to address the signage or the fact that he has a

mismatch when it comes to 40 kilometre, 50 kilometre and 60 kilometre speed limits.

I have sent him a photograph of what I saw in Sydney, which would be a simple solution to the problem. It is a blue sign which takes up most of the lane; it is slightly raised, about half an inch above the road; and in white writing it has '50'. It is safe in the wet for motorbikes and so on. That is a way to let people know what speed they are required to do on that road. It is a cheap investment for the government but, even though I have written the letter and I have raised the matter in the media and on the radio, I would be surprised if this government acted on it, because it wants the revenue, and the community is seeing that it is revenue driven rather than safety driven. I want to reinforce that message. As I said, I do not necessarily endorse all the comments of the member for Stuart, but I do endorse the fact that the honourable member is saying that, where decent citizens do the right thing on the roads, they should be given some encouragement, some thanks, some recognition and maybe a reward, as well as attacking the people who deserve to be fined because they disregard the laws. There needs to be some balance, but this government is not prepared to look at that.

The committee divided on the new clause:

AYES (21)

Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Chapman, V. A.	Evans, I. F.
Goldsworthy, R. M.	Gunn, G. M. (teller)
Hall, J. L.	Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.
Hanna, K.	Kotz, D. C.
Matthew, W. A.	Maywald, K. A.
McFetridge, D.	Meier, E. J.
Penfold, E. M.	Redmond, I. M.
Scalzi, G.	Venning, I. H.
Williams, M. R.	

NOES (23)

Atkinson, M. J. (teller)	Bedford, F. E.
Breuer, L. R.	Caica, P.
Ciccarello, V.	Conlon, P. F.
Foley, K. O.	Hill, J. D.
Key, S. W.	Koutsantonis, T.
Lewis, I. P.	Lomax-Smith, J. D.
McEwen, R. J.	O'Brien, M. F.
Rankine, J. M.	Rann, M. D.
Rau, J. R.	Snelling, J. J.
Stevens, L.	Thompson, M. G.
Weatherill, J. W.	White, P. L.
Wright, M. J.	

PAIR(S)

Kerin, R. G.	Geraghty, R. K.
--------------	-----------------

Majority of 2 for the noes.

New clause thus negated.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

EDUCATION (MATERIALS AND SERVICES CHARGES) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I believe that the House of Assembly will now accept the amendments made in the other place. The schedule comprises two amendments and we have had the debate on both of those. The first seeks to remove the link between the setting of fees by a school council and the recovery of those fees. That is not an optimal situation in the view of the government, but it is something that the government will work with. The second amendment seeks to have a section dealing with the ability of school councils to recover school fee debts to them expire on 1 September 2005, reverting to a system of voluntary fees at that date. Again, we have had the debate on that. So, I expect now that the bill will progress through the final stages.

Ms CHAPMAN: I read with interest the debate in the other place in relation to this bill, which took place substantially yesterday, and I welcome the amendments that have come back, which have been briefly referred to by the minister. In substance, they reflect the amendments that have previously been presented by the opposition in this house, save and except for two variations. May I first say that, in relation to the amendment to enable school councils to use the resources of the department and require the Director-General to make these services available free of charge at the election of the council, we at all material times have presented an amendment similar to this on the basis that this was an option available to the council—not that they must use it but that the Director-General must provide it and make those services available.

There was never any suggestion that the Liberal Party was proposing in its amendment for it to be compulsory. The Hon. Kate Reynolds in another place has moved an amendment to this amendment to the effect that it is to be at the request of the school council, and that simply makes it even clearer, if it was not before, as to the position of the Liberal Party. So, we welcome this, primarily for the reasons outlined in the previous debate but to be summarised in ensuring that we do not force school communities to be parent versus parent in litigation.

We consider that to be an unsatisfactory option in some circumstances, and schools should be relieved of that option when they need to enforce the payment of outstanding materials and services charges. This of course is particularly important because now, with the amendments, the government has supported a new category of school fees, that is, what I would call enforceable voluntary payments, which are available to schools in certain circumstances over and above a compulsory fee.

In relation to the expiry of this section being 1 September 2005, this is three months shorter than was proposed by the Liberal Party. Again, we have no objection to this. We had allowed over two years, effectively, to enable the government to undertake the comprehensive investigation that it had promised at this time last year and which it has clearly not undertaken. The Hon. Kate Reynolds, again, took the view that 1 September was the more appropriate date, and we have no problem with that whatsoever. It does mean that whatever is able to be reviewed and amended should give sufficient time for schools to prepare for the forthcoming academic year. Again, we welcome this amendment.

I might say for the record that I have today received an answer to a question about the review that has been undertaken by the government in the last 12 months. Whilst the minister, during the course of our presentation and submissions to the house, suggested that there had been a review by the department, her response today in answer to questions

about the review indicated that there was one, it was conducted by the Department of Education and Children's Services but, interestingly, that no review document or report has been provided. The answer to the question today tells the house that the response from the review came in the form of a cabinet submission.

I might be new to the house but I have never known a department to report in the form of a cabinet submission. To suggest that there had been some kind of inquiry or review by a department and that suddenly it would hand to the minister a document in the form of a cabinet submission is quite ridiculous. However, that only highlights to us the concern that there has not been a review as had clearly been presented as necessary to this house over a year ago, and that we are now in a situation where, with these amendments, the government will have plenty of opportunity to undertake the review that it said it would undertake and should undertake.

In conclusion, it is now incumbent upon the government to present a program under which there is to be a process for which the public and interested stakeholders ought to be able to present submissions for consideration of all aspects in relation to the future application of school fees and any regulation in relation to their operation if they are to continue to be applied in this state. I will not make any comment in relation to the merits or otherwise of the current program or whether it could be amended or improved. However, what I do say is that it is appropriate now that the government should set out a time line and program upon which those submissions can be put and all stakeholders be properly advised so that they can make their submission in relation to this. I simply conclude by saying to the other place that we welcome their amendments, their wise consideration and their support for what we had presented.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: This amendment provides:

The Director-General must, at the request of a school council, make services available (free of charge) to the school council for the recoveries of outstanding materials and services...

