LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 20 February 2003

The PRESIDENT (Hon. R.R. Roberts) took the chair at 2.15 p.m. and read prayers.

HIGHWAY ONE

A petition signed by 222 residents of South Australia, concerning the speed limit along Highway One that runs through Port Pirie and praying that this council will reduce the speed of traffic from 110 km/h to 80 km/h through the section of Highway One known locally as George's Corner, from 500 metres north of Wimpy's Mobil Roadhouse Motel to 500 metres south of Rangeview Caravan and Cabin Park, was presented by the Hon. Ian Gilfillan.

Petition received.

RADIOACTIVE WASTE

A petition signed by 1060 residents of South Australia, concerning the transport and storage of radioactive waste in South Australia and praying that this council will do all in its power to ensure that South Australia does not become the dumping ground for Australia's or the world's nuclear waste, was presented by the Hon. Sandra Kanck.

Petition received.

BUS SERVICE, ADELAIDE HILLS

A petition signed by 31 residents of South Australia, concerning weekend bus services to the Adelaide Hills and praying that this council will call on the member for Kavel and the Minister for Transport to address urgently the needs of people living in the Adelaide Hills and provide them with new weekend bus services, or taxi transfers, from existing weekend services, was presented by the Hon. Sandra Kanck.

Petition received.

LUCAS HEIGHTS NUCLEAR REACTOR

A petition signed by 24 residents of South Australia, concerning the Lucas Heights nuclear reactor and praying that this council will call on the federal government to halt the new nuclear reactor project and seek urgently alternative sources for medical isotopes and resist at every turn the plan to make South Australia the nation's nuclear waste dumping ground, was presented by the Hon. Sandra Kanck.

Petition received.

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

The PRESIDENT: I direct that written answers to the following questions on notice, as detailed in the schedule that I now table, be distributed and printed in *Hansard*: Nos 52, 61 and 66.

TEACHERS

52. **The Hon. A.J. REDFORD:** What was the total number of teachers employed in South Australia as at 13 March 2002?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following information:

In March 2002 there were over 17 400 full-time equivalent teachers employed in schools in South Australia. As there is no reliable collective data available about the number of teachers employed in independent schools at that time, I cannot supply that figure.

PORT ADELAIDE MARINE MAINTENANCE FUND

61. **The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:**

1. In relation to the Port Adelaide Marine Maintenance Fund—
(a) How much does the government contribute to this fund each year; and
(b) How much has been contributed to this fund since its establishment in 1974?
2. Can the minister provide me with a broad spending report commencing from the 1974-75 financial year until 2001-02?
3. Can the minister provide a detailed spending report for the following years—
(a) 1999-2000
(b) 2000-01; and
(c) 2001-02?
4. Can the minister provide the current amount in the fund, together with the future spending allocations for the years—
(a) 2002-03;
(b) 2003-04; and
(c) 2004-05?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

I understand that the question asked by the honourable member relates to the North Haven Harbor Maintenance Fund. This particular fund was established in September 1987. The original amount deposited into the account was $620 000. At the time of being established it was agreed that the then Department of Environment and Planning would be responsible for the administration of the deposit account.

From 9 December 1993, the responsibility for maintenance of the North Haven Harbor Maintenance Fund was transferred to the Minister for Housing, Urban Development and Local Government Relations.

At some time later, after 1993, the North Haven Habor Maintenance Fund was amalgamated into the SA Urban Lands Trust, which then evolved into the MFP Deposit Account. The account is now included in what is the Land Management Corporation Deposit Account.

COMPUTERS, EDUCATION

66. **The Hon. T.G. CAMERON:**

1. Will the South Australian government follow New South Wales' lead and introduce testing for computer aptitude for its students?
2. Are South Australian teachers adequately or sufficiently trained to be able to teach competent levels of computer education to students?
3. What computer training do South Australian teachers currently receive?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Education and Children's Services provided the following information:

The New South Wales test for computer aptitude is a paper based test which has limited capacity to assess the competencies of students to use a computer.

Officers of the Department are continually evaluating student assessment instruments for all aspects of the curriculum.

Over the past decade considerable resources have been allocated to the professional development of teachers to embed ICT skills across the curriculum delivered through Discovery Schools, Discovery Network Teachers, Principals Development Program, Master-classes, travelling scholarships and Technology School of the Future courses and seminars.

The commonwealth funded Quality Teacher Program had a major focus on ICT in 2002.

A professional association, Computers in Education Group SA, has been formed which organises courses and conferences throughout the state for teachers and support staff working in schools and pre-schools.

In addition to the government fulfilling it's election commitment with an allocation of an additional $4 million over the next 4 years for a professional development strategy that will focus on on-line learning there will be a continuation of the programs offered by the Technology School of the Future and the professional development association, Computers in Education Group SA.

ICT is a major component of individual teachers professional development program to fulfil their commitment to undertake one week of professional development, relevant to their teaching needs, each school year.

QUESTION TIME

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S OFFICE

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Correctional Services, representing the Attorney-General, a question about office extravagance.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.D. LAWSON: The opposition has been informed by a reliable source that the Attorney-General has spent up to $30 000 to install a radio antenna at his ministerial office. The ministerial office of the Attorney-General is located on the 11th floor of the multistorey ING Building at 45 Pirie Street. I personally occupied a ministerial office on the 4th floor of that building for some four years. I occupied the Attorney-General's office for a short time. During all my time, the radio reception on the AM band was not perfect, but adequate. I had to move my $20 transistor around the room from time to time. The Hon. Trevor Griffin occupied the Attorney-General's office for eight years and he coped with less than perfect, but adequate, reception. In fact, the former attorney-general was not prepared to spend large sums of taxpayers' money on any project to improve reception.

We have been advised that the sum of $30 000 will involve a major upgrade, including receiver, antenna and cabling. Given that the Attorney-General has full and continuous access to the government's media monitoring unit, which costs the taxpayer several hundreds of thousand dollars, and given the fact that the Attorney-General was set a savings target of some $16 million in the budget for 2002-03, and cut crime prevention by $800 000, my questions are:

1. Was any technical evaluation undertaken prior to the commencement of this project?

2. Will the Attorney-General detail the cost of the project?

3. How does he explain expenditure of this kind when crime prevention is being cut?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Correctional Services): I will pass that question on to the Attorney-General in another place and bring back a reply.

SHEARING AND WOOL INDUSTRIES

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about the future of the shearing and wool industries in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: The Hon. Bob Sneath, on a number of occasions, has made grievance speeches about the shortage of trained shearers and wool handlers in this state. As we know, he is a former shearer and contractor, so I am sure he also is concerned that in 2002 this state government withdrew funding for shearing and wool handling schools within the state. It was only due to the combined efforts of Australian Wool Innovation, Elders and training provider Ausgrow that the spring training schedule was able to proceed for last year. The wool industry is worth some $500 million to this state. Unfortunately, it has been announced recently that all funding has been cancelled for 2003. Again, this time the South Australian Farmers Federation and Elders have each put in $2 000 for the continuance of one school at Marrabel, which is due to start on 24 February. However, that leaves some 19 sheds and courses in jeopardy.

Further, I have been informed that the government is considering an increase in the identification or levy scheme and increased industry responsibility for its footrot program. My question is: can the minister provide us with an overview of his government's plans for the wool and sheep industry in this state, and will he provide some money, or lobby for a continuance of some funding, for the shearing and wool industries training scheme in this state?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): My colleague the Hon. Bob Sneath has raised issues in relation to the wool industry and shearers. I think his concern is the lack of continuity of work for shearers currently. One of the great problems we have in this state currently is that the size of the sheep flock is equivalent to that of the 1920s. The numbers of sheep are the lowest around the country now since the 1920s. That is a big issue for the future of the wool industry and is one I am urgently addressing at the moment to ensure that when the drought breaks—and hopefully the first part of that has come today with the rain—we are able to ensure that the flocks of sheep do increase so that we do have an industry that provides employment.

But in relation to those funding decisions, the priorities of expenditure under FarmBis, as the shadow minister should know, are deemed by the state planning group. They have to report to the commonwealth government because they half-fund all the FarmBis funds within the state, and the priorities are set by that body in accordance with need. That is the reason I abide by the decisions of the state planning group in relation to the expenditure of funds in those areas.

But the serious problems facing the wool industry in the future is the rebuilding of the sheep flocks which may take a number of years. It is a serious crisis facing the industry, and also will impact upon jobs in the city, because wool processors, such as G.H. Michell, depend very heavily on the supply. It is a case at the moment where for the first time for many years the sheep industry is being driven by supply rather than demand issues.

TRANSPORT SA, MINISTERIAL INSTRUCTION

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for Transport, a question about ministerial instruction to Transport SA.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Last Friday I rang Transport SA to follow up a personal matter, that being the status of an application lodged three weeks earlier for a partial disability parking permit for a member of my family. I gave my name, asked to be put through to the relevant section and highlighted the personal nature of the inquiry. Twice I was told that, on the instruction of the minister, nobody in Transport SA was allowed to speak to me on any matter, and they would not do so.

So, using considerable and some might say uncharacteristic restraint, I rang the minister's office, spoke to Mr Wright's chief of staff and asked why, on the instruction of the

minister, I am being denied the same rights enjoyed by everyone else in South Australia to pursue a personal family inquiry through Transport SA. The chief of staff told me that he would speak to someone in Transport SA, authorise an officer to speak to me, and that an officer would phone me back. I thanked him for his assistance but did take the opportunity to express surprise that Mr Wright's most senior ministerial officer did not have more productive things to do with his time than facilitate my family's private business with Transport SA.

Shortly thereafter, I did receive the promised phone call and learned that my inquiry had been elevated now to priority status, something I had never sought with my initial phone call to Transport SA. Now that my stepmother has received her permit—and I was not going to ask this question until she had it in her hand—I would like to thank the officers for processing her application. But I also wish to ask the minister to clarify the exact nature of the direction he has issued to Transport SA and possibly all other agencies prohibiting officers speaking to me on even a family-related or other personal inquiry. Has the minister given the same instruction to Transport SA and other agencies in relation to all contact by all members of parliament of all political persuasions, or does his instruction—

The Hon. R.K. Sneath interjecting:

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: Listen to this. Is the instruction in relation to all contact by all members of parliament of all political persuasions—including the Hon. Mr Sneath—or does this instruction relate only to Liberal Party members, or merely to me?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I cannot understand why anyone would not want to talk to the honourable member! I can understand that some of the residents of Adelaide where you walk regularly might want to avoid you and cross the road, but as far as departments go they should treat everyone with the respect that is deserved. I will refer the question to the Minister for Transport in another place and bring back a reply.

DROUGHT RELIEF

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question about the drought assistance package.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: On 12 October 2002, the Premier announced details of the state government's $5 million drought assistance package, $1.5 million of which was allocated for business support grants to individual farm businesses and $150 000 for community projects. What progress has been made in implementing this package?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I thank the member for her continuing interest in the agricultural industries of this state. As members would recall, the state government drought assistance package was made up of a suite of components to deliver support to drought-affected farmers, their families and rural communities. Some of the package elements target assistance directly to farmers who have suffered adverse seasonal conditions leading into the drought, while others were more broad support or designed to help farmers in developing mechanisms to better handle such severe droughts in the future. Some of the projects funded will be delivered over a three-year period.

Of the $5 million total package, to date $700 000 has been spent, with a further $1.6 million expected to be spent over the next few months and the remainder in the next two financial years. The package has funded three additional drought counsellors located in the Upper North, the Murray Mallee, and one in Adelaide with the Farmers Federation, to provide counselling assistance across the state. The State Association of Financial Counselling Services is providing direction on additional support that is required from the residual uncommitted funds out of the $300 000 allocated. FarmBis has received $300 000 of the $1 million committed through the drought assistance package.

The additional funding has allowed the FarmBis state planning group to increase the level of subsidy for training in areas of managing drought and other risk areas. The remaining funds will be invested in FarmBis as demand requires. The sum of $1.5 million was offered as reseeding and restocking grants targeted particularly at farmers in the Murray Mallee and the north-east of the state who, because of adverse seasonal conditions prior to 2002, were less well placed to handle the drought conditions. Applications for grants of up to $10 000 close at the end of February. The farmer members of the Premier's drought task force will assess the applications, and applicants will be notified in late March of the grants they will receive.

Lions International, which coordinated the supply of donated fodder from the South-East to drought-affected areas, was allocated $25 000 of these funds. To date, only seven applications have been approved for grants up to $5 000 for communities to run activities that will help them cope with drought conditions or learn coping mechanisms. One of the projects allocated funds has been the promotion of the Karoonda Sheep Fair. Further applications for this most flexible grant are known to be coming. An agreement has been signed with the South Australian Research and Development Institute to fund a research project that will accelerate the development of drought-tolerant wheat.

It is expected that the $150 000 of state funds will be matched by an industry group to significantly expand this project, which will give farmers more options for reducing the effect of severe drought. Workshops on livestock best practice have been held across the state helping farm managers make crucial decisions on which stock to retain, what feed they should buy, how to feedlot to protect the land and how best to build up flock and herd numbers when the season breaks. Nearly half of the $140 000 has been spent, with additional scheduled workshops likely to use the remainder of the funds. An amount of $50 000 was allocated to road maintenance in the central north-east and this has been committed to Transport SA to undertake wet road maintenance on the Yunta to Tea Tree road. This maintenance would not otherwise have been undertaken and has helped to improve the safety and comfort of local travellers on that road.

Negotiations are taking place with Outback SA to invest the $300 000 committed to support them in implementing strategies that will enhance sustainable production systems in the range lands and, with the Murray Mallee sustainable farming systems project, to expand the extension of improved farming technology throughout the Murray Mallee. The $200 000 provided to Farmhand contributed to 360 South Australian farm families receiving $529 000 in welfare support, with cheques ranging from $1 000 to $2 000. The

package also contains an allocation of $720 000 to cover the state's share of the exceptional circumstances business support interest rate subsidies.

As members would be aware, declarations were made for exceptional circumstances in the central north-east and Far North. However, the application for the southern Mallee was not successful. Only half the committed funds will be required for the reason they were allocated. I am currently considering options for the savings that might best help the drought affected communities in greatest need. All things considered, the package has been well received by the rural communities to whom it was directed.

This is a reflection of its development by a task force, which contained a range of farmers as well as government technologists and policy officials. It was announced early enough to show farm families and rural communities the genuine commitment this government has to those facing such adversity. It also complements the commonwealth drought assistance measures announced in December last year.

Finally, I also add, while on the subject of drought assistance and individual grants, that I was approached by the member for Stuart the other day in relation to a point he had raised with me concerning some farmers perhaps having difficulty in getting their applications for support in by the end of this month, on 28 February, when they are due. Providing applicants can at least notify the department by the end of this month of their intention to lodge an application then we will provide another month for the follow-up information to arise and I will make sure that that information is given out through the rural councillors to ensure that people are aware of that additional leeway given by the government in relation to applications.

FERNILEE LODGE

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, representing the Minister for Environment and Conservation, a question concerning the future of Fernilee Lodge.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer interjecting:

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: That interjection is very pertinent—it does not have a future. The *Advertiser* newspaper reports that historic Fernilee Lodge is likely to be subject to an application for demolition in the near future. Such an application would almost certainly be granted due to the absence of a heritage listing on the building. I am informed that an application for listing under the Heritage Act was made last year but was rejected. Section 16 of the Heritage Act 1993 sets out seven criteria under the Heritage Act, of which one or more have to be satisfied for registration. My questions to the minister are:

1. Given that Fernilee Lodge is one of the few remaining significant gentlemen's dwellings and gardens of the 1880s, why did it not qualify for registration under sections 16(a) and 16(d)?

2. Given its Italianate architecture and widow's walk, why did it not qualify under sections 16(b) and 16(e)?

3. Given its unique and extensive cellaring designed to deal with Adelaide's hot summer climate, why did it not qualify under sections 16(c) and 16(e)?

4. Given its long history as a reception centre for special events, making it a cultural icon for the tens of thousands of South Australians who attended those events, why did it not qualify under 16(f)?

5. Given it is one of the few remaining examples of Dennison Clarke's building expertise and was formerly home to the philanthropic Gartrell family and the Cooper family of Coopers brewing fame, why did it not qualify under 16(g)?

6. Why did not the environment and conservation department provide reasons for the refusal for state heritage listing made by the applicant, Mr Jim Jacobsen?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will refer that important question to the Minister for Environment and Conservation and bring back a reply.

SCHOOLS, MAINTENANCE

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I lay on the table a copy of a ministerial statement in relation to a new maintenance plan for South Australian schools made in the other place by the Minister for Education.

ROFE, Mr P.

The Hon. A.L. EVANS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for Justice, a question about the Director of Public Prosecutions.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.L. EVANS: In the Attorney-General's ministerial statement issued yesterday he stated that the South Australian DPP is entirely independent of direction or control by the Crown or any minister or officer of the Crown. He went on to state that Mr Rofe's conduct did not warrant termination of employment. Certainly, most people would agree that the DPP should be independent in terms of function and management of the position. The public would ask for nothing less. In the light of the admission made by Mr Rofe QC, will the minister appoint an independent officer to oversee his conduct, thereby ensuring a greater level of accountability to the office, as being a step in the direction to restore public confidence in the position?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will refer that important question to the Attorney-General in another place and bring back a reply.