I have a school at Booleroo Centre which has been trying to get fees out of the government which were originally allocated to them 18 months ago but the school still has not got them. I think the land the school was going to use for the project has now been taken off the market. So, it is the bureaucracy which has hindered. I wonder whether this provision could be used to assist that long-suffering school. The school provides a great service to the community, but it has now been denied the ability to spend its money. This is the first chance I have had to raise this matter. I think it is very appropriate, because we are talking about school councils making services available. The services the school council wants to provide will save the government money with the installation of an irrigation system, which will be excellent in itself. So, I ask the minister to respond accordingly.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (EXPIATION OF OFFENCES) BILL

In committee (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 887.)

Remaining clauses (11 and 12) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Bill read a third time and passed.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION COUNCIL (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 November. Page 711.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): I rise as the lead speaker, and possibly the only speaker, on this bill on behalf of the opposition. I am sure the minister is nervous about whether we are going to support this bill, given the nature of it. He can rest in peace; we are supporting the bill. This is actually a very minor bill in the scheme of things. It sets out some very small changes to the way in which the National Environment Protection Council operates. In layman's terms, it basically sets out new meeting procedures for that very esteemed council on which the environment minister of the day sits from time to time.

For those who are not aware of what the Environment Protection Council is, it is essentially a meeting of like minds. It is the meeting of all the environment ministers from around Australia who meet at the ministerial councils, which are well known to this place. It actually has formal statutory powers with regard to making environmental policies, commonly known as the National Environment Protection Measures (NEPMs). This council goes through a tortuous process of developing these NEPMs. From memory, and according to the minister's second reading explanation, there are five NEPMs currently in place in Australia: the Ambient Air Quality Measure; the National Pollution Inventory Measure; the Movement of Controlled Waste between States and Territories Measure; the Assessment of Site Contamination Measure; and the Used Packaging Materials Measure. Each of those has been signed off by the esteemed body called the National Environment Protection Council.

The National Environment Council was set up a relatively short period ago (something like early 1992), following a special premiers' conference in October 1990. An inter-governmental agreement on the environment came into effect in May 1992, and the establishment of this council marked the commitment of the commonwealth, states and territories to cooperatively work together to address environment protection and issues of national importance. Those words were taken direct from the minister's second reading explanation, but I think they accurately reflect the history of the establishment of this esteemed council.

When the commonwealth set up this council, it did so by way of an act. The commonwealth had a review clause in the act and, as a result of the review of the act, a number of recommendations were made to the council in regard to changes to the act that would make the council far easier to operate. I will go through those changes in a minute. The commonwealth agreed to make the changes and, indeed, has already made the changes to its legislation, and every state minister, regardless of political colour, has agreed to change their state legislation to mirror the federal legislation. So, this is one of those circumstances where we are simply bringing our legislation into line with the federal legislation.

I must say that it is not of huge import to the taxpayers of South Australia. It is fair to say that not many people have been lobbying my electorate on bringing the NEPC rules into line with the commonwealth, but it is important that we do have uniform procedures so that NEPC can operate well across all states and the commonwealth.

Essentially, the changes are fairly simple. They introduce a simplified procedure to facilitate minor variations to measures. For those members who have had the pleasure of reading the National Environment Protection Council (South Australia) Act 1995, or, indeed, any of the statutes that underpin the creation of NEPC, there is a tortuous process through which NEPC must go to vary or revoke certain measures. I will not read the briefing paper provided to me by the minister's officers. It is an excellent briefing paper, which sets out in detail the changes that are made.

The opposition has given this briefing paper due scrutiny and believes that the simplified measures which are outlined in the bill and which are explained in the briefing paper are worthy of support, because these national environment protection measures take some years to develop. It is a bit like the state developing its own Environment Protection Policy (EPP). They take years to develop; and to vary them in a very small way you must go through a tortious two or three year process, which is a waste of taxpayers' money. I am sure that the officers would have something better to do than to go through a tortious process (as outlined in the current act) just to make some very minor amendments.

As I understand the briefing and the bill with respect to the protection provided to make sure the changes are genuinely minor in nature, normal NEPC measures require only a two-third vote of council, that is, six out of the nine members vote on what I would call a 'normal' variation. However, under this particular change, for minor variations that decision must be unanimous. So, if one of the parties, whether it be a state, territory or the commonwealth, disagrees with the proposal that it is a minor variation it can delay the process. It must then go through the process that is in place prior to these changes.

It does give every state and party to the NEPC the opportunity to have that safeguard. If they believe they are being disadvantaged by a particular proposal, whether that be a national environment protection measure or something else, they can delay the proposal and make it go through the full process which, in some cases, as I said earlier, can take years. The opposition does not have a problem with the changes to the bill that seek to include a system where a minor variation of a national environment protection measure can be made in a far simpler manner. We support that concept.

For the technocrats who want to go away and check the detail of the bill, under the draft bill sections 20(2) and 20(4) of the act do not apply to a minor variation of a national environment protection measure under the relevant division; and sections 15, 17, 18 and 19 of the act do not apply to the making of a minor variation. Members who want to look at that will see that that simplifies the process quite significantly. Under this bill the service corporation is able to provide assistance and support to other ministerial councils as directed by the council.

Essentially, the offers of support—for want of simpler language—that are provided to the National Environment Protection Council can provide services to other ministerial councils. That allows the service corporation to do anything incidental to its provisions of assistance to other ministerial councils. As I understand it, it has already been approached to provide that service; and this simply clarifies that, under the act, it has that power. The bill then outlines what I would call mechanical issues, such as leave of absence for the NEPC executive officer.

The bill talks about the public service staff of the service corporation, it talks about the staff being seconded to the

service corporation and it talks about the application of money by the service corporation. They are almost rules, if you like, about how the service corporation is going to operate on a day-to-day basis. The opposition does not have any real issue with this bill. It is simply a tidying up measure. In fact, I think that, at one stage, our officers may have raised the issue at an officers' meeting at the time we were in government, and said, 'Surely, we can develop a simplified method of doing these minor variations.'

I know that, at the time, it did cause the officers great frustration that if very minor variations were to be made no process was in place. The opposition supports this bill. The minister will be pleased to know that we do not have any questions and there is no need for a committee stage.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the opposition for its support of the bill. I acknowledge the history that has been provided to the house by the member for Davenport. I think that he is probably right: that the origins of this measure possibly did begin from his time in government. As he says, this is really a procedural bill. It simplifies the processes for the NEPC and will allow it to operate in a more sensible way. I thank the honourable member for that. I thank my officers who are here. They will be pleased to know that they do not have to come into the chamber and answer questions. I also thank Parliamentary Counsel for drafting the legislation. I commend the bill to the house.

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

ZERO WASTE SA BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 11 November. Page 709.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): I move:
That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (20)

Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Chapman, V. A.	Evans, I. F. (teller)
Goldsworthy, R. M.	Gunn, G. M.
Hall, J. L.	Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.
Kerin, R. G.	Maywald, K. A.
Kotz, D. C.	McFetridge, D.
Meier, E. J.	Penfold, E. M.
Redmond, I. M.	Scalzi, G.
Venning, I. H.	Williams, M. R.

NOES (24)

Atkinson, M. J.	Bedford, F. E.
Breuer, L. R.	Caica, P.
Ciccarello, V.	Conlon, P. F.
Foley, K. O.	Hanna, K.
Hill, J. D. (teller)	Key, S. W.
Koutsantonis, T.	Lomax-Smith, J. D.
McEwen, R. J.	O'Brien, M. F.
Rankine, J. M.	Rann, M. D.
Rau, J. R.	Snelling, J. J.
Stevens, L.	Such, R. B.
Thompson, M. G.	Weatherill, J. W.
White, P. L.	Wright, M. J.

PAIR(S)

Matthew, W. A.	Geraghty, R. K.
----------------	-----------------

Majority of 4 for the noes.
Motion thus negatived.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): On behalf of the Greens, I speak in favour of the Zero Waste SA Bill 2003. This proposal establishes Zero Waste SA. The purpose of the authority is to manage waste in South Australia. It is very pleasing to see that there is, in the legislative proposal, a waste management hierarchy, that is, a reference to an order of priority for the management of waste, and, without going through all of the details, it is good to see that avoidance of the production of waste and minimisation of the production of waste are given the highest priority. Obviously, reusing waste and recycling waste comes ahead of the disposal of waste in the environment.

So the priorities do more or less seem to be given the appropriate values. I have long thought that it would be appropriate for South Australia to have a coordinated approach to waste management, and this bill does create an agency to give effect to that intention. For too long, various councils have been doing their own thing in respect of waste management. Sometimes councils have got together with the neighbouring councils to form regional authorities to cope with waste management, but the problems of waste management clearly cut across local government boundaries and need to be addressed on a statewide level. Indeed, in clause 6 of the bill before us, among the functions of Zero Waste SA, specific reference is made to the coordination of government policy objectives in respect of waste management.

The other functions of the Zero Waste SA authority include the raising of public and industry awareness; developing programs in respect of preventing litter and illegal dumping; market development for recovered resources and recycled material; developing a waste strategy for the state; monitoring and assessing the waste strategy; providing assistance to local councils with arrangements for regional waste management contributing to the development of waste management infrastructure, technologies and systems; and promoting research and providing advice to the minister.

The only reservation that I have about the bill is the name of the authority, but I suppose we will get used to the name Zero Waste SA, and will all come to be familiar with it in time. The Local Government Association has raised some concerns with the government and with other members of parliament about details of the bill. These concerns can be dealt with in committee, and in my opinion there is no need to hold up this stage of the bill when we discuss the principles inherent in the proposal. Because I support the principles, first, of a coordinating authority for waste management in South Australia and, secondly, values given to waste avoidance and minimisation, I support the second reading.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): I am the lead opposition speaker on this bill. I guess it is unfortunate that I need to rise to speak on this bill at this time, but the house has decided that we will debate this issue now and it is unfortunate that those members who may have voted in favour of having the debate now do not wish to contribute. I make that comment because the Local Government Association has sent faxes to the opposition and I understand has had discussions with other members of parliament requesting us not to debate this bill tonight, and that was the purpose of the division just held—because the LGA have some issues with this bill. The fax I received this afternoon says:

The LGA's strong preference is that the bill not be debated in the House of Assembly this week as we have requested urgent feedback from councils by 27 November.

So, the LGA has made clear that it does not wish to have the house debate this issue tonight. I sought to adjourn it so the LGA could properly inform members of parliament prior to the second reading contribution about the views of its councils. The government in its wisdom has decided that we can have the second reading debate, even though we do not know the views of the councils, so we are having the debate in a vacuum and that is where we are.

It is interesting to note that, as I understand the process, the government had a draft bill that it discussed with the LGA on 15 May. The next time the LGA saw a bill was something like 11 November, when the bill was tabled in the house and a number of changes had occurred in the bill. The LGA then sought to put it out to its councils and sought feedback by 27 November—in two days—and the government has decided not to wait for that feedback. So, we are denied the view of the 69 councils out there, which are basically the day-to-day operators to a large extent in relation to waste issues (certainly one of their key operations is waste management), during the second reading debate, which is unfortunate because there will not be a lot to do next week in this house.

The government is running around saying that we will be debating until 3 a.m. My guess is that we will not be here anywhere near that long next week. So the opposition is disappointed that the government has chosen to proceed with this debate now. It will say, of course, 'Don't worry; you can pick up the issues in the third reading debate.' That is fine, but we may make comments in the second reading debate that reflect our policy position, without knowing whether the LGA constituent groups have a totally different view. That creates some issues for us in regard to what we do at the third reading.

We will be making some general comments about the bill and it will all be subject to what the councils say, come the third reading. To some extent, doing it this way tends to stifle the debate. You do not want to put your position on record totally, because you are not sure what the key constituent groups will say. I know that the LGA has a view on some of the clauses but, for all it knows, its 69 councils may write back and say that some may have a problem with this clause or that clause, and the LGA may have to change its position. I agree that that is unlikely, but it is certainly possible.

The parliament is now debating this measure in a policy vacuum as far as the LGA and its constituent councils are concerned. I cannot understand the great urgency, because the Zero Waste statutory authority is already operating by way of a committee. As I understand the brief, it has been operating since 1 July. So, one would assume that the acting CEO is already implementing the principles outlined in the bill. It already has a chairman and a committee in place. It has access to the \$600 000, or whatever the figure was, in waste levies that are in the waste management fund held by the EPA for the purposes of the previous waste management committee. So, all this activity is happening. The waste strategy that the government so dearly wants to put in place is slowly but surely being put in place. Pray tell: what do three days of parliamentary sitting time really matter in regard to having the debate? I can understand why the LGA would be quite miffed that the government has chosen to snub its request and have the second reading debate tonight.