SUPERANNUATION LIABILITIES

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Leader of the Opposition): I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the minister representing the Treasurer a question about superannuation liabilities.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As members will know, I raised an issue earlier in the chamber in relation to a surprise increase in the mid year budget review of the state's superannuation liabilities, that is, that, in this year's mid year budget review just released, the estimate for this year is $4.3 billion, and in last year's mid year budget review the estimate for 2002 was $3.34 billion, a $1 billion increase in the state's unfunded superannuation liabilities. I understand that, subsequent to the issuing of my press release, some journalists have sought comment from the Treasurer and, in one case, also from the Under Treasurer.

I understand that both the Treasurer and the Under Treasurer said to some journalists words to the effect that this $1 billion increase was not a shock and was nothing new and, again, words to the effect that this was consistent with what the previous Liberal government had outlined in budget documents. I understand that figure 6.1 (which is a figure outlining superannuation liabilities over a 40-year period) from Budget Paper 3 in the new Labor government's budget was shown to at least one journalist, purporting to indicate that this, therefore, was nothing new.

When one looks at figure 6.1 from Budget Paper 3, it does show a significant increase in superannuation liabilities between the years 2001 and 2002. From 2002-03—and, indeed, for subsequent years—there is a plateauing before about the year 2015 or 2020. There is then a significant decline. When one compares that to figure 7.1 in the previous year's budget paper, one sees a quite significant difference between that and the superannuation liability figure produced by the former government in its last budget. My questions to the Treasurer are:

1. Will he now produce an update consistent with figure 6.1 in the budget document, now updated for the figures that have been included in the mid year budget update? In doing so, will he confirm that the estimate for the year 2003 in figure 6.1 is significantly below $4.3 billion, which is the new estimate in the mid year budget review and, indeed, which looks like approximately $3.8 billion?

2. Will the Treasurer also concede that that graph between the years 2002 and 2003 shows a very significant increase compared with previous similar graphs produced by the Liberal government in its last budget and implicit in the mid year budget review released by the Liberal government in January of last year?

3. Why did the Under Treasurer and the Treasurer indicate to at least one journalist words to the effect that there was nothing new in this $1 billion increase in superannuation liabilities, particularly when such a claim was untrue?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I will refer that question to the Treasurer for his response. However, I cannot let the opportunity pass without recalling how, several years ago, the former treasurer undertook an actuarial review of the superannuation scheme and, because of supposed increased future returns from the superannuation scheme, he was able to unlock some funds to make his budget viable. So, if the media is looking at this, I hope that it also looks at some of those changes that were made by the previous treasurer several years go which, in hindsight, grossly overestimated the potential returns from superannuation funds.

We are really talking about what has happened in equity markets in relation to the funding of superannuation. It would indeed be an interesting exercise to look back at the previous figures. Nevertheless, being an open and accountable government, I will bring back a reply from the Treasurer to the specifics of the Leader of the Opposition's questions.

KOURAKIS, Mr C.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Attorney-General, a question about the appointment of the Solicitor-General.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: On 24 January, the Attorney-General announced the appointment of Mr Chris Kourakis QC as Solicitor-General. The Solicitor-General is the state's second law officer after the Attorney-General and, generally speaking, the appointment is a guarantee of a subsequent appointment to either the Supreme or Federal Court bench. It is an important position and one which drew some comment from the Attorney in 2001. I refer members to *Hansard* dated 23 October concerning Mr Brad Selway, Mr Kourakis's predecessor.

Earlier this week, the public's attention was drawn to the Attorney-General's 2001 register of members' interests return which states:

> Since September 2000 I have received thousands of dollars worth of gratis legal work from an Adelaide Queen's Counsel and an Adelaide solicitor. I am too shy to ask them for a notional bill. However, my guess is that I have received $9 000 in advice and representation from Mr Chris Kourakis.

Under 'gifts', the 2002 return states:

> Gratis and contingent legal work from solicitor, Tim Bourne, and barrister, Chris Kourakis.

Despite repeated questions, the Attorney-General has failed to disclose what the value of the legal work was. This is an extremely important issue because the government has staked its whole reputation on honesty and accountability. The ministerial code of conduct requires ministers to avoid situations where private interests conflict or have the potential to conflict or appear to conflict with their duty. In that respect, I refer members to clause 3.1. It requires ministers to complete a form if this occurs. The obligation in the ministerial code of conduct is said to be additional to ministers' obligations under the Members of Parliament (Register of Interests) Act 1983. In light of that, my questions are:

1. Given the additional obligation on the Attorney-General through the code of conduct, will he disclose the precise value of the free legal services provided to him by Mr Kourakis?

2. Who prepared—

The Hon. P. Holloway interjecting:

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Well, they could have been answered earlier. My questions continue:

2. Who prepared the cabinet submission, that is, what minister?

3. Will the Attorney-General table the declaration provided by the Attorney-General to the cabinet as required under the code of conduct and, if not, why not?

4. Given the Attorney-General estimated the value of Mr Kourakis's services up to 30 June 2001 at $9 000, why can he not estimate the value from that date up to the date of the Kourakis appointment?

5. Prior to the appointment, what was the value and what were the discussions between the Solicitor-General and the Attorney-General regarding the debt and/or gift?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will refer those questions to the Attorney-General in another place and bring back a reply.

SECRETS CAMPAIGN

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for Tourism, a question about the *Secrets* campaign.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: It is a good one, too. I urge my colleagues to pay attention; they all will benefit from this—and so will their families. The new $5 million tourism advertising campaign, *Discover the Unwinding Roads*, aims to position South Australia as the nation's premier drive touring destination. I understand that this campaign is primarily aimed at New South Wales and Victorian consumers and is designed to take advantage of a growing trend amongst Australians to holiday at home. My question is: how effective has the new $5 million tourism advertising campaign, *Discover the Unwinding Roads*, been since it was launched in November last year?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I thank the honourable member for her question, which is in line with the priorities set by the Minister for Tourism in trying to attract our share of tourism within this state—which seemed to be slipping in the past. *Discover the Unwinding Roads* program is starting to get us back on track.

South Australia already attracts 350 000 interstate touring visitors each year and, on average, they stay seven nights. Some 70 per cent of them are from New South Wales and Victoria. By tapping into these key markets, South Australia has the potential to reap an extra $1.1 billion and generate an additional 3 200 jobs by 2006. The campaign includes two new commercials being screened around Australia in more than 300 cinemas and on television, while a 152-page touring guide takes readers on a step by step journey through Adelaide and South Australia. In just nine weeks more than 160 000 books have been distributed as a result of advertising and direct mail activity. About 80 per cent of these books have been distributed to interstate consumers and the campaign has added an additional 30 000 people to the *Secrets* database—an increase of 46 per cent. Online response to the latest campaign is almost four times greater than that of previous campaigns.

More than $250 000 in additional coverage about the new campaign has been generated so far, including positive editorials by Sydney's *Sun Herald* and the influential AFTA *Traveller*. In March, Qantas *In-flight* is planning a 24-page feature on South Australia—the largest ever on a single state—while *Vogue Entertaining and Living* will showcase the Flinders Ranges and Clare Valley for their March-April edition—something I will have to get out of the library because I no longer get it posted. It is therefore clear that this campaign is on its way to being an outstanding success, and South Australia's tourism industry will reap those rewards.

AGRICULTURE, PERPETUAL LEASES

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries a question relating to agricultural perpetual leases.

Leave granted.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: As we are all aware, there is growing disquiet about the government's proposal to introduce an annual administration fee of $300 per Crown lease and, as the Hon. Terry Stephens pointed out last year, this fee becomes a significant expense for properties that encompass many leases. I refer to a letter I received in May 1964 from the then Director of Lands, Mr J.R. Dunsford, a copy of which I sent to the Select Committee on the Crown Lands (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill in August last year. In that letter, the Director of Lands confirmed that the rent could not be increased, and I quote from the first paragraph of the letter as follows:

> In reply to your letter of the 19th ultimo, I wish to advise that the annual rental of £5-9-7 in respect of perpetual lease 8674 (sections 61, 65, 387, 389 and 392, hundred of Dudley) held by W. Gilfillan and Sons Limited, is fixed in perpetuity. There is no provision in the lease for revaluation of the rental.
>
> Lease 8674 was issued to Messrs N.T., W.V., S. and T. Simpson as from 1 July 1903, and since that date has been held as follows: H. and F.W. Neave on 23.10.23; R.W. Wilson on 14.3.46; Dr. W. Gilfillan on 7.9.51; I. and G. Gilfillan on 18.12.61; W. Gilfillan and Sons Limited on 24.4.63.

Each of those transactions was done commercially on the basis that they were equivalent to freehold in value and a similar amount of money was exchanged on the purchase of those properties.

As I have already indicated, the letter indicates the transfers, and it is the usual practice, over the life of a Crown lease, that people will, from time to time, pay significant sums of money for the transfer of the rights contained within the lease to themselves. On each occasion that this happened, the transferor paid a sum of money based on their assessment of the entitlements and obligations as specified in the lease. It was treated pari passu as freehold title.

The Crown lease is, of course, a form of contract, and there is a fundamental principle that underlies all contracts in that the conditions of a contract cannot be varied by one party to that contract. Even where there is an agreement between all parties to a contract, there must be some consideration or some 'extra thing' by way of compensation given by all parties to the contract, and it cannot be changed unilaterally. Without negotiation between the parties, the contract is unenforceable.

In this case, the lessee cannot be required to pay extra. I point out again that the 1964 letter clearly states that there is no provision to increase rents on perpetual leases. My questions to the minister are: what is the 'extra thing', if we are dealing with a contract arrangement, that the government is providing as compensation for the administration fee that it is intending to add unilaterally to existing Crown leases? How will the government negotiate this exchange of consideration on a lease by lease basis? Finally, given the complexity of the task and the likelihood of legal challenge, when does the government expect it to be completed?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply. I understand that the select committee is looking at a lot of issues associated with—

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan: I thought the Minister for Agriculture was handling this question.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: He is interested, I know, but it is the responsibility of the Minister for Environment and Conservation in another place, and I will pass those important questions—some of them dusty old questions but important nevertheless—to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

SPEED CAMERAS

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Police questions about speed cameras.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.G. CAMERON: In response to a question on notice that I asked the Minister for Police about the

average revenue raised by each speed camera for the year 2001-02, I was informed that the estimate was $828 for every hour of operation. On average, nine cameras are currently deployed at each shift, with two shifts per day. Speed cameras have an operating time of 38.5 hours per week per camera. That information was provided by the government. This works out at $31 878 each week, or $1.7 million for each speed camera per year. Considering that the cost of a speed camera is approximately $80 000, the government is receiving a return of 2 400 per cent each year for its investment. This compares to $83 per hour spent on the average poker machine, with about $4 per machine going to the government in revenue.

With the introduction of a 50 km/h speed limit for local roads and the confusion that will inevitably follow, one can only imagine the financial windfall that the government will receive. Even though speed cameras have been in use since the early 1990s, there is no evidence that either the road toll has been reduced or of any success in moderating driving behaviour. In fact, by the government's own admission, the road toll and accident figures here in South Australia are 10 per cent higher than in other states. I suspect that that is because of the way they are currently being deployed. My questions are:

1. Will the minister confirm or deny that the government is currently considering buying new digital speed cameras? If so, how many will be purchased, when will they be delivered and how much will each cost?

2. How old are the current speed cameras and how long is their expected working life?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY ((Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I will refer the questions to the Minister for Police and bring back a response.

NUCLEAR WASTE

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Environment and Conservation a question about the national nuclear waste repository.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.F. STEFANI: In March 1986 the federal Labor Minister for Resources and Energy wrote to all state government ministers seeking their support for and interest in hosting a repository. All state governments, including the South Australian Labor government, supported the concept of a national repository, with the exception of the Northern Territory government. Agreement was reached in principle between the state, territory and commonwealth governments that a suitable site for a repository must be found. State and territory agencies have assisted in phases 1 and 2 of the current siting study.

On 1 June 1992 the then Minister for Primary Industries and Energy (Hon. Simon Crean) reiterated the commonwealth's commitment to establishing a national radioactive waste repository and announced the commencement of an Australia-wide site selection study to identify a suitable repository site. This commitment was supported by state and territory governments and was embraced in the National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development, December 1992, under Objective 19.2, which states:

> Governments will undertake a siting study to identify a short list of suitable sites for a repository for low level and short-lived intermediate level radioactive waste.

It is important for me to note that during the period 1986 to 1992 Labor governments were in power at both the federal and state levels. It is also important for me to note that the Hon. Mike Rann (the current Labor Premier) became a minister in December 1989 and held a ministerial position until 1993. My questions are:

1. Will the minister table all correspondence that was transmitted between the state Labor government and the federal Labor government in relation to the establishment of a national nuclear waste repository?

2. Will the minister ensure that any correspondence that requires vetting in order to meet the provision of section 19 of the Radiation Protection and Control Act is so dealt with that it may be released to me?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I remind the honourable member that there are two bills before the council in relation to this subject matter. He will certainly be able to have a say in the debate when those bills are brought on. I will refer the questions the honourable member has asked to the Minister for the Environment in another place and bring back a reply.

DISTANCE EDUCATION SUPERVISOR TRAINING

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, representing the Minister for Education and Children's Services, a question concerning distance education supervisor training.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: In May 2001, the then Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. Malcolm Buckby, MP) announced a grant of $50 000 per annum for three years for a pilot program for distance education supervisor training. The $50 000 was to be divided into nine $5 000 lots for each of nine supervisors to undertake the training, $3 000 was to go to Spencer TAFE to write and deliver the training and $2 000 was to go to the supervisors themselves to assist with travel, accommodation and so on. Spencer TAFE was rewriting parts of the certificate 3 in education so that it would be suitable for external study and be able to be used in this program.

The course was to start at the beginning of the 2002 school year. For a variety of reasons, mainly the change of government, the course did not begin until midway through last year; thus the nine supervisors would be due to finish their course mid this year. In order to complete their course, supervisors were asked to sign contracts. I have been informed that these contracts are in the hands of the Minister for Education but have not yet been signed. Thus, the nine people involved have been given no money and no assurance of the completion of their certificate course.

Many of us have witnessed the difficulties of educating children by distance education and in isolation. This course gave confidence and qualifications to those who undertook it, and the qualifications themselves were an incentive to people to undertake the course and apply for the position of supervisor. I understand that a number of people have applied to do the course in 2003. If this course is to have any chance of success it must begin at the start of the school year, and I am sure we would all agree that $50 000 per annum for three years is not a large chunk out of the Education Department budget. My questions are:

1. When will the minister sign the contracts and give the people who are halfway through their course the confidence to continue and complete their training?

2. When will the minister confirm the continuance of the distance education supervisor training program for the 2003-04 year as committed by the previous government?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I will pass on that question to my colleague the Minister for Education in another place and bring back a response. Perhaps my colleague will also mention some of the other many positive things the government is doing in relation to attracting and retaining teachers in country areas with the additional money it is providing for that purpose.

PORT LINCOLN HEALTH SERVICE

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: My question is directed to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Minister for Health, on the Port Lincoln Health Service:

1. Why did Dr Sue Baillie resign as Medical Director of the Port Lincoln Health service?

2. What action has been taken to find a replacement?

3. In the 2½ months since Dr Baillie resigned, who has been providing the advice Dr Baillie was previously providing?

4. On what dates has the privilege committee met in the past six months?

5. In the absence of a medical director and no meetings of the privilege committee, what steps have been put in place to maintain clinical governance?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will refer those questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

ADELAIDE HILLS WINERIES

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation and former Minister for Regional Development, representing the Minister for Regional Development, a question concerning wineries in the Adelaide Hills.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: One of the great successes in South Australia in recent years has been the expansion of the wine industry. Export wine alone is worth $1 billion to South Australia's economy, and South Australia is responsible for in excess of 70 per cent of all the wine exported from Australia. Last year, the minister for planning, the Hon. Diana Laidlaw MLC, commissioned an inquiry into the environmental and economic impact of developing further wineries in the Adelaide Hills region. I am informed that the inquiry has been completed and that the risk of environmental damage to the Adelaide Hills has been found to be less than one in 10 000. My questions are:

1. Why has the report not been released?

2. Is the minister concerned that regional development may be hampered by withholding such a report?

3. Why does the minister believe that the report has not been released for public discussion?

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will report those questions to the Minister for Environment and Conservation in another place and bring back a reply.

SAND DRIFT

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government, representing the Premier, and in his own right as the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, a question about sand drift removal.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: My recent road travel through the Mallee region to attend the Constitutional Convention roadshow at Loxton allowed me to witness the dramatic escalation of the sand drift problem on the region's roads. I have become aware since that time of a campaign by the District Council of Karoonda East Murray (which has an extraordinary number of those roads in its area) to try to receive some assistance from the state government to remove that sand drift from the roads. I would like to quote a couple of extracts from a letter to the Premier from the District Clerk of the District Council of Karoonda East Murray, Mr Peter Smithson, dated 12 February. The first extract reads:

> On 11 December 2002, I wrote to you seeking reimbursement for the removal of sand drift from council roads. Unfortunately, the problem has not abated and council continues to carry out work on a weekly basis.

The letter continues:

> Expenditure on sand drift removal for our council has risen from $31 000 in December 2002 to $58 000 to date. This has severely impacted on council and that expenditure could well rise to $100 000.