For the life of me, I cannot understand what effect three days sitting will have, other than it does not suit the govern-

ment's time frame. The government wants to try to get this bill through the other place before Christmas so that it can issue a press release stating that the new body has been formed, that this waste group is established; and that the world is a better place as a result. Three days will not make a scrap of difference. We gave a commitment to the government that we were quite happy to debate this bill a week from now, next Tuesday night. The government decided that it is so urgent that we need to debate it tonight, even though we do not know what the 60-odd councils believe to be the issues with the bill. That is why we called the division earlier—to give the parliament the chance to hold up the debate and to give the LGA the opportunity to speak to its councils and come back to all the politicians with the issues that it has with the bill. We have been denied that opportunity, so all we can really do is talk about this measure in the most general terms which, in my view, is really not the purpose of the second reading contribution.

The Zero Waste bill sets up a statutory authority. This was the government, of course, that issued a press release saying that it was going to get rid of all these committees, statutory authorities and boards to keep Robert Champion de Crespigny happy, because the Economic Development Board said that we had too many in place. It is interesting that another statutory authority is being established. Having said that, the reality is that waste needs to be managed. We generate waste through economic and domestic activity; therefore, it needs to be handled. The previous government established a waste management committee. It was a section 17 committee established under the EPA chaired by David Cruickshanks-Boyd, if my memory serves me correctly. The committee performed the same function for the previous government that this statutory authority will for this government. It was funded in the same way, namely, through the waste levy that went into a fund that was set aside under the EPA for that committee. I understand that the fund is now being used to fund this interim statutory authority. The principle about waste management has been adopted by all parties, but the key is how it is administered—whether it is by a stand-alone statutory authority, or whether it is by a committee under the EPA.

During the committee stage, I hope that the minister will obtain the answers to the questions that I raised in the brief with his officers, because I am still waiting for replies to some questions that I put to the officers. Hopefully, since this debate has been forced upon us, we might reach the—

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The minister implied that the debate was forced upon us because of the agreement between the leaders of the house. The minister knows that, when the leaders of the house made that agreement, we did not have the facts from local government, which said, 'Don't debate the bill.'

The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The minister said, 'Pull the other one.' I ask the minister: when was the agreement made? As I understand it—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: The leaders of the house—

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The leaders of the house made the agreement at the start of the week. At the start of the parliamentary week, the leaders of the house make an agreement about which legislation will be debated. The ministers and shadow ministers are then rung and asked whether they are ready to debate the bill. At 3.15 p.m. today we received a fax from the LGA which said, 'Do not debate

the bill.' So, it postdates the agreement of the leaders of the house.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: That is a fatuous argument.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: That is not factually inaccurate: it is factually accurate.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: I said 'fatuous'.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I know the minister has had his way and won the division; that is fine. We will have the second reading; we are doing that. But I think it is unfortunate that we have been forced to do that. If the LGA had its preference, we would not be debating it: it is accepting the second reading as a compromise position.

What we have is a zero waste bill that sets up a statutory authority to look after waste. It is interesting that the LGA said in one of its letters to me that it supports the concept of a statutory authority because it is independent. I will quiz this during the committee stage, because I do not think that it is independent. The EPA, essentially, cannot be directed by the minister. The statutory authority, I think, might be able to be directed by the minister. It might be a stand-alone statutory authority but, if it can be directed by the minister, I fail to see how it is independent. The parliament will have to decide whether it wants a committee of a body that cannot be directed by the minister to run its waste management, or whether it wants a stand-alone authority that can be directed by the minister to run its waste management. I would have thought that a body that could be directed by the minister was hardly independent; that it was probably very much under the control of the government if it could be directed by the minister.

The purpose of this new statutory authority is, obviously, to come up with policies that look at reducing waste—things such as controlling landfills; encouraging the application of the latest waste management technologies; better informing consumers and producers; encouraging industry to use recycled and renewable products; working with KESAB and other producers to reduce litter; promoting private sector on-site treatment and recycling of waste; increasing recycling by government departments (it certainly does that through its media unit); increasing the reuse and recycling of construction and demolition waste (which is happening as we speak—we use it in roads and all sorts of things: it is one of the growing areas of recycling and reuse); developing a green waste action plan to divert garden food and wood waste from landfills; and supporting tough national packaging covenants to reduce unnecessary packaging. That is straight out of the minister's second reading contribution. That is the purpose of this new statutory authority, Zero Waste SA.

It is also stated in the second reading contribution that it will be an independent statutory authority. The LGA says that that is a good thing. As I said, I will be quizzing the minister about exactly how independent the statutory authority is with respect to directions from ministers and government, and so on. The statutory authority will need to come up with a business plan—not dissimilar to any other business plan of any other statutory authority, but one that suits its purpose. It will need to decide which committees and subcommittees it wishes to establish. The minister has tabled an amendment concerning conflicts of interest for committees and subcommittees, so where people have a conflict of interest they will need to declare it. I think that would be a pretty standard condition for the various committees of statutory authorities.

The other functions of Zero Waste are to develop, coordinate and contribute to the implementation of government policy objectives in respect of waste management for

the regions, for industry sectors or for material types, so it will be able to come up with policies in any of those areas. There might be a waste management policy for Yorke Peninsula, or a policy on tyres or a waste management strategy for the fast food industry, as an example.

Zero Waste can also come up with awareness and education programs in relation to waste management, whether that be public education campaigns or industry based campaigns. It can look at programs for the prevention of litter and illegal dumping around the state, and it can market development for recovery resources and recycled material. It can look at developing markets for recycled goods or material, and it will be interesting to see whether it can invest in companies or run businesses itself, as a statutory authority, to try to establish a market, and whether the taxpayer will subsidise, through the statutory authority, the establishment of what are marginal businesses in the recycling area to try to develop a market.

One of the issues with the very successful expansion of the container deposit legislation that was announced by the previous government was whether there were markets for some of the recycled products. That was one of the considerations put to us by the officers at that time. One of the problems with expanding the container deposit legislation to products—and it could be put on almost any product—is whether there are markets for the recycled product or whether there is the technology to get it into a reusable form. All those issues need to be taken into account. It is that sort of advice and that sort of policy issue that the people involved in the statutory authority, whether at board, committee or subcommittee level, will be working through.

Clause 4 provides that Zero Waste is subject to the direction of the minister, except in relation to the making of a recommendation or a report to the minister. Essentially the authority is subject to the minister's direction. If my memory serves me correctly, the EPA is not subject to the minister's direction, and the minister has been trumpeting the fearlessly independent EPA. This measure takes away the waste management policy development, the waste management strategy development and the waste management business plan development from the independent EPA and gives it to a body that can now be directed by the minister. I am not convinced necessarily that that is the right move.