I understand that this figure of $100 000 would represent 10 per cent of council's rate revenue. In addition, the Premier's response to the council's original letter provided no joy. My questions are:

1. When will the Premier respond to the District Council of Karoonda East Murray's most recent request for assistance?

2. Will the government consider allocating funds from the drought assistance package to address this serious problem?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): That is an important question. In relation to the latter question, indeed, the possibility of using drought funds for removing sand drifts on roads in the Murray-Mallee was one of the original issues considered by the Premier's drought task force. I understand that, when the package of measures was considered, significant attention was given to that matter but, in the end, it was the view of the task force at that time that that should not be a priority. What has happened, of course, since that time is that the exceptional circumstances application for the Murray-Mallee area has been rejected by the commonwealth.

I wrote to Minister Truss on 13 February and asked him to reconsider the application for exceptional circumstances. In that letter, I pointed out that, in relation to the declaration of drought in New South Wales—in particular, in the Walgett and Coonamble districts—Minister Truss had said in his press release:

> EC assistance will be made available to producers who can demonstrate that they have experienced more than a 50 per cent decline in crop yields and farm income for their winter crop in 2001 and 2002, compared with their average yields and incomes from 1998 to 2000.

That was Minister Truss's comment. I pointed out to the Minister:

The approximately 40 farmers in the southern Mallee, for whom I have sought support through EC, had an average decline in farm income compared to their five-year average of 40 per cent in the year 2000, 44 per cent in the year 2001 and 72 per cent in 2002. This decline was caused by frost in 2002 and 2001 and drought in 2002.

I made the point to Minister Truss that, as it is possible in Walgett and Coonamble to declare EC and then apply screens to ensure only those targeted as having had a certain level of financial hardship can receive the assistance, it is difficult to understand why such measures could not have applied to the southern Murray-Mallee.

I am still awaiting a response in relation to that from Minister Truss, and I hope that he will consider the application for exceptional circumstances in that area. As I indicated earlier, if the government were not successful, that would mean that the money that has been set aside in the state's package to fund the state's component of drought assistance in that region would become available, and I would consider the issue raised by the honourable member in that context.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: As a supplementary question, does the minister recognise the particular difficulty that a small council, such as the Karoonda East Murray council, which is almost totally based on farming enterprises, faces in the light of the proportion of money they have to spend to remove sand, particularly for safety reasons, from the roads in its district?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I understand that and, of course, that is the reason I provided the answer about EC assistance. To underline the point, given that the ratepayers of the council of Karoonda East Murray will, in many cases, be severely affected by the drought and the frost of the last few years, the capacity of those ratepayers to contribute to the cost of their council will be greatly diminished as well. The Mayor of Karoonda East Murray was a member of the original task force, but I accept that conditions have changed since last September or October, or whenever these matters were being considered.

The government's priority was that assistance should go to those individuals of the council's by way of EC assistance. We believe that, given the precedent it has set in parts of New South Wales, there is absolutely no reason why those principles should not apply to that region. Our first priority is to obtain individual assistance for the area. However, if that is not possible, we will consider some collective contribution we may be able to make to that area.

VOTING

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, representing the Attorney-General, a question about failure to vote.

Leave granted.

The Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW: I will follow up a number of issues arising from an article in the *Advertiser* today entitled '5 000 people to lose car licences'. It is reported that more than 34 600 South Australians enrolled to vote did not do so on 9 February last year and, of that number, 4 971 have either failed to provide a satisfactory explanation or pay a fine for being enrolled but failing to vote.

Honourable members may recall that on several occasions the Liberal government introduced voluntary voting legislation, which the Labor Party always opposed. On one of those occasions in 1994, the then attorney-general (Hon. Trevor Griffin) introduced legislation to remove the sanction of a criminal penalty where the citizen chooses, for whatever reason, not to vote. Again, the Labor Party did not support that measure: it preferred to fine a person for being enrolled but failing to vote.

Since 1994, when the cost of pursuing people through the courts who were enrolled but failed to vote was some $500 000, I imagine that the cost has risen considerably. I also recall that, in the meantime, as shadow attorney-general the Hon. Michael Atkinson questioned the approach of losing a licence or failing to gain registration of a vehicle for non-payment of any fine. I was a member of the government that introduced this penalty regime for non-payment of fines, that being the loss of licence or the failure to gain registration of vehicles, but have to confess that, on reflection, it is bizarre that, in a democratic system, such an arrangement applies to a person who fails to exercise a vote when enrolled to do so.

Therefore, I ask the Attorney: does he regard that it is a justifiable expenditure by this government to pursue court action against some 5 000 South Australians, which would cost more than $500 000, at a time when that money could be better spent on crime prevention and other projects, such as education and health? I ask him—as I will take to my party a proposal for a bill to remove the sanction of the criminal penalty for failing to vote if enrolled—whether the Labor Party will reconsider its earlier opposition to such a measure, both for reasons of democracy and also for saving costs and fairness overall.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I will refer those questions and statements to the Attorney-General in the other place and bring back a reply.

NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE FACILITY (PROHIBITION) (REFERENDUM) (No. 2) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000. Read a first time.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The current Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000 prevents the construction or operation of a facility to store or dispose of certain types of nuclear waste generated outside of the state and prevents the transportation of such material into the state.

The Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) (Referendum) Amendment Bill 2002 was introduced to parliament on 8 May 2002 and passed through the House of Assembly on 9 July 2002. The bill seeks to prohibit the disposal of low level and short-lived intermediate nuclear waste generated outside of South Australia and prohibits the transportation of this material into the state. Parliament is aware that the commonwealth is proposing to construct a repository for this material at a site near Woomera in South Australia. The bill also sought to introduce a clause that would enable the minister to call a referendum should the commonwealth indicate that it proposes to construct a store for long-lived intermediate or high level waste in this state.

The proposed amendments providing for the holding of a referendum are being excised from the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) (Referendum) Amendment Bill 2002 in order to focus parliament's attention on the urgent requirement to enact the parts of the bill related to the prohibition of low level and short lived intermediate radioactive waste being transported to and disposed of at the national repository near Woomera in South Australia.

The amendment is urgent as the commonwealth government has announced it will advise of its decision on the final site for the repository during March 2003. However, should the commonwealth government deem it opportune to do so, it could make the announcement at an earlier time. Parliament must form a position on the establishment and operation of a repository before the commonwealth government makes a decision about the final location of the site. The Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) (Referendum) (No. 2) Amendment Bill 2003 introduces the excised referendum clause. It proposes amendments to the Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000 in an attempt to stop this state from being the dumping ground for international and national high level and long lived intermediate level radioactive waste.

Should the commonwealth seek to establish a facility for storage of long lived intermediate or high level nuclear waste, the proposed amendment to the act would enable the South Australian Minister for Environment and Conservation to call a referendum to gauge the attitude of the community to such a proposal. The proposed amendment provides the minister with a choice of three questions to be put to the referendum. Each of the questions asks whether the voter approves of the establishment in South Australia of a facility for the storage or disposal of nuclear waste generated outside this state. However, while the first question refers to the establishment of a facility for the storage or disposal of long lived intermediate and high level nuclear waste, the second question refers only to long lived intermediate nuclear waste and the last question refers only to high level nuclear waste.

In the event of a referendum being called, the minister's choice of question will be determined on the basis of whether the commonwealth seeks to establish a facility for the storage of both long lived intermediate and high level nuclear waste, long lived immediate nuclear waste only, or high level nuclear waste only. I commend this bill to members. I seek leave to have the detailed explanation of the clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Clause 1: Short title

This clause is formal.

Clause 2: Commencement

This clause provides that the measure will come into operation on a date to be fixed by proclamation.

Clause 3: Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Clause 4: Insertion of sections 15, 16 and 17

Clause 4 inserts three additional sections into the *Nuclear Waste Storage Facility (Prohibition) Act 2000*. Section 15 provides that the Minister may direct that a referendum take place if he or she forms the opinion that an application is likely to be made under a Commonwealth law for a licence, exemption or other authority to construct or operate in this State a facility for the storage or disposal of long-lived intermediate nuclear waste or high level nuclear waste generated outside of South Australia.

The question to be submitted to the referendum is to be selected by the Minister from a list of three. The first asks whether the voter approves of the establishment in South Australia of a facility for the storage or disposal of long-lived intermediate and high level nuclear waste generated outside of this State. The second question is similar but refers to storage or disposal of long-lived intermediate nuclear waste only. The final question is also similar to the first but refers to the storage or disposal of high level nuclear waste only.

Section 16 deals with formal matters associated with the conduct of the referendum. It is contemplated that regulations will be made for the purpose of adapting or modifying the *Electoral Act 1985*, which applies to the referendum as if it were a general election.

Section 17 empowers the Governor to make regulations necessary or expedient for the purposes of the Act.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD secured the adjournment of the debate.

NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE FACILITY (PROHIBITION) (REFERENDUM) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 24 October. Page 1200.)

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I speak briefly to support this bill, which in its amended form is a prohibition on the transport of nuclear waste across our state borders. I know the discussion and the debate has become complicated, and there is looming over us the federal powers—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Members will not converse in the gallery. They are well aware of standing orders.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: —which can often bully states into unwillingly accepting measures imposed on them, so our sovereignty as a state can be at risk. It is important that I inform the council that my colleague, Sandra Kanck, as leader has written to all the state premiers asking them to reconsider their state's support for a single national waste repository. We believe firmly and with justification that each state should be responsible for the storage of the nuclear waste that is generated within its boundaries. It is not as if any state in Australia is so confined in territorial extent that it does not have the opportunity to find a satisfactory repository within its own state. We do not accept that South Australia should be used as the nuclear waste dumping site for the whole of Australia. We believe that the federal government has ridden roughshod over the sensitivities, while paying lip service to the feelings and concerns of South Australian residents.

Regardless of what the ultimate situation may be, and regardless of the ultimate powers of the interface between state legislation and federal legislation, we want to show very clearly to the federal government, and to the rest of Australia, that the people of South Australia do not want their rubbish dumped in our state. Therefore, we will make it an offence for nuclear waste material to be transported across our borders. The bill is now simple in its intention as there is no complication of a referendum—that has been moved to another bill. As a party we can see no reason why we cannot support the bill as presented, and the Democrats enthusiastically support it.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I thank the honourable member for his contribution. I think he succinctly stated the case in relation to the intention to separate the bill to make the argument less complicated and convoluted for those who have concerns about problems associated with a referendum and the questions related to a referendum. They can make a decision in an uncomplicated way. They can separate out the principles related to the nuclear waste storage facility and the

arguments in relation to a referendum. It has simplified the matter.

It is not something that happens every day in relation to bills in this state. At the commonwealth level, bill splitting occurs reasonably regularly as a result of discussions and negotiations. In this case it was found necessary as a result of negotiations to simplify the progress of the important section of the bill. The time frames of the commonwealth have complicated the progress of this bill. It simplifies the argument and, hopefully, we can get speedy passage of the bill so that we do not get outmanoeuvred by the commonwealth and get locked into a position where inactivity brings about the commonwealth's decision that makes a ruling which we find impossible to get out of. We hope that the council is able to progress this bill through all stages to avoid the progress that the commonwealth is making to try to outmanoeuvre this state.

We are taking a tough line in relation to tactics. Our aim, with members' cooperation, is to try to get the bill through parliament today. The bill has been in this place since last July and everyone has had time for negotiations and considerations. We hope there is no further delay in the discussion in relation to how we should proceed. The amended bill to be debated today makes it illegal to establish a national repository for low level waste, and it makes it illegal to transport these wastes into South Australia from other states. These activities are already illegal when it comes to long lived intermediate and high level waste. All we are seeking to do today is to extend the current legislation to include all levels of radioactive waste.

It is imperative that we have the debate today. Now is the time to make the decision. The commonwealth will be making its final decision by 24 March and we need to ensure that this amended bill is passed today. This is the strongest message we can send to the commonwealth to reflect the will of the majority of South Australians. We think it is ethical and proper to let the commonwealth know in the strongest possible terms the opinion of both the state government and the majority of South Australians. South Australians do not want our state to become the nuclear dump state. It is that simple. There have been many arguments about this bill, but in large part they fail to take notice of this basic fact. What we do here today can reflect the will of the people who have elected us—or we can go against them.

Arguments have been made suggesting that we should know what we are doing with our own waste before we oppose the siting of a national repository in our state. As we have explained, the EPA is currently auditing the waste that is here, and this is something the previous government failed to do. After we know the extent of the situation of the places in relation to the repositories that exist around the state, we can propose solutions as to how we deal with them. It defies commonsense to say what we will do with our waste until we know what waste exists.

When the previous government passed legislation prohibiting the establishment of a store for high-level waste, no mention was made then of what would be done with South Australian waste. This argument is not really relevant to the discussion at hand. If we wait to debate this until the commonwealth has made the final decision on the location, we will miss the best opportunity we have had to send a strong and clear message to them. We cannot afford to delay and debate any longer, and the government will view any failure to have the debate today as support for having the repository located in this state.

The Hon. A.J. Redford interjecting:

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: That is a summary of the government's position in relation to the bill. I am not sure what negotiations the honourable member has been carrying out with the minister. I understand he has been in contact with the minister in relation to the bill. I am sure that, during the committee stage, he will inform us of what discussions have taken place and what replies he has to the questions he has put.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1.

The CHAIRMAN: This bill has four clauses, and there are a number of indicated amendments. Does any member want to talk on any matter?

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I have had a request from the Hon. Nick Xenophon that, as he needs to conduct some discussions in relation to this bill which should take up to an hour, we report progress.

The CHAIRMAN: You are speaking to clause 1, you have made a contribution and you are now seeking to report progress and ask leave for the committee to sit again?

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: Yes.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: In relation to the government's position—

The CHAIRMAN: I am sorry, the question has been put. We will need to vote. This could become emotional, so we will stick precisely to standing orders.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

VETERINARY PRACTICE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 February. Page 1784.)

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: I indicate support from the Democrats for this bill. It is an extensive re-write of the Veterinary Surgeons Act 1985 which it repeals in its entirety. It addresses several pressing needs, including clearly defining—

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is too much background noise in the chamber. I cannot hear the speaker.

The Hon. IAN GILFILLAN: Thank you, Mr President. I am glad that you show so much interest in what I have to say—a number of veterinary procedures that cannot be performed for a fee by anyone other than an appropriately registered practitioner, while recognising that routine animal husbandry procedures may be performed on the farm by farmers and their employees. From many years experience as a sheep farmer, I know that there are practices the proscription of which would be totally unacceptable to the animal husbandry and farming communities.

The maximum penalty for an unqualified person providing veterinary treatments for fee or reward is $50 000, and that quite clearly would be a disincentive. The bill provides for the continuation of the Veterinary Surgeons Board which is given the task, with the creation and endorsement of, first, codes of conduct; secondly, professional standards; and thirdly, guidelines on education. But perhaps more important than those, the board has appropriate powers to hear complaints about veterinary surgeons or their organisations.

As well, the bill provides for a registrar to maintain a register of general practitioners, specialist practitioners, and most importantly, a register of those who are removed from general or specialist registers. The Leader of the Government,

the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, gave me a copy of a letter he had received from the Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia, signed by Paul Leadbeter, the presiding officer, and the final paragraph is worth sharing. He states:

> I advise that, upon further reflection on these issues—

they had raised some issues particularly about being able to deal with less serious and minor complaints in an informal way—

> the board is prepared to accept the legislation as presented to parliament and to operate its system for dealing with complaints in accordance with the scheme proposed under that legislation.

There are no objections, quite clearly, from the profession to the legislation, and we take that as being support, so I repeat that the Democrats support the second reading of the bill.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I thank the Hon. Ian Gilfillan and the other members who contributed earlier this week for their indications of support for the bill. I take this opportunity to respond to a number of issues raised during the second reading debate.

In his second reading contribution, the Hon. Angus Redford referred to a letter dated 12 February from Mr Paul Leadbeter, Chairman of the Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia, in which Mr Leadbeter raised some minor concerns with the wording of the bill. He referred in particular to clauses 13(1)(g) and 62(3) which relate to the mechanisms by which the board is able to deal with complaints, as well as a query regarding the proposed reduction in the number of persons to comprise the tribunal from four to three, which is in clause 64(1).

I am pleased to inform the council that, after further discussions, Mr Leadbeter has advised me in writing—and it was part of that letter which was quoted by the Hon. Ian Gilfillan—that the Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia is satisfied with the bill. In a letter dated 20 February, Mr Leadbeter states:

> I refer to a letter dated 12 February 2003 which I wrote to Ms Helen Ward, the Registrar at the Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia, a copy of which I understand was provided to you. In that letter I raised concerns about the board's ability under the new act to deal on an informal basis with less serious complaints against members of the veterinary profession.
>
> The registrar and I were subsequently invited to meet with Ms Christine Swift of the Parliamentary Counsel's Office and Mr Robert Baker. We met on the afternoon of Wednesday 19 February 2003. The discussion at that meeting and the consideration of situations which have caused the board some concern under the present act was most useful.
>
> The board fully supports the concept of new legislation in this area. I am now prepared to accept that, if the board establishes the administrative processes set out in section 13(1)(g) of the act then it may be able to create a device whereby less serious and minor complaints can be satisfactorily addressed without the need to go to a full formal hearing.
>
> We note the approach of the Parliamentary Counsel's office that all statutory bills in relation to health professionals should contain similar provisions as far as practicable and that the procedures for dealing with complaints outlined in the Veterinary Practices Bill are, as far as practicable, similar if not the same as procedures in other health professional legislation. I support that approach which I understand seeks to achieve greater uniformity, fairness and clarity across legislation.
>
> I advise that upon further reflection on these issues the board is prepared to accept the legislation as presented to parliament and to operate its system for dealing with complaints in accordance with the scheme proposed under that legislation.

In relation to the definition of 'unprofessional conduct' that was raised by the Hon. Angus Redford, I advise the following. The definition of 'unprofessional conduct' reflects that contained in the current Veterinary Surgeons Act, with an additional component to take into account non-compliance with codes of conduct or professional standards prepared or endorsed by the board under the new measure. Similar definitions currently appear in the South Australian statute book in section 3(1) of the Nurses Act and section 3(1) of the Dental Practice Act.

The Victorian definition of 'unprofessional conduct' in the Veterinary Practice Act 1997 refers to professional conduct and professional misconduct. It also refers to 'infamous conduct in a professional respect' and 'providing veterinary services of a kind that are excessive, unnecessary or not reasonably required for an animal's wellbeing.' It separately refers to standards that might be reasonably expected by the community as compared to the profession, but only in relation to professional conduct, not professional misconduct or the other matters referred to above.

In South Australia we have preferred the more specific (but all-encompassing) references to improper or unethical conduct in relation to professional practice or incompetence or negligence in relation to the provision of veterinary treatment. What falls within 'improper or unethical conduct' in relation to professional practice or incompetence or negligence in relation to the provision of veterinary treatment is, of course, something that would be tested against current community and professional expectations.

In relation to the issue of informal hearings I advise that this bill is designed to provide the board with a highly flexible system to deal with the variety of complaints that the board may receive against veterinary surgeons or veterinary services providers in both a formal and informal manner. The bill has also been drafted with a view to avoiding imposing on the board burdensome and restrictive processes. In relation to formal proceedings I advise that the bill makes clear that part 5 disciplinary proceedings are instigated by the laying of a formal complaint before the board, which can only be made in a manner and form approved by the board (clause 62(1)).

The formal complaint can be laid by the Registrar, the minister or an aggrieved person. When such a formal complaint is laid, the board is required to inquire into the subject matter of the complaint unless the board considers it frivolous or vexatious (clause 62(2)). The bill specifically allows a mediation process to take place even at this stage (clause 62(3)). This is designed to cover situations where a complainant insists on making a formal complaint in circumstances where it appears that there is a misapprehension or misunderstanding. A range of orders is open to the board, extending from censure through fines, imposition of conditions on registration, suspension or cancellation of registration, to disqualification from registration or prohibition from carrying on business as a veterinary services provider.

In addition, it is open to the board to adjourn the proceedings should it decide that a voluntary undertaking offered by the veterinary surgeon is an appropriate response. However, many steps can be taken in respect of a letter or telephone call complaining about a veterinary surgeon before a formal complaint may be laid before the board in respect of the matter. In the absence of specific legislative provisions (as is the case now), it would be a matter for the board to determine whether and how to deal with matters before reaching the stage at which a formal complaint is laid.

However, it is recognised that it is advantageous to try to deal with complaints outside the formal process provided for in legislation, and the bill consequently introduces a new function requiring the board to establish administrative processes for handling complaints received against veterinary surgeons or veterinary services providers (clause 13(1)(g)). This is in contrast to the legislative processes set out in part 5. The bill goes further and recognises that the administrative processes may lead to a veterinary surgeon or veterinary services provider voluntarily entering into an undertaking. Such an undertaking could, for example, involve a change of practice to avoid a similar problem recurring or may involve some action to remedy the complaint.

A veterinary surgeon is not obliged to be cooperative or to enter an undertaking. In such a case, the Registrar must make a decision on whether to elevate the matter to formal proceedings. Of course, in any particular case the matter may be so serious that the Registrar determines to lay a formal complaint immediately. The administrative procedures established by the board under clause 13(1)(g) will need to include steps to ensure that an aggrieved person is made aware that he or she can choose to lay a formal complaint before the board if he or she is unhappy with the administrative process. Apart from this, the board has a great deal of flexibility as to the extent and nature of the procedures to be established. These can be made to suit the needs of the particular profession concerned.

The bill provides significant powers to support investigation into complaints. The board may authorise a person to exercise the powers of an inspector under this act. The board could delegate the power to so authorise inspectors to members of the board, the Registrar, an employee of the board or a committee established by the board. Under clause 56 an inspector may investigate a matter if there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that there is a proper course for disciplinary action against a person, a veterinary surgeon is medically unfit, or a person is guilty of an offence. Clause 56(3) provides inspectors with various powers to enter and inspect, require the production of documents and ask questions.

In relation to the issue of the number of members constituting the board for disciplinary proceedings and the delegation of power to hear and determine disciplinary proceedings, I advise that the bill provides that the board must be constituted of three members for the purposes of hearing and determining disciplinary proceedings. Clearly, it would be inappropriate to provide for the exercise of a casting vote in a disciplinary matter, hence it is necessary to avoid an even number of members. The number has been selected taking into account the size of the board, which will have seven members. The three members are to be a legal practitioner and two other members, one of whom must be a veterinary surgeon.

While it is preferable that the third member constituting the board be a person who is not a veterinary surgeon, at the request of the Veterinary Surgeons Board the bill has been drafted to allow flexibility. In those situations where the board believes that it is necessary to have two veterinary surgeons sit on a matter, that can happen. The board is prevented from delegating the power to hear and determine proceedings under part 5 (clause 16(1)(b)). Because the bill specifically provides for the board to be constituted of a small number of members for this purpose, delegation would not be appropriate. This approach is consistent with other occupational licensing or registration schemes. In conclusion, I thank members for their indications of support for this bill and commend the second reading to members.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER: It is my responsibility to handle this bill in this chamber. However, in the spirit of delegation and sharing as a team I gave that responsibility to the Hon. Angus Redford, who now is too busy to continue with this, so I am left in somewhat of a quandary here. I have only just seen the letter from the Veterinary Surgeons Board, my interpretation of which is that it agrees that there is no need for a formal method of hearing an informal complaint, so we would not be proceeding with our proposed amendments in that direction. Contrary to what the minister has said, there is no mention of reducing the complaints board from the four that is currently the case, and I am assured that the complaints board of four has always reached agreement by consensus.

There is no mention of whether the Veterinary Surgeons Board is pursuing its request to take the board from four to three. I have a number of other concerns with regard to what the regulations will be on what is undoubtedly a commonly accepted practice on farms. We can progress this in either one of two ways: I can agree to pass the bill without amendment in this chamber, because we are in essence in agreement with the bulk of the bill, but give forewarning that there will probably be a series of amendments in the lower house which, if successful, will mean a return of that legislation to us; or, I can move to report progress and go back to the Veterinary Surgeons Board and those vets who have contacted me with regard to placing amendments on file when we next sit. I have not had an opportunity to discuss this with the minister and it is really in his hands. I am prepared to go down either of those paths.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

SPEED CAMERAS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.G. Cameron:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be appointed to investigate and report upon the current use of speed cameras in South Australia including—

(a) their effectiveness as a deterrent to speeding and road injury;
(b) strategies for deciding their placement;
(c) differences in their use between city and country roads;
(d) the relationship between fines collected, main arterial roads and crash 'blackspots';
(e) drivers' perception, beliefs and attitude towards speed cameras;
(f) placement and effectiveness of speed camera warning signs;
(g) the feasibility of putting all money raised by speed cameras into road safety initiatives;
(h) initiatives taken by other governments;
(i) the appropriateness of setting up a 'Speed Camera Advisory Committee'; and
(j) any other matter on speed cameras which is deemed relevant.

2. That the committee consist of six members and the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the committee be fixed at four members and that Standing Order No. 389 be so far suspended as to enable the chairperson of the committee to have a deliberative vote only.

3. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the council.

4. Standing Order No. 396 be suspended to enable strangers to be admitted when the select committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the committee is deliberating.

(Continued from 4 December. Page 1705.)

The Hon. J. GAZZOLA: The government is seriously addressing road safety in South Australia and is introducing a number of measures to improve road safety and to reduce the death toll. Some of these measures to be introduced in a phased manner are an education and advertising campaign, additional speed cameras on roads with high crash rates, the incurring of demerit points when caught by red light or mobile cameras in conjunction with expiation notices, and a mandatory loss of licence for driving with a blood alcohol concentration of .05 or between .05 and .08 as part of a comprehensive $20 million road safety package as announced in the budget.

This road safety package recognises that there are a number of contributing factors to death and trauma, commonly known as the fatal five, namely: speeding; drink driving; inattentive driving; failure to wear seat belts; and, vulnerable road users such as cyclists and pedestrians. It is recognised that a holistic approach is required if we are to reduce the state's road toll. In relation to the first of the fatal five, numerous studies have been undertaken on the dangers of speeding, as honourable members would be aware. Accordingly, enforcement of speeding offences remains a high priority for road safety and the deployment of speed cameras is an important and integral part of the strategy to reduce excessive speed and reinforce the belief and need for long-term change in driver attitudes to speeding.

There is currently before the council a motion for a select committee to be established to investigate and report on the current use of speed cameras in South Australia and it is this that I wish to address. The Hon. Terry Cameron in his address to the motion has claimed, amongst many things, that the road fatality figures for the years 1992 to 2001 have remained 'remarkably static', that government policy on speed cameras has been ineffective and that the continuance of such a failed strategy is more about revenue raising than reducing speed and saving lives. The Hon. Terry Cameron maintains that the figures speak for themselves. I think the figures speak for themselves, but not necessarily to the conclusions the honourable member wishes.

The figures tabled on fines issued, revenue collected and road deaths are for the years 1992 to 2001 inclusive, but a wider perspective gives us a more interesting picture. Statistics provided by the RAA's traffic and safety officer show that road fatalities for South Australia from 1984 to 1990 were generally in the low to high 200s, with peak mortality figures of 288 in 1986 and 268 in 1985 being recorded. Since 1990—the year of the introduction of speed cameras—the trend in the number of fatalities demonstrates a gradual decline to a low of 154 for 2001. It is true that there was some upward movement in 1993, 1995 and 1996, but the trend has been one of reduction in fatalities. In fact, the peak difference between 1993 and 2001 in the number of fatalities is a reduction of 69—an interesting statistic—which reinforces the current downward trend. The per capita rate has dropped from 14.90 in 1993 to 11.30 in 1998, placing South Australia in about the middle of Australia's fatality rates for those years according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

The PRESIDENT: I point out to the cameraman in the gallery that there are rules with respect to the use of cameras from the gallery and he is currently breaching them. I ask him to pay attention to that.

The Hon. J. GAZZOLA: On a per capita basis, on these figures we are certainly not the worst and can compare favourably with a state similar to us geographically and demographically, such as Western Australia which is on a figure of 12.34. The number of fines issued across this period is also of interest. The Hon. Terry Cameron correctly points out that the number of expiation notices has fallen from 245 788 in 1992 to 244 347 in 2001.

This is a paltry difference of about 1 000, which prompted the Hon. Terry Cameron to suggest that the effectiveness of speed cameras in diminishing fatalities is not there. But the figures across the years do fluctuate wildly. In 1995, over 198 000 fines were issued and 181 fatalities were recorded. In 2001, over 244 000 fines were issued but only 154 fatalities were recorded. These figures suggest that there could be a strong causal relationship between the number of fines and fatalities. Some figures for other years contradict this, but there is an interesting general statistic correlation between high numbers of fines issued and low fatality figures over this period.

These statistical probabilities need further support. Since the 1970s, there has been a concerted effort to improve vehicles and roads, create greater safety awareness and vigilantly prosecute offenders through new initiatives and devices. These combined measures have seen the fatality figures fall from the 300s in the 1970s to the present figures. When asked what he thought were the three major factors Australia-wide that had contributed the most to this, the RAA traffic and safety officer was of the clear opinion that it was because of the introduction and use of seatbelts, random breath testing, cameras and radar. Specifically, cameras, hidden and open, together with laser or radar guns, are considered, in his professional opinion, as an important part of world's best practice. He also pointed out that some businesses were paying the speeding fines of their employees. If people in some businesses are, indeed, becoming blasé about openly positioned cameras and laser guns, the continued use of hidden cameras, no matter where the urban location, is a necessity.

Even anecdotal evidence suggests that public awareness of the possible presence of hidden cameras contributes to better safety and safety consciousness. It is a view that I strongly hold, and a view that I believe is endorsed by the comments of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw. To show that the Hon. Diana Laidlaw and I can agree on at least two things, the people who are fined need to realise that speeding, no matter what the defence, is a choice that they make, and that such a choice regarding public safety on the roads is not to be condoned. The government believes that public safety and safety awareness are paramount. I believe that the measures identified in the government's safety package, when fully initiated and realised, should vitiate the need for a select committee.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO secured the adjournment of the debate.

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

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 November. Page 1418.)

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: At last I get an opportunity to speak on this bill. I was lining up repeatedly in that first week in December and every time I thought that I might get

a chance it was adjourned. I do not often feel so enthusiastic about supporting a piece of legislation. Members might recall that, when we dealt with the Equal Opportunity Bill amendments in 2001 I expressed a desire, on behalf of the Democrats, to not have just same sex relationships, but interdependent relationships included, as defined in the Migration Act. The point I made then, and the point that I make again, is that relationships should not be defined purely on the basis of whether two people have a sexual relationship or have had a sexual relationship with each other.

I wanted to go down the path of including that Migration Act amendment with this bill, but it became increasingly clear to me, when I had a briefing from Treasury, that such a provision would have resulted in abuse. So, the Democrats have reluctantly accepted that the widening of the definition in this way is not feasible. Given that we will have to continue to define these things in terms of sexual relationship, it should apply whether the relationship is heterosexual or homosexual. The Democrats have taken a strong position on this issue of equal opportunity and same sex superannuation in the federal parliament over a number of years.

I want to look specifically at some of the Christian edicts as far as homosexuality is concerned. In the lower house when this bill was being debated the member for Goyder made some very interesting comments—and I note from *Hansard* that there was laughter at the time and, in a way, I am not surprised. But also I am angered at some of the stuff that he introduced into the debate. The member talked about what the Bible had to say about homosexuality, and he quoted Leviticus, chapter 18, verse 22:

> No man is to have sexual relations with another man; God hates that.

In fact, in the King James version, the word that is used is 'abomination'. I note, however, that God only singled out male homosexual relationships; he did not single out lesbians—which might say something about God. John Meier then went on to say that we did not have to worry about what Leviticus said because we do not live under the old law any more. Then he went on to quote 1 Corinthians, chapter 6, verse 9:

> Do you not know that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived; neither the immoral nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor homosexuals—

again, the King James version actually says men who are having sex with men; it did not bring women into that—

> nor thieves, nor the greedy, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor robbers will inherit the kingdom of God.

What I find disturbing about this is that, according to John Meier's beliefs, someone whose sexual preference is not of the opposite sex is put in the same class as thieves and extortionists. I know, from having been brought up as a Christian for many years, that *The Bible* is supposed to be the inspired word of God. But I also learnt, even as a child, that some parts were more or less inspired than others. This happens to be some of the less inspired part of it, and I think, more than anything else—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: You can choose what you want when you want.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I will go on to that in a minute, Ms Laidlaw. Rather, I think that that shows St Paul's own insecurities about his own sexuality showing through. The difference between the Old Testament and New Testament readings that John Meier selected is that these people who have sinned according to these biblical codes are not required to be put to death: it is just that they will not be able to enter or inherit the kingdom of heaven. So, obviously, going from the Old Testament (or the old law, as the member for Goyder calls it), to the New Testament the punishment is not quite as bad.

John Meier represents a group of people who use such quotes to argue that homosexual people should not inherit their partner's superannuation and, in effect, to justify bigotry. I wonder whether he also considers that this same inheritance prohibition should apply to the fornicators, the adulterers and the drunkards that he quotes. Would he—and I would challenge him to do this—consider introducing a private member's bill to cut out the fornicators, the adulterers and the drunkards? I would suggest that, if John Meier holds to the righteousness of those quotes, and got a bill passed along those lines, he would probably in the process have cut off the spouses and partners of about 50 per cent of the population who at some times are fornicators, adulterers or drunkards—and, I would suggest, maybe even some of the members of this parliament.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins): Order!

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I return to the quote that states that these people cannot inherit the kingdom of heaven, because it does not say that they will not be able to inherit their partner's superannuation. Having been brought up as a Christian, I have a fairly wide Biblical knowledge and, in my upbringing, I learned that Jesus said that he who is without sin should be the one to cast the first stone. Perhaps the member for Goyder is that person. As I was growing up, I learned that the Old Testament God was a jealous, angry and punishing one, while the New Testament God was a forgiving, accepting and inclusive one. I note that Jesus was a friend of taxpayers and prostitutes.

The Hon. Ian Gilfillan: And tax collectors.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: And tax collectors, yes. *The Bible* can be used selectively to validate any position you want and, to that end, I will read some offerings that I came across in the winter 2000 edition of a magazine called *New Doctor*. This letter has came from the internet, and it was posted to North American media personality Laura Schlessinger, who has built up quite a reputation based upon attacking homosexual people. Whoever wrote this letter said:

> I have learned a great deal from your show, and I try to share that knowledge with as many people as I can. When someone tries to defend the homosexual lifestyle, for example, I simply remind him that Leviticus 18:22 clearly states it to be an abomination: end of debate. I do need some advice from you, however, regarding some of the specific laws and how to best follow them:
>
> (a) When I burn a bull on the altar as a sacrifice, I know it creates a pleasing odour for the Lord (Leviticus 1:9). The problem is my neighbours. They claim the odour is not pleasing to them. Should I smite them?
>
> (b) I would like to sell my daughter into slavery, as sanctioned in Exodus 21:7. In this day and age, what do you think would be a fair price for her?
>
> (c) I have a neighbour who insists on working on the Sabbath. Exodus 35:2 clearly states he should be put to death. Am I morally obligated to kill him myself?
>
> (d) A friend of mine feels that even though eating shellfish is an abomination (Leviticus 11:10) it is a lesser abomination than homosexuality. I don't agree. Can you settle this?
>
> (e) Most of my male friends get their hair trimmed, including the hair around their temples, even though this is expressly forbidden by Leviticus 19:27. How should they die?
>
> (f) My uncle has a farm. He violates Leviticus 19:19 by planting two different crops in the same field, as does his wife by wearing garments made of two different kinds of thread (cotton/polyester).