I accept that the government will have the numbers to get this measure through but, when the minister's second reading explanation states that it will be an independent statutory body, the word 'independent' must be read as being in parenthesis, to some degree, because it is not independent of the minister. The minister can direct the statutory authority and the directions will have to be in writing. From what I see in this clause, I do not think the directions have to be put in the annual report, although most other ministerial directions to statutory authorities have to go in the annual report.

I am not sure whether describing this as an 'independent statutory authority' is absolutely accurate. I know what the minister means by the word 'independent', but I do not think it is independent when the minister can describe it. It will look at a whole range of things. One of them is how the new statutory authority will be funded. Essentially, as I understand it, the minister has doubled the waste levies to \$10.10 a tonne in metropolitan South Australia and \$5.10 in the country. That is a 100 per cent increase in the waste levy. I remember the election promise that they would not have to put up any levies, charges or taxes, but apparently they have forgotten that election promise in relation to the waste levy. In fact,

they have put it up by 100 per cent. Some 50 per cent of that levy will go to the Waste to Resources Fund, which will fund this statutory authority.

It was my understanding that the government had made a commitment that all the levy would go to that fund and all the levy would be available to the statutory authority for waste management. My understanding is that local government is none too pleased with the fact that it will be getting only 50 per cent of the levy: I think the other 50 per cent will go to the EPA, if my memory serves me correctly. We might flesh that out during the committee stage next week in the wee small hours—because we have this huge legislative program to get through next week. My understanding is that the increase in the levy introduces an extra cost of about \$2 million per year into the system. That is an extra \$2 million being taken out of the system and being put into waste management, even though the government said that it would not have to increase rates, taxes or charges to implement its election policy. The second reading explanation states:

The government is aware that the Local Government Association would like to see even more of the waste levy used for zero waste.

I would love to say how much local government wanted, but, since we are debating the issue without the view of local government, we will have to leave that contribution until the third reading stage. It will be interesting to find out from the minister exactly what the waste levy will be used for in the other agencies in the environment and conservation portfolio. The way that was explained to me during the briefing was that it would be going to the EPA. The way it reads in the second reading contribution is that it can go to any of the agencies in the environment and conservation portfolio. If one takes the second reading explanation at its word, that could be, for example, the coastal marine area, the Office of Coastal Marine, or the old national parks—or whatever it is called these days since the restructure. It will be interesting to see how the waste levy will be used and, indeed, what restrictions, if any, are used on it. Does it need to be used for waste management purposes? Can it be used for marketing, or anything else, in that portfolio? There appears to be no restriction on how the other 50 per cent of the levy that is collected will be used. There seems to be a flexible approach as to how the government uses the levy.

There is not even an indication in the second reading explanation as to whether the government can then cut the contribution to the environment and conservation portfolio by the amount of the levy. All it has really done is levy local government for the amount that would normally be in its budget appropriation, and there is nothing in the second reading explanation or the bill that touches on that. I am not sure what the Local Government Association's view on that is but, when get to the third reading and have had a chance to talk to the LGA in detail, we will know its view.

At this stage there appears to be nothing at all to stop the government taking half the waste management levy, giving it to the environment and conservation portfolio and then spending it on whatever it wants and, when it comes to the Treasury negotiations, it can simply cut the portfolio by that amount and it is another budget cut to the agency being funded by LGA levies—a very generous approach, if that is accurate. On my reading of it, that certainly appears to be the case.

The statutory authority will naturally be supported by a small office. They have already established that. I have confidence in the office, having dealt with the officers who

are currently located there. I have confidence in their dedication and their capacity to handle that position, having received much good advice from them during my time as minister. The government has established a short-term ministerial advisory committee, which has helped to guide and inform the activities of the office, and it will be interesting to see the exact format long term of the board in relation to how many of those committee members actually make it through.

In relation to the statutory authority, of course, it can appoint a chief executive. I assume that it will wait to formally do that once the bill is through. We have the usual requirements for the proceedings of the boards, by way of minutes and a quorum and all those sorts of issues, which are pretty standard in this bill compared to all the other statutory authorities. I do not think there is anything unique in the way that this committee is going to operate. It has the power to establish committees and subcommittees, basically at the statutory authority's leisure. It has a requirement, as I said earlier, to create a business plan, which sets out a three-year goal.

I wonder whether three years is actually too short and whether it would not be better to have a longer-term goal. I think most of the water catchment boards have a five-year business plan, but, if the government wants to do it for three years, good luck to it. It seeks to protect the name 'zero waste.' If I recall, a press release was put out announcing a zero waste strategy. It is not a bad name, actually. It is really just a marketing exercise trying to keep in the public's mind the importance of trying to reduce waste. We put out that exact name about three years ago, and it is pleasing to see that the government has picked up the same target and the same name: it is just establishing a different structure to get there.

There is the Waste Resources Fund, which essentially is directed by the Treasurer and can be funded from the following sources: 50 per cent from the levy; any money appropriated by the parliament for the purposes of the fund; any money paid into the fund at the direction or the approval of the Treasurer; any money received by way of gift, grant or bequest; and any money paid into the fund under any other act. It will be interesting to see how they come up with a waste strategy. As I understand it, the central role for this body is to come up with a waste strategy. I think it would be hard pressed to say that there is not already a waste strategy within government.

There are very few governments that do not have a waste strategy, so one would assume that this statutory authority will get all the waste strategies out there, run them together and call it a statewide waste strategy.

It will be interesting because, in the last few weeks, this government has signed off on the green waste proposal out at Virginia. I think that proposal is by Jeffries. My understanding is that that green waste proposal did not go to this particular waste committee. So, the green waste reduction strategy that is going to be in place for 20 years out at Virginia did not actually go past this committee. It went to the minister for development and other areas, but my understanding is that the committee that is responsible for the development of a statewide strategy for green waste as part of its terms of reference did not consider that proposal. This is a system that they are putting in for 20 years. It will be interesting to see how much the government uses them as a policy development mechanism, not just a marketing tool. It will be interesting to see exactly how that works.

Waste collection is one of the big issues facing South Australia. I have not finished reading all of the State of the Environment report that was tabled yesterday, but I did notice that waste to landfill went up, from memory, about 14 per cent, as I read in the minister's press release. Clearly, with the booming economy and increased consumer consumption—both at the industry and domestic levels—issues of waste management are going to be difficult ones for government and the parliament to address for some years to come. They will need to establish stricter policies on a range of matters, and this statutory authority, Zero Waste, will be central to that.

Now that it is out of the EPA, it will be interesting to see who actually develops the environment protection policy for waste. My understanding is that the EPA still has the responsibility to develop an EPP, so it will be interesting to see who overrides whom. I think the EPA, since its establishment, has always been independent. I think the way it might work—and I will be fleshing this out in the committee stage—is for the EPA to do the courtesy of consulting this statutory authority, but I do not think that the statutory authority overrides the EPA. If the EPA wants to, it can actually reject the statutory authority and recommend a different EPP or take a different approach to the issue. That is something that is unclear in the second reading contribution by the minister. It is also unclear in the bill. It is my interpretation that the EPA might be the higher-level body and the statutory authority might be the lower-level body. The statutory authority will develop a statewide plan, but I am wondering how that fits in with an EPP process under the EPA Act.

I guess that is one of the reasons why we had those two together. The committee reports to the EPA so that there is straight co-ordination of that particular issue, and the EPP for waste could be developed in full consultation. Having an EPA board member chairing that waste committee, as I recall, probably made it a little bit easier. It will be interesting to see whether the EPA and the statutory authority share the same view on all issues in the long term. If they do share the same view on all issues, why do we need two bodies? If they do not share the same view on all issues, then who overrides whom? That will be an interesting policy question that will need to be fleshed out during this famous committee session that we are going to have next week after they have spoken to the Local Government Association. It will be interesting to see whether this body has the power to override councils. Does this body have the power to override local government? Frankly, I have no idea. I asked the question during the brief about that issue, because some councils of which I am aware and with which I have communicated on a personal level are petrified about the rate increase that is going to be imposed on them by this statutory authority.

We would need to make clear whether this statutory authority has the power to override local government. So, if this statutory authority says that this landfill must close or that that one must open, or that tractor tyres cannot be dumped or that green waste cannot be shredded, or whatever the policy area, is that mandated on local government, regardless of the cost to local government?

The management committee might come up with a policy that says you must have a two-bin (recyclable and non-recyclable) waste collection system. In urban South Australia that is probably the standard with some councils, but in some of the peri-urban areas, such as the Adelaide Hills council, where you have one major centre and then a spread of

population over a huge geographic area, that policy would increase the rates by a significant amount. So, does this body actually have the power to force councils to adopt a waste strategy that they do not want to adopt? That is a question that will need to be answered during the committee stage.

I note that clause 18 provides that Zero Waste and the Environment Protection Authority need to coordinate their activities. That is all well and good. However, one would assume that all of government coordinates its activities, but apparently we need this in the legislation for these two groups. As I said earlier, that does not clarify who overrides whom in the food chain in relation to waste management issues. It gives the government the opportunity to make regulations as per the normal regulation making power, and it also sets out various transitional provisions.

My brief tells me that this clause requires the EPA to pay the Treasurer for the credit of the Waste to Resources Fund 47½ per cent of the waste deposit levy paid under section 113 of the EPA Act between 1 July and the date the act commences. I am not sure why it is 47½ per cent. The way I read the bill, 50 per cent of the levy is meant to be going in, so I am not quite sure why 47½ per cent is being used. Perhaps that can be fleshed out during the second reading contribution.

I could go on, but I do not intend to. What I do intend to do is to go away and talk to the Local Government Association about what its issues are, but I will talk to the association after it has talked to its 69 councils. It is important that we hear the councils' view, because I think local government will bear the brunt of these waste management issues.

As I understand it, the LGA has a number of issues. The issues relate to the functions of Zero Waste SA; they relate to the board of Zero Waste SA; they relate to the Waste to Resources Fund; they relate to clauses 16(3) and 16(4), which are about the Waste to Resources Fund; they relate to the schedules; and they relate to conflicts of interest provisions—and whatever the other 69 councils bring up during the consultation process.

The opposition will not oppose the establishment of this statutory authority. We accept that any government needs a waste management strategy. We had it under a committee of the EPA; this government wants to set up a statutory authority to run it. If that is the structure the government wants to employ, we do not intend to stand in the way. However, we look forward to an enthusiastic committee stage, and I hope that between now and the committee stage, the officers might get back to me with answers to the questions I raised with them a couple of weeks ago so that we can properly partake in the committee stage. At this stage, none of the questions taken on notice has yet been responded to.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I move:

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I will respond to several issues raised by the member for Davenport. He made much of the fact that this debate had been forced upon the opposition. As I understand it—I just confirmed it with the Leader of the House—the arrangements about the program for this week were made

between the leader of this side and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, and that was an agreed arrangement—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: On Thursday of last week, as I understand it. At 3.15 p.m. the member for Davenport received correspondence from a third party, that is, the LGA, which raised some issues and, on that basis, he made a unilateral decision to adjourn the debate. That is not the way in which we do things. We have discussions about things and try to get agreement, and ultimately the government is responsible for the business of the house, and that is what happened today. In relation to the concerns of the LGA, I did not receive the document that the opposition spokesperson and a number of other members received until somebody provided me with a copy. I then organised for a member of my staff to ring the LGA. We talked to the President of the LGA, John Legoe, who was quite happy for us to continue with the debate. We said that we would adjourn at the end of the second reading stage and prior to going into committee. He was very comfortable with that as it addressed the concerns that he had to have a number of the outstanding issues between the LGA and the government resolved. I do not think the LGA will be unhappy about today's debate.

My department, officers and I have been having discussions with the LGA since early this year. The first conversations were in January and February when we announced the concept and we had further conversations when the draft legislation was prepared. Subsequent to that, we have had many discussions, most of which focused on the percentage of the levy on waste to landfill and other issues. In broad terms, the LGA supports the Zero Waste SA concept and the legislation. They have some issues which I will address but they are of a minor nature and can be addressed relatively simply. Zero Waste, as the member for Davenport says, is this government's way of managing our state's waste. We made a commitment prior to the election to set up an authority which had some powers to deal with zero waste.