He also tends to curse and blaspheme a lot. Is it really necessary that we go to all the trouble of getting the whole town together to stone them (Leviticus 24:10-16)? Couldn't we just burn them to death at a private family affair, like we do with people who sleep with their in-laws (Leviticus 20:14)?

I am sad that the member for Goyder used *The Bible* to defend what is an indefensible position. What surely matters in our society is that two people love each other enough to make a commitment to spend their life together and to care for each other. Society is the better for the support that one person gives another regardless of their homosexuality. A person's sexual partner should have no bearing on their superannuation entitlements in any way, shape or form.

I congratulate Frances Bedford on pushing this issue over more than three years and not giving up. I urge members of this council to demonstrate that we are mature, tolerate people and support this legislation, as the Democrats are proud to do.

The Hon. J. GAZZOLA: I rise to support this bill. Since the eighties, there has been considerable discussion by governments, gay and lesbian groups and the community about the scope and direction of laws covering property division, inheritance laws, superannuation and others that fall under the umbrella of 'family laws' that define and govern the concept and status of family. We have witnessed change in the law affecting non-traditional families in the broadening debate about the concept of family, with the recognition by the New South Wales government of the rights of same-sex cohabiting couples in regard to property and family matters in the Property Relationships Legislation Amendment Act 1999.

We have seen further calls for the extension of same-sex law in as yet unamended New South Wales laws by the New South Wales Legislative Standing Committee Social Issues report of 1999, and in the 2000 federal select committee inquiry into discrimination against same-sex partners in superannuation law. All of these changes have been well documented by my colleague the Hon. Gail Gago in a submission to the council. There is little doubt, even given this potted history of reform, that there is broad recognition by both sides of politics to redress the legacy of prejudice and marginalisation that besets this minority group.

Studies by the Australian Institute of Family Studies have recognised the emerging diverse face of the family. As we undergo religious, cultural and economic change, so the structure of the family changes. For example, social attitudes towards divorce, separation, the single parent, pre-marital sex and so on are far more accepting than they were in the past. Gay and lesbian couples, with or without children, are now being recognised in the national census on family statistics.

The need for reconsideration of family law in regard to recognition of the rights of same-sex families is seen in the call by High Court judge Justice Michael Kirby for equality in the Family Court. The 'turning tide' of reform, as it has been described in an article by Jenny Millbank, a lecturer in law, and as published in an article in the Australian Institute of Family Studies, debates the quest for equality and dignity in the face of critics concerned with the slippery slope of social decline and lost values.

This transition has not and will not be easy, and the rights of all groups require that the issue be handled with tolerance and understanding if we are to develop and enhance the rights of all families—a point not lost on the chief judge of the Family Court, when he stated:

One of the fundamental misconceptions which plagues me is the failure to understand that heterosexual family life in no way gains stature, security and respect by the denigration or refusal to acknowledge same-sex families. The sum social good is, in fact, reduced, because when a community refuses to recognise and protect the genuine commitment made by its members, the state acts against everybody's interests.

It strikes me as contradictory and absurd that, of the near 20 000 same-sex couples in the 1996 Australian census, many are contributors to superannuation schemes, yet they do not have the same rights as heterosexual couples. This point was not lost on the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, which recommended that relevant commonwealth superannuation and benefit acts be amended to remove provisions which impair quality of employment and deny equal protection before the law, especially where gender-specific terms are used to determine spouse benefit.

South Australia—traditionally at the forefront of homosexual reform—now has two bills before its parliament in regard to same-sex couple superannuation entitlements, which is a strange thing in itself and which warrants further discussion. There is no doubt that there is merit in the member for Hartley's bill in its concern for and recognition of the rights of all superannuants in domestic codependent circumstances. What concerns me are the real and objective consequences of the member for Hartley's bill in regard to the rights of same sex couples. The issue in regard to both bills is not only about the rights to superannuation, but the perception of equal rights for same sex couples.

There are two interrelated aspects, as I see it. First, I will elaborate the issues from the point of view of a same sex couple. By substituting 'domestic co-dependants' for the definition of 'putative spouse' in the member for Florey's bill, the member for Hartley's bill makes assumptions about the ethical and legal status of marriage. In effect, it raises the question about what group should own and uphold the concept of marriage. It also raises the possibility of quarantining the concept of marriage from same sex couples. I would like to stress that this is not a deception, but an unintended consequence of the member for Hartley's bill in its intention to offer broad and genuine reform for a previously unrecognised group.

This brings me to the second aspect. What will give these consequences further concrete reality is the requirement of the member for Hartley's bill to cap the superannuation payouts to all domestic co-dependants because of the greater cost to a greater number of superannuants compared to the member for Florey's same sex bill. The government's increased liabilities, as costed by Treasury and Finance for the member for Florey's same sex bill, has been put at around $20 million, while the figure for the member for Hartley's bill has been put at $100 million. The latter estimate may well be conservative, according to the Director of Superannuation Policy, Treasury and Finance.

The necessity for a cap or quota under the member for Hartley's bill will see all domestic co-dependants treated equally, including same sex couples, but will see same sex couples receive less than if they were under the non-capped member for Florey's bill. Under the member for Florey's bill, same sex couples would receive entitlements equal to those granted to heterosexual couples. In offering support to a larger number of domestic co-dependants than the number of same sex couples alone, the member for Hartley's bill would appear to have greater utility and fairness but, if we are going to treat domestic co-dependants and same sex couples equally

with heterosexual couples in superannuation law, this is not the way to go about it.

This bill, if accepted, would also reinforce the ideological concerns, which I have previously discussed and which have been used by some opponents of the member for Florey's bill as the ground for their arguments. It would stifle and further subordinate argument and reform on the rights of same sex couples. The domestic co-dependants bill, as the Hon. Gail Gago correctly pointed out in her address on both bills, would further entrench discrimination in our statute books and widen the degree of discrimination. I hope that we are not witnessing a skirmish to a battle that was fought and won in South Australia many years ago: the legal right for consenting adults to have homosexual relationships.

It is the responsibility of members to represent the views of their constituents, as some members in the other place have argued, but members also have another important duty, that is, to consider the merits of arguments, not accept consensus politics as a fait accompli. It is pleasing to read that many members in the other place have seen clearly the priority issue as a moral issue about the rights of superannuation and not as an issue about homosexuality. The views of some are enlightening. The member for Mitchell, in relation to the member for Florey's bill, said:

> It is not a bill about homosexuality at all, as far as I can see. It is a bill about making it a level playing field as far as superannuation benefits are concerned.

He supports the bill. It is about homosexuality but, more importantly, it is about recognising fairly, openly and honestly that the rights of a minority group in this matter transcend sexual preference. The member for Fisher, in his support for the member for Florey's bill, said:

> We have within our society, sadly, a very strong element of prejudice, both overt and covert, directed against people who are categorised as lesbian or homosexual. That is very unfortunate and unfair, and reflects badly on our community. Also, it shows a degree of immaturity and an unwillingness to accept that people should have a freedom of choice in regard to their sexual orientation.

The concern for the relevant issue of individual and family rights, freed from the shackles of prejudice and intolerance, was also appropriately addressed by the Hon. Diana Laidlaw in her address to the amendment bill when she said:

> As a Liberal I have always championed individual dignity and individual decision making, and I do so again on this occasion. . . I have always contributed to superannuation and I find it completely offensive that an individual who contributes to their superannuation, no matter their sex or life choice decisions, should be discriminated against because they are not married in the traditional sense of male and female over some period of time.

I commend the members in the other place and the Hon. Diana Laidlaw for their maturity and reason. What has been explicitly stated or implied by some members in the other place who are opposed to the member for Florey's bill? The member for Goyder—who seems to be getting a bit of a run today—surrenders the question of the status of same sex superannuants' rights to the prescriptive will of Romans 27. He hinted at the real argument when he said:

> Maybe society is changing. Whether that change is for better or worse is open to argument itself.

This is the issue and it is the issue that the member for Florey's bill is best placed to meet. The orthodox defence of the status quo has been followed by another member in the other place, but has centred on the arguments of what should constitute the definitions of putative spouse and marriage. The member for Waite's concern with the member for Florey's bill is initially centred on the traditional and nominal status of putative spouse which, in being reconciled to the concept of same sex couples, sets a dangerous precedent for future legislation.

This is a bill in its own right, and whether or not it implies some obligation on other bills is not sufficient reason to reject the bill in its current form. For the member for Waite, the question of the moral intention of the member for Florey's bill is finally reduced to a discussion of the concept of marriage where he concludes that the proper resolution is to be found in the value free or neutral idea of 'friendship'. According to the member for Waite, quoting Archbishop Carnley, who, presumably, is quoting God, the idea of true 'friendship' finds its strongest expression in heterosexual marriage. It is interesting that this so-called amoral or value free interpretation of God's wisdom and benevolence, as implied by the member for Waite, did not stop the member from recommending the domestic co-dependants bill with all its consequential discrimination and prejudice. All this came from a person who said:

> I will not try to impose a moral viewpoint on people.

There is no neutral or value free position in this debate, or in any other debate for that matter, and attempts to hide behind one only confuse the issues.

In closing, we must be clear that there are two arguments here and we must be careful not to confuse the two. The member for Florey's bill is not about making homosexuality mandatory. It is not about undermining the rights of heterosexual families. It is to be dearly hoped that members will be guided by reason and a concern for the rights of a minority group that should not be penalised for the fact of being different. It may well require painful examination and re-examination of values that are near and dear to us, but this is what human value is really about. I commend the member for Florey's bill to the council.

The Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MANOCK, Dr C.

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. Nick Xenophon:

1. That this council expresses its deep concern over the material presented and allegations contained in the ABC's *Four Corners* report entitled 'Expert Witness' broadcast on 22 October 2001, involving Dr Colin Manock, forensic pathologist, and the evidence he gave from 1968-1995 in numerous criminal law cases;

2. Further, this council calls on the Attorney-General to request an inquiry by independent senior counsel, or a retired Supreme Court judge, to report whether there are matters of substance raised by the *Four Corners* report that warrant further formal investigation; and

3. That the Attorney-General subsequently report, in an appropriate manner, to this council on the allegations made in the *Four Corners* report and their impact on the administration of justice in this state.

(Continued from 4 December. Page 1709.)

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): The motion moved by the Hon. Nick Xenophon called upon the Attorney-General to do a number of things. The response I have received from the Attorney-General, which he has asked me to convey to the council, reads as follows:

> There is considerable doubt about the reliability of the ABC report on which Mr Xenophon's motion is based. It was an attempt to discredit Dr Manock in order to cast doubt on one particular court decision that allegedly relied on his findings. There may appear to be nothing wrong with that, in principle. But a closer look at the

circumstances may lead you to think that we, as a parliament, should not take the matter further. I will deal first with the report and then its contents.

The report made some serious assertions but there was no serious attempt at balance or context or accuracy, and the report verged on dishonesty in the way it sensationalised the Keogh trial and Dr Manock's part in it. Also, the objectivity of some of those interviewed on the program was questionable. Some of those making the assertions had an axe to grind but hid it. They were either connected closely with unsuccessful defences in the trials referred to in the report, as counsel or as expert witnesses, or were experts not involved with these cases but prepared to give an opinion after the event on material selected by the reporter. It is worth noting that key South Australian pathologists declined to participate in the program. The police representative interviewed was in fact practising at the time as a criminal defence lawyer, working closely with the criminal lawyer featured in the report. This was not disclosed in the program, leaving viewers to assume that he represented an official and independent police view.

Comments by those tending to defend Dr Manock's credentials or to put the impact of his evidence in context in particular cases appear to have been heavily edited. The report did not say whether Dr Manock had been asked to comment, and no comment from Dr Manock was broadcast. Instead, the report showed a brief, edited clip of Dr Manock speaking to an ABC news reporter in 1991 on unrelated issues.

I turn now to the subject matter of the report, and, first, to the three infant deaths, the subject of a thorough coronial inquiry that found Dr Manock to have been in error in his findings. The house is asked to note that there were no prosecutions after the coronial inquiry because the DPP considered there was no reasonable prospect of conviction, for a number of reasons apart from the Manock findings. In other words, the fact that certain people were not prosecuted in relation to the deaths is not attributable to the impugned findings of Dr Manock. There is nothing of substance in the *Four Corners* report that warrants further inquiry into this.

As to the Keogh case, and the relevance of the findings in the coronial inquiry into the infant deaths to it, I ask the house to note the following facts, not mentioned in the *Four Corners* report. Keogh's petition in 1996 to the Governor to exercise the prerogative of mercy was based on the assertion that the verdict was unsafe because Dr Manock's findings were unreliable, that this unreliability had been demonstrated by the coronial inquiry into his findings in the three infant death cases, and that the appeal court had not taken due notice of this. The Governor dismissed the petition on advice. That advice was to the effect that the evidence referred to in the petition could not be described as 'fresh evidence' not previously considered by the court.

Neither the evidence produced at the inquest, nor the coronial findings, could lead to any real doubt as to Dr Manock's expertise to conduct the autopsy in the Keogh case. The coroner, when inquiring into Dr Manock's findings in the three infant deaths, did not find Dr Manock incompetent to conduct adult autopsies. The defence in Keogh had every opportunity to raise the matters raised in the infant death coronial inquiry in the Keogh defence, but chose not to. There was no miscarriage of justice in the Keogh case. The verdict did not depend on acceptance of one or other pathology report, but on circumstantial evidence. Indeed, much of Dr Manock's evidence was relied upon by defence or supported by photographic evidence. Dr Manock's evidence as to how the bruises came to be on the victim's leg in the Keogh case had marginal weight and relevance to the prosecution case.

In summary, the *Four Corners* report did not reveal any new evidence relating to the Keogh case. None of the material presented in the report was not already available to the defence before the trial took place. If there had been a miscarriage of justice, the High Court would have found so on appeal. But the High Court dismissed Keogh's application in 1997 for special leave to appeal. It did not accept Keogh's submission that the verdict was unsafe and unsatisfactory because it relied on Dr Manock's allegedly tainted evidence, and that infant death coronial findings about his expertise had not, and should have, been considered by the South Australian Court of Criminal Appeal.

The High Court made no finding about whether there was, in fact, relevant fresh evidence affecting the verdict. But it did find, and I quote, that 'It was a conscious decision on the part of counsel for the applicant not to advance that evidence', and 'The fact that it is now submitted that counsel was in error is no ground for the grant of special leave.' The point being made here is that, at the time of Keogh's appeal to the Court of Criminal Appeal, the infant death coronial findings (and, for that matter, all the forensic differences of opinion presented on the *Four Corners* program) were known to his defence team. The choice not to object to the safety of the verdict on these grounds in the appeal can only suggest advice that this argument would not succeed because the verdict did not depend on Dr Manock's evidence. It is significant that the *Four Corners* program, although mentioning in passing that the High Court had dismissed Keogh's application for leave to appeal, omitted to mention why. If it had, of course, the air would have been let out of the balloon.

As in the Keogh case, the evidence of Dr Manock in the van Beelen case that was criticised on the *Four Corners* program by Mr Borick, a member of the unsuccessful defence team in van Beelen, was thoroughly scrutinised on appeal. The appeal court upheld van Beelen's conviction. The *Four Corners* report raised no evidence that was not before that appeal court. There is nothing to suggest the need for further inquiry into this matter, or the reopening of the cases of Keogh or van Beelen. The government is not prepared, without a trace of fresh evidence, and with every indication that allegedly impugned evidence where it affected a verdict, was subjected to an appropriate level of judicial scrutiny in any event, to provide large sums of money to defence counsel to go behind decisions made by the highest appeal courts. We do not want to set up a publicly-funded platform for campaigns for the release of convicted murderers or rapists. What public good would this serve? Giving unsuccessful defendants another go, on the same evidence and outside the court process, is likely to create quite unwarranted and damaging uncertainty about our criminal justice system. This government will not support it.

That is the official reply by the Attorney-General to the motion moved by the Hon. Nick Xenophon in relation to the ABC *Four Corners* report entitled 'Expert Witness'. There is nothing more I can add other than to draw the attention of the Hon. Nick Xenophon to the statement given to the council. As I cannot filibuster any longer, we may have to now suspend temporarily or hope that the jury comes back within the next five minutes.

The Hon. J. GAZZOLA secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 4.47 to 5.45 p.m.]

NUCLEAR WASTE STORAGE FACILITY (PROHIBITION) (REFERENDUM) AMENDMENT BILL

In committee (resumed on motion).

(Continued from page 1847.)

Clause 1.

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I will report progress in relation to the discussions that have been held, as far as I understand them. As we broke to report progress, there was a feeling that a compromise position was being developed; that came to pass. Negotiations and discussions were held by all parties, and an agreed position has developed that will entail a return to parliament at an earlier date, with progress being reported at the committee stage.

I understand that some questions may be put on notice to which the government will endeavour to bring back replies at a later date. We will not progress the bill any further. We will seek an adjournment to another day after the questions have been put on notice.

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: I will try to be as neutral as I can in asking these questions. Since this bill was introduced last year, the opposition has consistently asked the government to put on the record its policy in so far as dealing with radioactive waste is concerned. During my second reading

speech back in August last year I asked two questions: first, is radioactive waste currently transported in South Australia by road, rail, air and shipping? If so, are these forms licensed by the commonwealth, the state or both? Secondly, can the minister advise how much radioactive waste by category—that is, low, medium or high—is transported within South Australia each year by road, air, rail or shipping, and can he detail the extent of that?

Other questions have been put on record in the past to which we, in the opposition, want answers. First, how much is in the budget forward estimates for the construction of a state low-level waste repository and/or an interim low-level storage facility, and in which minister's budget and budget line is the construction?

If the federal government is to build a low-level storage facility at Woomera, will the state government use it and, if not, will the state government build its own low-level waste storage facility and, if so, where? What will the cost and time frame be? What public consultation will take place prior to the construction of a state facility?

If the federal government is to build a low level storage facility at Woomera, will the state government need to build an interim storage facility and, if so, where, at what cost, in what time frame and what will be the public consultation process? If the federal government does not build a low level waste repository at Woomera, where will the government store the waste and how will it store it—

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw: The South Australian government?

The Hon. A.J. REDFORD: The South Australian government storing South Australian waste. At what cost? What will the time frame be and what will be the public consultation process? Where will the federal Labor Party store the radioactive waste, given that its policy is not to force storage on to any state and the state Labor Party does not want the radioactive waste store in South Australia. Where will the federal Labor Party move the 2 000 cubic metres of waste that was dumped in South Australia by the Keating government? Will it be to New South Wales, Victoria or where?

Has the Premier or the minister sought the views of other states' and territories' leaders as to whether or not they are prepared to take low-level, medium level or high-level waste and, if so, what are the views of each of the other states? Finally, how much is in the budget and the forward estimates for the referendum? Which minister's budget is it in and which budget line will identify that?

Those are some of the questions that we in the opposition have been asking consistently and persistently week after week, month after month, and these are the questions to which we demand answers to enable us to fulfil our responsibility so that we can make an informed decision at the committee stage of this bill.

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: I want to express my disappointment at the game-playing in which the Liberals have indulged this afternoon. The so-called legitimate questions—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Previous members were heard in silence. This member will be heard the same way.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: The so-called legitimate questions that have been asked this afternoon do not have any bearing on the fact that, in 12 months, South Australia will have waste from Lucas Heights being transported here into South Australia. I would have expected that the Liberal opposition would behave a little more responsibly in this regard. This afternoon, we had an opportunity to deal with this quickly and effectively, and I believe that the opposition ought to be ashamed of itself.

Yes, I do have some of the information that you are seeking, and it is not all that hard to find. I have a letter here from Dennis Matthews of the Conservation Council who says that, according to federal government documents, South Australia holds only 0.5 per cent of the waste that could be put in the radioactive waste repository and 0.03 per cent of the radioactivity. If people in the Conservation Council can find out this information, I find it surprising that members of the opposition cannot do their own research and find some of the information that they appear to be lacking.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

The Hon. SANDRA KANCK: The government policy is clearly enunciated in this piece of legislation and members of the opposition do not need to go further than that. They had an opportunity to deal responsibly with this matter this afternoon: they have chosen not to and they should be ashamed of themselves.

The CHAIRMAN: My generosity has again got me into trouble. Members are starting to now debate issues that are not anything to do with the title of the bill, or anything to do with the arrangements that I understand have been agreed amongst you all. Much of this has been debated in the house, and I do not think it is profitable to go over it again. I understand there is an agreement. There needs to be a procedural motion to allow that agreement to be put into place.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

REPLIES TO QUESTIONS

MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT

In reply to **Hon. R.D. LAWSON** (24 October).

The Hon T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. Is (the Attorney General) aware of the latest report of the National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council and its recommendations?

2. Does the government support the introduction in this state of a subsidised vehicle immobiliser program?

The Executive Director of Transport SA, Mr Trevor Argent, responded to the NMVTRC. In this response, it was noted that the principles behind the scheme had merit. However, the need for further investigation before such a scheme could be considered for introduction was also highlighted.

Such a scheme would be of interest to the insurance industry, consumer groups and enforcement agencies. Considering this, further discussion would need to take place with these groups, and issues such as resource allocation for the research, implementation and administration of any such scheme would need to be considered carefully.

Since 1 July 2001, it has been compulsory across Australia for all new vehicles to be fitted with an appropriate immobiliser. This will go some way toward addressing the incidence of opportunistic theft of new cars in South Australia.

The South Australian Vehicle Theft Reduction Committee, which reports to the Attorney General, is the most appropriate body to consider the implementation of a compulsory immobiliser scheme, as all relevant state and industry bodies are represented on this Committee.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (24 October).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Local Government has advised:

1. Ms Hurley was engaged by the Local Government Association of South Australia, with respect to her participation in the Local Government Association President's Forum on 30 August 2002.

2. None.

3. No.

4. Remuneration arrangements were a matter between Ms Hurley and the Local Government Association of South Australia.

5. The Treasurer, the Minister for Local Government and a number of senior public servants participated in the Forum

PEDESTRIAN CROSSING, GRAND JUNCTION ROAD

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (16 October).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. Does the Minister recognise the dangers posed to pedestrians by the absence of a crossing in the vicinity of the Lutheran Homes Retirement Village?

The importance of a pedestrian actuated crossing on Grand Junction Road, adjacent to the Lutheran Homes Retirement Village is recognised. Transport SA officers have consulted with Lutheran Homes, the Shopping Centre Developers and the local council to ensure that all parties' needs were catered for in the design process.

2. Considering that funding was allocated by the previous government for the installation of the crossing in the 2001-2002 budget, does the government intend to honour the commitment to construct the crossing and, if so, when?

This government has honoured the commitment to construct the pedestrian actuated crossing. Transport SA commenced work on site on Monday, 21 October 2002.

DUKES HIGHWAY

In reply to **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** (15 October).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. Have the necessary budget alterations been made for these repairs?

Funding of approximately $300,000 for immediate repairs to the worst sections of road between Bordertown and the Victorian Border has been made available through reprioritising of national highway funding. The exact level of funding will be determined on the basis of safety risk and performance to ensure the repairs last until funds can be obtained for a full rehabilitation.

2. When will the repair work commence?

Maintenance repair work is anticipated to commence in November 2002.

3. Will the 100 km/h speed limit be lifted at the completion of those repairs?

The initial repairs proposed will not be substantial or extensive. They will make the badly deteriorated areas safer but they will not halt deterioration of the remaining pavement nor will they treat all the rough and rutted sections. Therefore, it is not proposed to consider re-introducing the speed limit of 110km/h until a final rehabilitation is carried out. In addition, the speed limit is consistent with the adjoining section of Highway in Victoria.

4. Will the minister give a commitment as to when the $8 million will be provided to fix the problem?

Transport SA will be placing a high priority on these works in its bid for future National Highway funding. Transport SA will be discussing this project in detail with the Commonwealth Department of Transport and Regional Services over the coming months to negotiate these funding outcomes.

COMMUNITY BUILDERS PROGRAM

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (23 October).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I advise:

The Sate government is committed to the continuation of the Community Builders Program, allocating $90,000 within the Office of Regional Affairs budget in the 2002—2003 financial year.

Negotiations to seek matching funds are proceeding with the Commonwealth government through the Department of Family and Community Services.

An application was made to the Local Government Association—Research and Development Scheme but was unsuccessful.

RABBITS

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (27 August).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has advised:

1. It is not possible to estimate the total number of rabbits in South Australia, nor has it ever been possible. Rabbit numbers can vary 10-fold from one year to the next simply because of seasonal conditions. However, we can make reasonable estimates of changes in relative numbers since the arrival of RHD.

RHD has dramatically reduced rabbit populations in South Australia but its impact has varied between regions. The greatest impact has been in the arid interior, where rabbit numbers have generally been held to about 10 per cent of their former levels. RHD has also greatly reduced rabbit numbers in the mallee cereal belt but in higher rainfall areas the disease has had a lesser and more geographically variable impact.

For example, several reports have indicated that parts of the Adelaide Hills and Fleurieu Peninsula have received little or no reduction.

Recent research has found that the lesser impact of RHD in high rainfall areas has several causes. Among them are:

- Evidence that transmission of RHD is poorer in high rainfall areas, and
- Evidence that another pre-existing calicivirus in rabbits may be reducing the mortality rates caused by RHD in the high rainfall areas (in much the same way as cowpox vaccines protect humans against smallpox infection).

2. Notwithstanding regional differences, increasing numbers of rabbits have been observed in some parts of South Australia during the past year, but the response is not uniform. For example, a recent visit to a study site in the Northern Flinders Ranges found rabbit numbers that were lower than at any time since the arrival of rabbit haemorrhagic disease. (RHD, also commonly known in Australia as rabbit calicivirus disease RCD).

There are several reasons why increasing numbers of rabbits may have been reported:

- Even without the effect of disease, rabbit populations fluctuate greatly between years in response to seasonal conditions.
- Myxomatosis may have been less active. Myxomatosis still plays an important role in limiting rabbit populations.
- Rabbit numbers have been so low in the aftermath of RHD that relatively minor changes in numbers of rabbits now seem significant, and are reported, even though the rabbits may still be present at only a small fraction of their pre-RHD population levels.
- Rabbits may be becoming more resistant to RHD or new strains of the RHD virus may be appearing that are less virulent.

In summary, it is not yet clear whether the increase in rabbit numbers during the past year is due to seasonal conditions or whether it indicates the beginning of recovery from the effects of the recently introduced calicivirus. Given the natural variability in rabbit populations and RHD activity, we will probably not be able to distinguish between these alternative explanations for another five years or more.

3. The Animal and Plant Control Commission is conducting research to develop management recommendations that ensure rabbit control operations are integrated with RHD in a way that provides the best overall level of rabbit control.

The research is being conducted at 4 sites in South Australia and 4 sites in Victoria, as a joint project between the South Australian APCC, the Victorian DNRE and CSIRO Sustainable Ecosystems. Support funding comes from the National Feral Animal Control Program (part of Natural Heritage Trust funding).

There is no evidence that steel-jawed traps have ever been a significant influence on rabbit numbers in South Australia. Trapping was an effective (albeit labour-intensive) method of harvesting from dense rabbit populations, or catching an occasional bunny ‘for the pot’ but was not an effective means of controlling them to low levels.

PLASTIC SHOPPING BAGS

In reply to **Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (22 October).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has advised:

The Plastic Bag Working Party established under the auspices of the National Environment and Heritage Council had its first meeting mid October in Melbourne to begin its work. The Working Party currently consists of a range of stakeholders including industry, state and federal governments. Planet Ark and the council for the Encouragement of Philanthropy in Australia (CEPA) are also represented.

The Working Party has resolved to work on three major strategies and or options for consideration by Ministers in December: a code of practice for retailers, voluntary levies and legislative instruments, and biodegradable alternatives to plastic bags.

At this stage the working group is focussing on the plastic carry bags used in most retail outlets. However, the information gained may also be usefully applied to other plastics and wastes where relevant.

MUSIC INDUSTRY

In reply to **Hon DIANA LAIDLAW** (15 October).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Premier has provided the following information:

(1) The Live Music Working Group made eight separate recommendations which should be considered so as to further protect and enhance the interests of live music in South Australia and to reconcile the concerns of local residents about noise and disturbance from music venues with the needs of live music in licensed premises.

Summary of Recommendations

1. The Environment Protection Authority (EPA) should collate available information concerning licensed venues in relation to the need for noise attenuation and produce Guidelines and a Technical Bulletin on noise levels associated with licensed entertainment venues to assist planning authorities.

2. Planning SA should ensure the adequacy of the planning strategy to guide development plan amendments and prepare a Planning Bulletin on new licensed entertainment venues and development proposals in areas surrounding existing licensed entertainment venues.

3. Local government should be encouraged to update development plan policies for their areas based on the proposed Planning Bulletin, continue to consult widely with all affected stakeholders, consult with the live music industry in the PAR process, and consult with the Australian Hotels Association, and other relevant industry associations, enabling them to assist their members to understand, monitor and participate in the PAR process.

4. The Building Code of Australia (BCA 96) should be amended to incorporate material on noise attenuation (based on the EPA Guidelines/Technical Bulletin) for new residential buildings constructed in the vicinity of an existing or possible future licensed entertainment venue or a mixed use precinct and for new licensed entertainment venues being constructed in the vicinity of existing or possible future residences or in a mixed use precinct.

5. Liquor Licensing.

(a) More voluntary liquor-licensing accords should be developed for mixed-use precincts.

(b) Amend the Objects of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997.

(c) Section 106 of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 should be amended.

(d) Further integration of the Development Act and the Liquor Licensing Act should occur through the consideration of the development plan process for a locality as part of the suggested noise complaint process, and integration of the Environment Protection Act with the Liquor Licensing Act should occur through consideration of EPA guidelines an part of that process.

6. The Land and Business (Sales and Conveyancing) Regulations 1994 and the Residential Tenancies Act Regulations 1995 be amended so that purchasers of land or future tenants of houses be notified of the existence of a licensed entertainment venue in their vicinity. This information is to be provided by the Department of Environment and Heritage as an extension of the existing process for provision of Form 1 Statements under section 7 of the Land and Business (Sales and Conveyancing) Act 1994.

7. The AHA, Police and the Liquor and Gaming Commissioner develop protocols and procedures regarding patron behaviour. Furthermore, the scope of section 20 of the Summary Offences Act 1953 should be expanded to create a new offence relating to circumstances where any person who without reasonable cause disturbs another in or adjacent to any licensed premises where entertainment is held.

8. That a Live Music Fund be established, hypothecated from gaming machine revenue, to assist venues to undertake structural or building improvements, to assist developers of residential developments in mixed use with noise attenuation measures, and enhance the development of the live music industry.

Regarding Recommendations 1—4

I am advised that the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) is continuing work to prepare guidelines to assist planning authorities and enforcement agencies in establishing reasonable and practicable noise reduction measures for new development near existing live music venues.

Regarding Recommendation 5

Amendments to the Liquor Licensing Act 1997, passed during July 2002, make significant changes to the provisions of the Act as it relates to complaints about noise and disturbance associated with licensed premises.

The changes mean that courts will no longer consider complaints against pubs and other licensed venues providing live music simply on the basis of noise.

The courts will have to consider the interests of the live music industry when making decisions.

Some venues have a long history of live music. Under these amendments, a live music history will have to be taken into account by the courts and the Licensing Commissioner.

Other factors to be considered by the licensing authority when determining a complaint include:

- the period of time over which the activity complained of has been occurring,
- the unreasonableness or otherwise of the activity,
- the trading hours and character of the business conducted at the licensed premises,
- the desired future character of the area as provided in any relevant Development Plan, and
- relevant environmental policies or guidelines.

Regarding Recommendation 6

The office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner has ensured the accuracy of the database of all licensed premises in South Australia with entertainment consent. This database is available to be accessed by the Department of Environment and Heritage.

Regarding Recommendation 7

The office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner has well-established task force protocols with most local councils and SAPOL. It would not be appropriate to involve either the AHA or Clubs SA in complaints made by the general public against a member licensee.

Regarding Recommendation 8

On 24 October 2002, The Hon. K.O. Foley announced that $500,000 would be applied towards programs that will be of benefit to the live music industry.

(2) I have requested Arts SA to monitor progress of the Live Music Working Group recommendations. Arts SA will provide regular briefings regarding the development of recommendations contained within the Live Music Working Group report.

PRISON ESCAPES

In reply to **Hon. R.D. LAWSON** (14 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I advise the following:

1. I was informed of the escapes by a message left for me on the evening of Thursday 7 November 2002. At this time I was near Umuwa in the far North West of South Australia.

2. Both prisoners walked out of the low security Cadell Training Centre during the night of Thursday 7 November. Their absence was noticed following institutional counts that are routinely undertaken during the night. Police were immediately advised and carried out appropriate searches. One prisoner, Ronald Walton, was apprehended the next day in Adelaide. The other, Shane Adams was returned to custody on 10 January 2003.

3. Five prisoners escaped during the calendar year. Four were returned to custody during the year, and the fifth was returned to custody on 10 January 2003.

ROXBY DOWNS, FIRE

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (28 August).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has provided the following information:

1. The fire mainly involved copper solvent extraction areas of the plant. Small amounts of uranium in the uranium solvent extraction area were also involved.

2. Very small quantities of uranium were detected in air monitoring conducted during the fire in the plume of smoke, which travelled in a SW direction. Levels were below the government reporting level.

The Minister for Industrial Relations has provided the following information:

3. I am advised that the Department for Administrative and Information Services, Workplace Services, has received a report from both the SA Metropolitan Fire Service (SAMFS) and Western Mining Corporation. The Occupational Health and Safety Inspectorate, Workplace Services, has completed its report into the fire.

4. Country Fire Service (CFS) units from Roxby Downs, Andamooka and Woomera, and the SAMFS from Port Augusta assisted during the fire and clean-up process.

5. Western Mining Corporation has provided the government with a report that concluded that the most likely cause of the fire was static discharge in high density polyethylene piping.

PORT STANVAC

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (29 August).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Government Enterprises has provided the following information:

The honourable member has asked a number of questions relating to the proposal by Mobil, the Australian Wheat Board and the Australian Barley Board to construct a deep-sea grain port at Port Stanvac.