It is true to say that, in some ways, it is similar to Eco Recycle, a Victorian government measure (I am not sure which government introduced it) which has been in place for some years now and which works effectively, as I understand it. Two agencies within my portfolio will be responsible for waste management; that is, Zero Waste, the policy making body, and the EPA, the regulatory body. That will continue to have the regulatory role in relation to waste as it does in relation to other industry. Zero Waste's job will be to develop the broad strategy and to attempt to have that implemented. The essential element of Zero Waste Authority is a partnership between local government, state government, industry and community. The interim board which we have at the moment consists of more members from local government than from state government.

There is one representative from industry and one from the community—someone from the Conservation Council. The aim of the authority and the aim of this board is to get good cooperation and good working relations between those bodies. Advice I have received since this interim body was established is that it is working very well. In relation to the outstanding concerns of local government to zero waste, I advise the house of the following: the issues about which it is concerned are the percentage allocation to zero waste from the EP Fund. The legislation makes plain that 50 per cent of the funding collected from the levy will go into the new EP Fund, the statutory fund. That money will be used for the purposes of the zero waste legislation.

Local government would have liked to see a higher proportion. In fact, the original proportion was 47½ per cent, and we agreed to increase it to 50 per cent. The other 50 per cent basically supports the EPA. We made that commitment. I think I said in my second reading explanation (I am not entirely sure now) that I agreed with the LGA that we would review that on a regular basis. I will say formally, for the benefit of the LGA and the house, that the minister will review annually the allocation to Zero Waste SA.

Further, the board of Zero Waste SA will consult with industry and local government and provide advice to the minister on allocations from EP funds to Zero Waste. The legislation is written so that 50 per cent of the funds collected must go into zero waste, but there is nothing to say that, in the future, there cannot be a greater percentage. Effectively, in future, we will be examining—and on an annual basis—whether that figure will be greater than the 50 per cent, and I give that commitment to local government.

The second issue of concern to local government was the Waste to Resources Fund and whether or not the money in that fund—I think that, from memory, it is around \$1.8 million, but I will correct that in the committee stages if that is not correct, but it is certainly of that order—would be transferred to Zero Waste. I can give an assurance to both the LGA and the house that all funds held in trust by the EPA in relation to former bodies will be transferred to the Zero Waste SA Fund.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Is that all of the \$1.8 million?

The Hon. J.D. Hill: Whatever the quantum is, yes. We are establishing a statutory fund and, as I understand it, the money that goes into that fund must be applied to the purposes of the act. It cannot be attacked by Treasury or other ministers and taken away for other purposes. It must be applied for the purposes of the act. The existing funds that are sitting in the Waste to Resources Fund will be transferred to Zero Waste; and, in addition, the funds that have been accumulating since the levy was increased will stay within that fund.

The third issue related to the board of Zero Waste. The bill requires that the minister consult with the LGA on the appointment of the Zero Waste board, and it states, '... in accordance with the regulations'. The LGA has a concern about this because, of course, the regulations are yet to be drafted. In order to address that issue, I am happy to say that the minister will consult with the Local Government Association on the development of the regulations that relate to the appointment of the Zero Waste SA board. In relation to the waste strategy, the LGA, I understand, is concerned that, although the EPA has to give regard to the state waste strategy, development approvals and the making of environment protection policies may not. My officers have been advised by Parliamentary Counsel that this is not a valid concern and I will attempt, between now and next week, to explain that in some detail to the LGA.

The final point, as I understand it, about which the LGA was concerned related to the absence of a conflict of interest provision in the bill. That issue has been addressed and I have tabled an amendment which deals with it. I now give an undertaking to the house and to the LGA to have further conversation with the LGA during the next week before this matter is dealt with again to see whether we can get resolution on all those issues. I think they are relatively straightforward issues. In fact, I think that the LGA would agree that they may be of significance, but they are relatively minor

issues in the overall scheme of things in relation to this legislation.

That is what we are dealing with. I think the member for Davenport made a point about the number of changes to the legislation since it was first distributed. I have an annotated version of the bill in front of me, and I can say that there are relatively few changes to the legislation. Clause 5—Primary objective and guiding principles—provides:

The primary objective of Zero Waste SA is to promote waste management practices that, as far as possible, . . .

Then there is a list of things that it is supposed to do. A new paragraph (c) has been added, and that provides:

are based on an integrated strategy for the state.

There may be a new paragraph (b), but I am not sure, because it has not been highlighted correctly on my copy, but it says:

advance the development of resource recovery and recycling.

That is hardly a major change.

Under clause 6—Functions of Zero Waste SA—there is a new paragraph (g) which says that Zero Waste should advise the minister from time to time about the amount to be charged by way of a levy under section 113 of the Environment Protection Act 1993. That is relatively straightforward.

In clause 11—Proceedings of board—there is a minor change in subclause (3) which relates to the quorum rule. Under clause 14—Annual report—there is a new paragraph which provides that the report must include details of the coordination of activities by Zero Waste and the EPA during the period to which the report relates. I would have thought that is a pretty sensible provision. Under clause 15—Use and protection of name—there is a whole series of subclauses to protect the intellectual property of Zero Waste. It states that Zero Waste SA has a proprietary interest in the names 'Zero Waste' and 'Zero Waste SA'.

Under clause 16, there is a new reference to 50 per cent or such greater percentage as may be prescribed. As I said, in the original bill it was 47.5 per cent. We have increased it to, I believe, the satisfaction, and certainly the benefit, of the fund. Subclause (4) provides that the fund may be applied by Zero Waste SA (without further appropriation than this subsection). That clarifies that Zero Waste SA can spend the money once it has gone into the fund. The word 'objects' has been changed to 'purposes'.

In clause 17(2)(c) we have included the word 'goals' after the word 'targets'. Paragraph (d) is rephrased but has the same purpose as the existing legislation. The member for Davenport referred to the transitional arrangements in part 3. That refers to the 47.5 per cent, because as I said the original legislation was based on 47.5 per cent and this year's budget has been worked out on that basis. So in this transition period, the first year of the program, it will be 47.5 per cent of the fund going to Zero Waste, but in subsequent years it will be 50 per cent.

As I said, these are fairly minor changes. The substance of the bill has not altered at all. I am happy to continue talking with the Local Government Authority over the next week to try to clarify its concerns. I thank the honourable member for indicating the opposition's general support for the provisions. I also thank the member for Mitchell for his support for the legislation. This is important legislation, and I commend it to the house.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I seek the minister's agreement that the government will not bring this back before Wednesday next week so that our party room, which meets on Tuesday, has a chance to discuss the Local Government Association's amendments.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Obviously this is a matter to be discussed between the leaders of the house, but we have noted your recommendation.