The questions, which relate to a number of operational and environmental issues that would need to be satisfactorily addressed if the Port Stanvac proposal was to be pursued, were prompted by a front page article in the Advertiser of 19 August 2002.

Questions were also asked about the Port Stanvac proposal in the House of Assembly.

The short answer to the questions asked by the Honourable member is that the government does not and will not support the Port Stanvac grain port proposal.

Indeed, the Premier announced on Friday, 27 September 2002 that the government had completed a review of the deep-sea grain port options for Adelaide and had decided that the deep-sea grain port should be located at Outer Harbor.

That decision was made after consultation with the grain industry and port operator and, in particular, took into account the strong recommendation of the South Australian Farmers Federation's Grain Council that the port should be at Outer Harbor.

I should point out that the final choice of the site for the grain berth, at a site adjacent to the container terminal rather than at the former government's preferred site in front of the power station at Pelican Point, is expected to save the taxpayer over $15 million.

The new site will substantially reduce the dredging requirements.

I understand that the new site is also superior from a ship handling perspective.

In view of the Premier's recent announcement it is not necessary nor do I intend to answer the questions of detail raised by the honourable member.

I would like to take this opportunity though to briefly talk about Outer Harbor and why Outer Harbor is preferred to the Port Stanvac alternative.

It is important to note and I do stress that the government is not and has never been a proponent of the Port Stanvac option.

The Port Stanvac proposal was suggested independent of government by the grain marketing boards in conjunction with Mobil.

Whilst government has not undertaken a detailed investigation of the Port Stanvac proposal, it is clear that the proposal raises a number of operational and environmental issues that are of concern.

The questions by the Honourable member bring attention to some of these issues, such as integrating oil refinery and grain operations, safety, the ability of the port to deal with the large grain vessels given that it is an open port exposed to the weather elements.

To fully address these issues would involve the commissioning of lengthy studies and the proponents of Port Stanvac have simply not undertaken these studies.

When you start factoring in to the Port Stanvac project the costs of standardising the rail track, the potential cost of dealing with traffic management issues resulting from the grain trains, and of course the potential cost of dealing with noise and other environmental impacts, it becomes obvious that Port Stanvac is not the best option available for a deep-sea grain port.

The cost of the Port Stanvac to industry and the State taxpayer would be very large.

On the other hand, Outer Harbor does not present the same operational issues, as it is a protected port that offers calm water.

The existing contractual arrangements with the port operator, Flinders Ports, will allow the channel to be deepened to handle the larger panamax class grain vessels.

The contractual arrangements also allow for the construction of a new grain wharf and a deep berth pocket.

All of this would be provided at no cost to the grain industry.

With the construction by industry of a new grain terminal, the construction of rail and road bridges over the Port River as part of the Third River Crossing project, and other improved rail and road infrastructure in the area, the stage is set for a world-class deep-sea grain port at Outer Harbor.

Along with Port Giles and Port Lincoln, South Australia will boast three of the best grain ports in Australia and the big winners will be the State's grain farmers and the State's economy.

But the government's vision for Outer Harbor goes beyond grain and we will continue to work with Flinders Ports and other stakeholders to ensure that Outer Harbor is developed into a world-class export port for a whole range of commodities.

The government is also conscious of the need for this development to be sympathetic to the community living on the Le Fevre peninsula and we intend to deal with these issues during a consultative process.

As the Premier has said, a deep-sea grain port for Adelaide has been on the public agenda for some twenty years.

This government has taken a short period of time to review the locations options and saved the taxpayer millions of dollars in the process.

We have listened to the State's peak grain body and have shown clear leadership in strongly supporting Outer Harbor.

We continue to encourage the grain industry to work together to ensure that the potential offered by Outer Harbor is fully realised for the benefit of the State's grain growers.

RAIL, SOUTHERN LINK

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (29 August).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Government Enterprises has provided the following information:

The honourable member has asked a number of questions relating to the proposal by Mobil, the Australian Wheat Board and the Australian Barley Board to construct a deep-sea grain port at Port Stanvac.

The questions, which relate to a number of operational and environmental issues that would need to be satisfactorily addressed if the Port Stanvac proposal was to be pursued, were prompted by a front page article in the *Advertiser* of 19 August 2002.

Questions were also asked about the Port Stanvac proposal in the House of Assembly.

The short answer to the questions asked by the honourable members is that the government does not and will not support the Port Stanvac grain port proposal.

Indeed, the Premier announced on Friday, 27 September 2002 that the government had completed a review of the deep-sea grain port options for Adelaide and had decided that the deep-sea grain port should be located at Outer Harbor.

That decision was made after consultation with the grain industry and port operator and, in particular, took into account the strong recommendation of the South Australian Farmers Federation's Grain Council that the port should be at Outer Harbor.

I should point out that the final choice of the site for the grain berth, at a site adjacent to the container terminal rather than at the former government's preferred site in front of the power station at Pelican Point, is expected to save the taxpayer over $15 million.

The new site will substantially reduce the dredging requirements.

I understand that the new site is also superior from a ship handling perspective.

In view of the Premier's recent announcement it is not necessary nor do I intend to answer the questions of detail raised by the honourable member.

I would like to take this opportunity though to briefly talk about Outer Harbor and why Outer Harbor is preferred to the Port Stanvac alternative.

It is important to note and I do stress that the government is not and has never been a proponent of the Port Stanvac option.

The Port Stanvac proposal was suggested independent of government by the grain marketing boards in conjunction with Mobil.

Whilst government has not undertaken a detailed investigation of the Port Stanvac proposal, it is clear that the proposal raises a number of operational and environmental issues that are of concern.

The questions by the honourable members bring attention to some of these issues, such as integrating oil refinery and grain operations, safety, the ability of the port to deal with the large grain vessels given that it is an open port exposed to the weather elements, and the social and environmental impacts of freight trains on the south-west rail corridor.

To fully address these issues would involve the commissioning of lengthy studies and the proponents of Port Stanvac have simply not undertaken these studies.

Some of these issues include integrating oil refinery and grain operations, safety, the ability of the port to deal with the large grain vessels given that it is an open port exposed to the weather elements, and the social and environmental impacts of freight trains on the south-west corridor.

To fully address these issues would involve the commissioning of lengthy studies and the proponents of Port Stanvac have simply not undertaken these studies.

When you start factoring in to the Port Stanvac project the costs of standardising the rail track, the potential cost of dealing with traffic management issues resulting from the grain trains, and of course the potential cost of dealing with noise and other environmental impacts, it becomes obvious that Port Stanvac is not the best option available for a deep-sea grain port.

The cost of the Port Stanvac to industry and the State taxpayer would be very large.

On the other hand, Outer Harbor does not present the same operational issues, as it is a protected port that offers calm water.

The existing contractual arrangements with the port operator, Flinders Ports, will allow the channel to be deepened to handle the larger panamax class grain vessels.

The contractual arrangements also allow for the construction of a new grain wharf and a deep berth pocket.

All of this would be provided at no cost to the grain industry.

With the construction by industry of a new grain terminal, the construction of rail and road bridges over the Port River as part of the Third River Crossing project, and other improved rail and road infrastructure in the area, the stage is set for a world-class deep-sea grain port at Outer Harbor.

Along with Port Giles and Port Lincoln, South Australia will boast three of the best grain ports in Australia and the big winners will be the State's grain farmers and the State's economy.

But the government's vision for Outer Harbor goes beyond grain and we will continue to work with Flinders Ports and other stakeholders to ensure that Outer Harbor is developed into a world-class export port for a whole range of commodities.

The government is also conscious of the need for this development to be sympathetic to the community living on the Le Fevre peninsula and we intend to deal with these issues during a consultative process.

As the Premier has said, a deep-sea grain port for Adelaide has been on the public agenda for some twenty years.

This government has taken a short period of time to review the locations options and saved the taxpayer millions of dollars in the process.

We have listened to the State's peak grain body and have shown clear leadership in strongly supporting Outer Harbor.

We continue to encourage the grain industry to work together to ensure that the potential offered by Outer Harbor is fully realised for the benefit of the State's grain growers.

SOCIAL INCLUSION UNIT

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD** (14 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Premier has provided the following information:

1. In relation to the Social Inclusion Initiative, three Interministerial Committees through the Social Development Cabinet Committee, have been established to oversee and lead the implementation of the government's Social Inclusion Initiatives.

2. Three Ministers have agreed to lead the Social Inclusion Initiative Interministerial Committee through the Social Development Cabinet Committee. The role the Ministers are taking for this very important work has been described as one of 'championing' the achievement of the social inclusive objectives of government. The Hon Lea Stevens is leading the Interministerial Committee dealing with the government's response to the Drug Summit recommendations. The Hon Stephanie Key is leading the committee dealing with the homelessness reference and the Hon Trish White leads the School Retention reference Committee.

3. The Interministerial Committees chaired by these three Ministers will approve plans of action across operational areas to implement the Social Inclusion Initiatives and agree on models for the provision of funds and the distribution of benefits among operational agencies.

Chairing committees is part of the usual role of a Minister in providing leadership in matters relating to their portfolios.

4. Cabinet has discussed the establishment of these Interministerial Committees for the purpose of implementation of the Government's Social Inclusion Initiative objectives and endorses their work and those who have agreed to chair them.

GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOOD

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (16 October).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The honourable member was correct in the assertion that the government's pre-election statement on genetically engineered food also proposed the making of an annual report to parliament on the current status and safety of genetic engineering, and asked what action has been taken in that regard.

In response I refer the honourable member to my earlier remarks that day in relation to the establishment of a Parliamentary Select Committee of Inquiry into Gene Technology. What more thorough and appropriate mechanism could be put into place to advise Parliament on these issues, including a thorough examination of how the '…South Australian community can be consulted and informed, and their views consolidated…'. I see this Parliamentary Inquiry as completely fulfilling the pre-election intentions the Member refers to for the initial and comprehensive report to Parliament on the matter.

GREEN ENERGY PAYMENTS

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (previously Hon. M.J. Elliott) (17 October).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister Energy has provided the following information:

The government is already aware of the issues regarding the operation of the Commonwealth government's Mandated Renewable Energy Target (MRET) as highlighted in the Australian EcoGeneration Association report. I am advised that the Commonwealth government will be reviewing the Renewable Energy (Electricity) Act 2000 next year. The government will be considering its position regarding the issues associated with the MRET scheme over the next few months.

However, let me assure you that the government supports the greater use of sustainable energy technologies where they are economically feasible and practicable, as they will provide an important contribution to reducing the State's greenhouse gas emissions.

As you are aware, the government agreed with AGL in June 2002 to purchase 32,000 MWhs per annum of energy, or approximately 6.4 per cent of the government's total electricity consumption, from renewable sources. This renewable energy will be sourced from the Starfish Hill wind farm being constructed at Cape Jervis, which is expected to produce a total of 64,000 MWhs per annum of renewable energy. The government's commitment to renewable energy will reduce the government's greenhouse gas emissions by 35,507 tonnes per annum and provide a stimulus to the renewable energy industry in South Australia.

SHARKS

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (17 October).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: In June 2002, I requested a review of the Shark Response Plan implemented in December 2001, by the previous Liberal government and the current exemptions under the Fisheries Act 1982, which permit the berleying of the White Shark for tourist viewing purposes.

This review was necessary in recognition of the community concerns for greater public safety and a call that pre-emptive action be taken where a large shark is 'patrolling' a beach or area where interaction with human activity is high.

PIRSA Fisheries conducted a public meeting with fishing industry stakeholders in Streaky Bay in July 2002 to provide an update on the CSIRO National White Shark Research Program and provide an opportunity for discussion on the Shark Response Plan. PIRSA Fisheries also held a number of discussions with the two berley exemption holders and National Parks and Wildlife officers concerning the shark berley operations and exemption conditions.

I have now received the outcomes of the review which included a number of recommendations, mainly relating to the cage viewing charters for white shark.

As white sharks are a protected species, it is important that any action to destroy a white shark is only undertaken by authorised officers.

The Shark Response Plan is aimed at coordinating response activities by government, Local government and non-government agencies (eg Surf Life Saving SA) when large sharks are sighted inshore and present an immediate threat to human life, or when an attack occurs.

The review of the Shark Response Plan maintains the view that no white shark should be destroyed unless it presents a high risk and an immediate threat to human life. However, there has been some debate on whether a shark that has conducted an attack should be trapped and destroyed, if it is possible to identify the shark and remove it using fishing nets and a firearm.

The Shark Response Plan of December 2001 detailed appropriate response and procedures following a fatal shark attack, including the destruction of the offending shark by an authorised officer, if the shark can be identified and if it remains in the immediate area of the attack.

The revised Plan includes appropriate procedures for responding to any shark sightings, including the pre-emptive destruction of a shark that presents an immediate threat to human life by persisting close to shore, if considered necessary by an authorised officer.

With respect to the cage viewing activity, the review supported the continuation of exemptions to allow this to occur under very strict conditions. There have been some additional conditions recommended as well as changes to the administration of the exemptions and the areas in which this activity can occur. This includes a prohibition of berleying for white sharks around the islands of the Sir Joseph Banks Group.

FOOD SA

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (17 October).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Industry, Investment and Trade has provided the following information:

1. All the companies on the Centre for Innovation, Business and Manufacturing database, the Regional Development Boards, Flavor SA, Food SA, Food Adelaide, the Innovation Working Group of the Premier's Council, the Industry Development Managers at the Centre for Innovation, Business and Manufacturing, Regional Business Services managers, relevant department staff and representatives of the National Food Industry Strategy Ltd were advised.

2. The companies were requested to complete an Expression of Interest form developed for the grant. Representatives of the Food Team at the Centre for Innovation, Business and Manufacturing reviewed the submissions to evaluate if the project was suitable for the grant. Assistance, in the form of 10 hours of free mentoring, was offered for preparation of the first phase of the grant application if suitable projects were identified.

Clients were also advised that further assistance would be considered if the project was successful in the first phase.

3. Under the State Food Plan there is an officer appointed to help companies in identifying suitable grants for their projects. This officer also provides companies with information about the various grants as they become available.

Additional support was provided for the Food Innovation Grant in the way of a subsidy for consultants for preparation of the grant applications as these grants are targeted to the Food Industry and therefore there would be greater opportunities for the industry.

In collaboration with the policy section of the Office of Economic Development, the officer also lobbied on behalf of South Australian companies for reducing the eligibility threshold for application. Initially, the minimum project value was required to be $100,000 but it has now been reduced to $50,000 wherein the company contribution has to be a minimum of $25,000, a figure more achievable by the small and medium size enterprises in South Australia.

4. All the Regional Development Boards were contacted and provided information about the grant.

Relevant officers of the Regional Business Services group at the Centre for Innovation, Business and Manufacturing were also briefed on the grant.

Regional companies who would qualify and who were likely to have suitable projects, were contacted personally and informed about the grant.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

In reply to **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (18 November and 19 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Industry and Investment has provided the following information:

The government has recently announced its restructure of the Office of Economic Development. A copy of the announcement is attached.

All senior positions within the Office of Economic Development and the Department of Business, Manufacturing and Trade will be filled as soon as possible.

PROHIBITIVE EMPLOYMENT REGISTER

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (21 October).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

1. SAPOL produces National Police Clearance Certificates for individuals wishing to provide a prospective employer with proof of good character. SAPOL also provides information directly to employers, however, the result of such checks is only disclosed with the full written consent of the individual.

Release of information is governed by legislation and privacy principles.

SAPOL does not maintain a register or system for pre-employment checks or a 'Prohibitive Employment Register'.

2. As SAPOL's current service meets the needs of employers, and addresses the privacy concerns of potential employees the development of a register has not been investigated.

POLICE, MOTORCYCLE NUMBERPLATES

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (22 October).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

This issue is the subject of a complaint to the Police Complaints Authority. Under the Police Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings Act all complaints are to be dealt with in a confidential manner. This matter has not yet been finalised however, it is believed that the Authority has sent a copy of his determination to the complainant.

The determination of the Authority is being reviewed by the Commissioner of Police and will be progressed in accordance with the legislative processes pursuant to the Police Complaints and Disciplinary Proceedings Act.

NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (5 December).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has advised:

1. A total of 19 information sessions were held across the state. The primary purpose of these sessions was to allow those interested in the government's natural resource management initiative to clarify any issues they may have with the content of the discussion paper: New Directions for Natural Resource Management in South Australia which was released on 4 November 2002.

There were two types of sessions held:

There were 11 public sessions, advertised through state and local press and through direct mailing to all groups with an interest in natural resource management. In addition there were also 7 sessions for staff of agencies and groups that might be affected by the proposed changes. Staff were also welcome to attend public sessions.

The public sessions were held at:

- Karoonda (for the Murray region) on 14 November at 2:30 p.m.
- Naracoorte (for the South East region) on 15 November at 10:00 a.m.
- Hahndorf (for the Mt Lofty Ranges/Metro/Fleurieu region) on 18 November at 9:30 a.m.
- Clare (for the Northern and Yorke Agricultural region) on November 19 at 9:30 a.m.
- Wudinna (for the Eyre Peninsula region) on 19 November at 10:00 a.m.

- Marion (for the Mt Lofty Ranges/Metro/Fleurieu region) on November 20 at 9:30 a.m.
- Pt Augusta (for the Rangelands region) on November 20 at 10:00 a.m.
- Kingscote (for Kangaroo Island) on 21 November at 9:30 a.m.
- Adelaide (for the Aboriginal Lands) on 26 November at 9:30 a.m.