Clause passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

PATAWALONGA REPORT

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): I lay on the table the Patawalonga Sea Water Circulation and Storm Water Outlet System June 2003 Flooding and Systems Operation Report.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the house do now adjourn.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): It is with great pleasure this evening to put on the public record some of the great things that are happening in the electorate of Mawson, and also how good our young people are. So often we tend to see a focus on the small percentage of young people who do not want to toe the line and be part of an exciting future for South Australia. But they are a real minority and, in fact, I would suggest that they are probably only 1 or 2 per cent at the most. In my opinion, the 98 or 99 per cent of great young people do not get enough positive exposure throughout the community and the media. I want to put on public record my congratulations to Miriam Drought. She is a young lady from Tatchilla Lutheran College and she has been selected from more than 2 000 applicants from around Australia to attend the 21st Annual National Youth Science Forum being held in Canberra in January 2004. She will take part in a two-week residential program of activities that will enthuse and inform students' choices as they plan their university studies and post university careers in science, engineering or technology.

During the forum, Miriam will meet with practising scientists, participate in debates, visit significant sites of scientific endeavour, and practise job interviews. They will also, along with fellow year 12 students of similar abilities, be meeting and talking about their ambitions and goals—something that we need to see young people doing. I want to acknowledge the partnership in this between Rotary, a great service club—as indeed all service clubs are—and also the university industry and the federal government.

Miriam is an outstanding young lady. She comes from a great family, a strong Christian family, who, I believe, typify what you can do as a family if you are prepared to put some time and love into supporting your children. All the Drought children are young adults whom I see offering a great future for South Australia and they are a credit to themselves, their mum and their dad, and their extended family. I was pleased to see that Miriam has again won another award, in that she won one of the City of Onkaparinga's community youth services awards and will now possibly be considered for the City of Onkaparinga Youth of the Year that is announced during the celebrations on Australia Day. I wish Miriam every success with that. She is a talented lady, highly

academic, and also very good with music, which is not a surprise if you know the family, because they are all talented at singing and music. When you see the calibre of young people such as Miriam, you know that South Australia's future is in great shape.

I also acknowledge a club that I have spent quite a bit of time with over the years which does a lot of good work for young people in the area of healthy lifestyles. I congratulate the Noarlunga United Soccer Club on its 40th anniversary. It is an achievement for any club to last 40 years in South Australia, and today we see that a lot of clubs are struggling because of the requirement for them to be run by volunteers. But, whilst all clubs have highs and lows, I believe that the history of the Noarlunga United Soccer Club shows that it has had far more highs than lows, and it is a credit to soccer, particularly in the south, and to itself as a club.

I congratulate all the people who have been involved in supporting the Noarlunga United Soccer Club (commonly known as the Bulldogs). I particularly pay tribute to Margaret and Peter Young, Pat Maslin and John Jones. Of course, many others also should be acknowledged and thanked for their great work and the successes that they have achieved both on the pitch and also back in the clubrooms, but I think it is fair to single out these few individuals and thank them in particular for their dedication to the Noarlunga United Soccer Club.

I also want to touch for a moment on the McLaren Vale Business Association awards night, at which I was privileged, along with some others, to be one of the judges. It is certainly a great honour to be asked, as a local member of parliament, to be a judge at these awards nights. We do not really spend enough time patting people on the back who are prepared to put in the extra yards and the extra hours to ensure that we see positive growth in a community. The McLaren Vale Business Association is to be congratulated for not only its initiatives in recognising people who should be recognised at these awards nights, but also for the partnerships that they have developed with state government and local government. The undergrounding of power (the PLEC scheme) and the upgrading of McLaren Vale's main street are things in which I had a bit of involvement when we were in government. The undergrounding policy was driven also by the council, the City of Onkaparinga and the McLaren Vale Business Association.

I can think back further than I probably want, to when I was a young teenager and invited, as someone who had an interest in business in McLaren Vale, to try to get a McLaren Vale business association going. I liken our function that night to a beef and burgundy evening rather than a meeting of the professional association that we now have in McLaren Vale. It really has got some results for the town and is creating a lot of jobs along the way. Small businesses are very diverse throughout the Fleurieu Peninsula, including McLaren Vale and Noarlunga, and are an enticement for people to put money into the area who otherwise would not come into the area, so we are really value-adding our tourism. Seeing young people capitalising on vocational education and training opportunities, TAFE opportunities and the job outcomes happening in our area is something that makes me and, I am sure, the rest of the community immensely proud. I was pleased that not only businesses were recognised by these awards but also other people who put that extra outstanding commitment into our community. Whether it was in sport, as citizen of the year, or in tourism or the arts, all of these people were acknowledged on the night.

The community spirit in the south is strong and has been growing strongly since we first pioneered the country. Its history goes back to 1838 when Willunga (one of the oldest towns in the state) first originated, primarily because of the slate that was there for building. Since then, we have seen a great community spirit growing in the south.

Unfortunately, of course, we have had, and we do still have, from time to time, hiccups in our opportunities to promote that strong community spirit and enthusiasm. We had to deal with that again recently when there was some quite negative media due, again, to only a small percentage of people who were not working with the rest of the community. I am pleased to see that that was addressed with some rapid strategies. Some of those I admit are only bandaid strategies, but others are broader strategies that will work for several years to ensure that we keep the community safe, the community spirit strong and the community in the south growing.

I would like, at this stage, to congratulate the police for the excellent work that they did. The Assistant Commissioner,

the superintendent and the sergeant involved in the intelligence and strategy planning for the particular operations that had to get underway quickly need to be thanked by me on behalf of the broader community. I have talked to a number of community members since those policing strategies went in to address the problems that were highlighted in the media a couple of weeks ago, and people are very pleased to see those strategies in place.

Graffiti is a problem. At the moment the member for Fisher and I both have some amendments to the act for which I hope we will get support in the parliament. Graffiti appears to be a growth problem right across the metropolitan area and, indeed, quite a lot of the state. I am pleased to see the city of Onkaparinga working with South Australia Police to come up with Operation Sightscreen to ensure that we keep our state and our city clean and beautiful, and I congratulate the city on that.

Motion carried.

At 6.20 p.m. the house adjourned until Wednesday 26 November at 2 p.m.