In addition to those nine mentioned, and in response to requests from the community, two additional evening sessions were held in the metropolitan area.

- Para Hills West on 9 December at 7:00 p.m.
- Seaford Rise on 9 December at 7:00 p.m.

2. As previously indicated the primary purpose of the information sessions was to provide an opportunity for people to seek clarification on any issues to do with the content of the discussion paper: New Directions for Natural Resource Management in South Australia, prior to making a submission in response to the paper.

3. The Natural Resource Management Taskforce was responsible for the organisation of meetings and all associated tasks in relation to the natural resource management reform process. In organising the round of information sessions, the Taskforce worked with key members of the community in each region who had strong links to natural resource management.

PLANNING REGULATIONS

In reply to **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY** (18 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Urban Development and Planning has advised that:

1. I confirm that recent amendments to the Development Regulations 1993 have included excavation or filling of a volume of material in excess of 50 cubic metres in total as constituting development for the purposes of the Development Act 1993 within the Coorong, Kingston, Naracoorte Lucindale and Tatiara council areas. There are some specified activities for which the regulations do not apply such as ploughing of land and to do with underground services.

Under the new provisions authority to administer and assess development applications for excavation and filling lies with the councils. A council is obliged to refer such applications to the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board and the Board may direct the council to refuse certain applications or to impose conditions of approval. No licence application is involved with respect to the Development Regulations 1993. The South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board is unlikely to be interested in applications for housing blocks, swimming pools and clay pits and these will be promptly returned to the council without comment for the council to determine as it sees fit.

The purpose of the new regulations is to bring under control unauthorised private drain digging activities that have been occurring in the Upper South East. The need for such a measure arose when the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board took legal advice to the effect that it is not able to rely upon provisions under its own Act that were specifically drafted to regulate private drainage works. The government has introduced the new regulations as a temporary measure pending a more considered assessment of all aspects of drainage in the Upper South East, including issues affecting the government's Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Program. The regulations will expire on 1 October 2004.

To avoid the need for the unnecessary referral of development applications, the Minister for Urban Development and Planning will give consideration to the need to amend schedule 2 in order to raise the threshold for excavation and filling applications from 50 cubic metres to 500 cubic metres. Should the government's Bill to amend the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Act be passed, then these regulations will no longer be required and consideration will be given to revoking them.

Supplementary question (Hon, Caroline Schaefer).

2. It is not a coincidence that the council areas referred to in the regulations correspond with areas that have been included under the Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Bill 2002. Following a tour of the Upper South East in early September 2002, the Minister for Environment and Conservation requested that the Bill be drafted. The Bill addresses a range of issues affecting drainage and conservation activities in the Upper South East and it is intended that upon the successful passage of the Bill through the Parliament the regulations under the Development Act will become redundant and will be revoked.

Supplementary question (Hon. J.F. Stefani)

3. Schedule 2 of the Development Regulations 1993 specifies that the excavation or filling of a volume of material in excess of 9 cubic metres is development in the Hills Face Zone, some zones in the City of Mitcham outside the Hills Face Zone and within 3 nautical kilometres seaward of the coast and on coastal land. Such activity requires a development approval in these areas. In relation to the coastal land, there is a referral to the Coast Protection Board.

The schedule 8 referral to the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board only applies to the Coorong, Kingston, Naracoorte Lucindale and Tatiara Council areas.

AUTISM

In reply to **Hon T.G. CAMERON** (5 December).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Social Justice has advised:

1. Funding to the Autism Association of South Australia from the Department of Human Services (DHS) under the Commonwealth State Territory Disability Agreement (CSTDA) has not been cut over the last two financial years. Funding from DHS to the Autism Association has actually increased over the last two financial years as indicated below:

Financial Year	Funding
2000-01	$417,142
2001-02	$451,342
2002-03	$464,342

Once off funding of $100,000 was also provided during 2000-01 to assist the Autism Association clear a backlog in the waiting list for assessments, and to implement changes to the assessment process in order to permanently reduce waiting times.

A component of the recurrent funding increase for 2001-02 was to increase the ongoing funds available for assessment services from $50,000 per annum to $75,000 per annum.

I am advised that the Education Minister's Advisory Committee 'Students with Disabilities' also provide funding to the Autism Association of South Australia. Funding is allocated on calender years:

Calender Year	Funding
2001	$760,387
2002	$756,934
2003	$890,461

In addition, the Autism Association received $29,000 in 2001 and $44,861 in 2003 for capital works. The Autism Association did not apply for funds for capital projects in 2002.

2. The value of early intervention for children with developmental challenges is acknowledged. This is particularly true for Autism Spectrum Disorders.

As there have been no recent cuts it is not considered necessary to have the Department investigate further.

EDUCATION, FURTHER

In reply to **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (3 December).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education has provided the following information:

Question 1

As part of this government's budget strategy for 2000-03, efficiency targets were set for portfolios. The target set for TAFE Institutes was not linked to savings generated from voluntary separation packages in previous years.

Question 2

The additional funds made available to the broader portfolio, were in two parts:

(a) $6.8 million recurrent from ANTA, of which $4.7 million was allocated to TAFE.

(b) $12.1 million in the form of 'one off' cash from Treasury, of which more than 50 per cent was paid to TAFE for delivery of User Choice.

TAFE received an appropriate share of the additional recurrent funds from ANTA and cash from Treasury to meet demand for User Choice. There is therefore no overlap between these funds and TAFE deficits.

HOME SAFETY AUDIT

In reply to **Hon. IAN GILFILLAN** (18 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Health has provided the following information:

1. The minister is aware of this free older persons home safety inspection program managed by Archicentre for the Department of Human Services in Victoria.

2. Any program that raises awareness of hazards in the homes of older people and provides or assists in implementing preventive actions is of benefit to older Australians.

In South Australia the Department of Human Services provides a free home assessment program to address the priority issue of falls prevention in older people. Since 1991, it is estimated that over 20,000 free home assessments have been conducted for older people in South Australia. The current program called 'Taking Steps', is an early intervention, falls prevention program delivered from the Metropolitan Domiciliary Care services. In addition to metropolitan Adelaide, it is being piloted in two country regions.

The Taking Steps program is a further development of the environmental audit approach of the Victorian program, using a public health approach to the prevention of falls injuries in older people. The Taking Steps program is based on evidence that a comprehensive approach to falls prevention is required to maximise effectiveness. This program therefore provides both an assessment of the home environment as well as a thorough assessment of personal risk factors that are known to contribute to falls for older people. The risk factors assessed include: strength, balance, gait, vision, footwear and foot problems, medication, sensory loss and previous history of falling. An action plan is developed to address the identified hazards & risk factors through strategies including, home modifications, mobility aid, provision of equipment, review by General Practitioner, referral to community therapy or the provision of home therapy and education and advice as appropriate to meet the individual's need. A $30 subsidy is available to assist in making recommended changes.

The Taking Steps program is currently providing a comprehensive program to prevent injury for older people in their homes.

MAGISTRATES

In reply to **Hon. R.D. LAWSON** (2 December).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Attorney-General has provided the following information:

1. Yes

2. On 12 December, 2002, William John Ackland was appointed to the pool of auxiliary Magistrates.

On 1 January, 2003, Jacynth Elizabeth Sanders was appointed to the pool of auxiliary Magistrates.

On 23 January, 2003, John Antoine Kiosoglous was appointed to the pool of auxiliary Magistrates.

On 23 January, 2003, Cathy Helen Deland and Clive William Kitchin were appointed as Stipendiary Magistrates

DISCRIMINATION LAWS

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD** (18 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Social Justice has advised:

1. Does the Minister agree that there has been some overlap and duplication in so far as a review of discrimination laws is concerned when one has regard to the extensive statements in the Stevens report?

The Minister for Social Justice does not consider that there has been any duplication or unnecessary overlap between a review of equal opportunity and anti-discrimination laws and the Review of South Australia's Industrial Relations System (the Stevens Review).

South Australia's equal opportunity legislation addresses unjustified discrimination in many areas of public life, including, but not limited to, the workplace. South Australia's industrial relations laws also deal with some discrimination in the workplace.

Discrimination provisions in each statute should be reviewed to improve consistency between the jurisdictions, and to ensure clarity for employers and protection for employees. In modernising South Australia's equal opportunity and anti-discrimination laws, the review announced by the Attorney-General and the Minister for Social Justice on 11 November 2002 will consider the outcomes of the Stevens Review.

2. Who is to chair this review?

The review of equal opportunity and anti-discrimination laws will be framed and led by a coordinating group that will report to the Attorney-General and the Minister for Social Justice. The group consists of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity, Ms Linda Matthews, Ms Liana Buchanan, Project Officer Office of the Status of Women, Ms Katherine O'Neil, Senior Legal Officer Attorney-General's Department, Ms Sarah Macdonald, Ministerial Adviser to the Minister for Social Justice and Mr Peter Louca, Ministerial Adviser to the Attorney-General.

3. What is the difference between a draft framework paper and the framework paper for consideration by the two ministers, and why will it take some eight months to prepare a draft framework paper for public comment?

The coordinating group will prepare a framework paper in draft form before the framework paper is released for public comment.

As stated by the Attorney-General and the Minister for Social Justice on 11 November 2002, it is possible that the framework paper will be released for public comment before mid 2003. This time frame was determined to ensure that the working group has adequate opportunity to obtain input from key stakeholders in preparing the framework paper.

4. Will the same sex legislation in so far as superannuation is concerned currently before this place be deferred until members in this place have had the opportunity to consider the result of the review announced last week by the Minister for Social Justice and the Attorney-General?

The Statutes Amendment (Equal Superannuation Rights for Same Sex Couples) Bill is a private members bill that has been considered and accepted in another place. The question as to whether that bill will be deferred is a matter for the Member for Florey.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON:** (28 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. TravelSmart SA was formally launched during June 2001. It is a central component of Transport SA's integrated travel demand management approach to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, limiting the growth of traffic congestion and encouraging healthier lifestyles and communities in South Australia. It encourages the use of more environmentally sustainable transport. Other benefits include ongoing improvement of walking, cycling and public transport facilities and influencing urban development to reduce the need for car trips.

TravelSmart SA involves Transport SA working with other government agencies, the Australian Greenhouse Office, local councils and community groups to facilitate travel behaviour change. The program consists of a highly regarded schools curriculum package, and a range of approaches for encouraging environmentally sustainable travel in households, in workplaces and to major events.

In reply to the supplementary question asked by the Hon Diana Laidlaw.

1. Local government seed funding grants have been an integral component of the TravelSmart SA program. The grants engender council commitment to the program and provide a critical gateway to local communities. To date, the grants have enabled Mitcham, Marion and Onkaparinga councils to promote TravelSmart SA principles and initiatives within council and the local community. So far, the program has been delivered to 1600 households, 13 schools and four workplaces, achieving an average 10 per cent reduction in car kilometres travelled.

During 2002, Transport SA developed a draft 5-Year Plan to guide ongoing development, delivery and evaluation of the program. The plan outlines the delivery areas, investment models and program evaluation.

Metropolitan councils were invited to submit expressions of interest to participate in the TravelSmart SA council Grants Program during November 2002. Grants in the order of up to $60,000 per annum will be available for up to five councils to deliver travel behaviour change initiatives within council and the local community.

The 2002-2003 financial investment in the TravelSmart SA program is $1.179 million.

WOMEN AND ALCOHOL

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (19 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: *The Minister for Health has provided the following information:*

1. Section 42 of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 specifically addresses the issue of responsible service of alcohol at events such as happy hours. This section states that every licensee must comply

with a prescribed code of practice to minimise the harmful and hazardous use of liquor and promote responsible attitudes in relation to the promotion, sale, supply and consumption of liquor. Compliance with this code of practice is a mandatory condition for the obtaining and maintaining of any licence issued under the Act.

This code of practice specifies that '…the business of a liquor licensee must not be promoted, advertised or operated in a way that tends to encourage the rapid or excessive consumption of alcohol by customers.' It further requires that 'particular care must be taken to ensure compliance with this clause if a promotion involves the supply of liquor free of charge, or at a discounted price, at the licensed premises.' The code then provides a list of examples of practices that may assist licensees in adhering to these requirements. For example, it is suggested that during a promotion that involves the supply of liquor free of charge or at a discounted price, licensees should limit the amount of liquor provided to each customer, and supply low-alcohol and non-alcoholic beverages on a similar basis.

The Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner examines liquor promotions within licensed premises and acts on specific promotions judged as breaching the code of practice. In the first instance a licensee will be requested to modify or cease such a promotion. If unwilling to comply with this direction, disciplinary action may be taken through the Licensing Court, which could result in a reprimand, fine, suspension or revocation of a licence.

2. High risk drinking is defined in terms of both short-term and long-term harm within the National Health and Medical Research council's Australian Alcohol Guidelines. Risk of short-term harm is high if males drink 11 or more standard drinks on any one day and women drink 7 or more standard drinks on any one day. Risk of long-term harm is high if males drink 43 or more standard drinks per week and women drink 29 or more standard drinks per week.

The South Australian government has been working with the Commonwealth government over the past months in the development of a population-based health promotion strategy to assist in the dissemination of these guidelines to specific groups and individuals within the community. The Commonwealth government is now in the process of producing a range of resources that will assist with increasing awareness about low-risk drinking levels, standard drinks and the harm associated with short and long-term high-risk drinking. I have been advised that these resources will be made available for licensees, health practitioners and individuals within the next couple of months.

In addition to this national initiative, the South Australian government has been active in developing and supporting state-based initiatives that assist in reducing alcohol-related harm. There has been a range of projects developed, including:

- The Alcohol. Go Easy campaign, which addresses alcohol service and consumption within specific sports, arts and recreational settings.
- The development of youth-focused programs in conjunction with Schoolies Week organisers and the community broadcaster, Fresh FM.

All of these initiatives have been developed in partnership with other government portfolios to ensure we have comprehensive health promotion activities in place that address alcohol-related harm.

REGIONAL COMMUNITIES CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (14 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I advise:

In July 2002 the Minister for Regional Affairs wrote to members of the former Regional Development Council advising of new governance arrangements for regional development.

Included in the letter was:

- advice that a new mechanism for consultation with regional communities was under consideration.
- a request to members of the former Regional Development Council to give advice to the Minister about how this might be best achieved to ensure that the new body was best equipped to give feedback and support the Minister.
- advice that the Minister hoped to be able to make an announcement about a new body to replace the Regional Development Council in the near future.
- a statement recognising the past achievements of members of the Regional Development Council and thanking members for their time and commitment to the development of regions.

B-DOUBLE ROUTES

In reply to **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY** (19 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. Transport SA currently issues a number of B-Double permits for the road between Sedan and Murray Bridge. Therefore, it is possible for a B-Double to travel from the Sturt Highway to Sedan on the gazetted route and then continue south to Murray Bridge under permit.

Deficiencies were identified along the route between Sedan and Murray Bridge as part of the Adelaide Heavy Vehicle Bypass study, including several low-lying floodways, narrow lane widths, limited safe overtaking opportunities and no designated driver rest bays. When these deficiencies have been addressed, Transport SA will reconsider gazettal of this route for B-Double access.

2. Transport SA recently produced the Route Access Assessment for Restricted Vehicle Access manual, which establishes the current standard for Restricted Access Vehicle (RAV) routes. This document has a focus on the identification, assessment and management of risks associated with the use of RAVs and will promote safe use of these vehicles. The assessment of potential RAV routes is now a fundamental requirement of Transport SA's network planning process.

In consultation with regional councils, Transport SA also is promoting the 'farm gate to wharf' approach by developing B-Double networks on suitable local government roads.

SOUTHERN EXPRESSWAY

In reply to **Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (26 August).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. The Southern Expressway, being a very large project, was broken down into a number of separable parts. The responsibility for operation and maintenance is handed over to Transport SA as each part reaches practical completion. Final handover occurs when a final certificate (which shows the contractor has discharged his contractural obligations) is issued to the contractor. This occurs after the defect liability period and after the correction of all defects and omissions. Final handover of the last separable part is expected in March 2003.

2. Transport SA has advised that 90 minutes is the advertised time allowed to clear and turn the Southern Expressway around for both Stage 1 and 2. 60 minutes was allowed to turn Stage 1 of the Expressway around, and Stage 1 is approximately one third the length of the complete Expressway. During the turn around period, the Expressway is progressively closed, cleared of all traffic including broken down or abandoned vehicles, and progressively opened in the other direction.

The clearance of vehicles from the Expressway is critical for safety reasons and this process takes time, particularly when there are vehicles broken down or abandoned.

Due to the progressive nature of the closing and opening of the Expressway, the entire Expressway is not closed for 90 minutes. Rather, 90 minutes is the total period during which the four sections of the Expressway are sequentially turned around. For instance on a weekday, after first closing the Expressway at Old Noarlunga it is checked through to Beach Road. The Expressway is then closed at Beach Road and checked through to Sherriffs Road. The Expressway is subsequently closed at Sherriffs Road and opened in the opposite direction at Beach Road for people travelling south. If there are no delays in this process due to broken down or abandoned vehicles the Expressway section between Old Noarlunga and Beach Road is closed for approximately half an hour. Transport SA has advised that you observed the transition with Transport SA officers on Friday 29 November 2002.

Notwithstanding the 90 minutes advertised turnabout time, the Expressway is opened immediately upon completion of the turnabout activities. Over the last three months the Expressway was opened in 1 hour or less 25 per cent of the time.

3. At present the changeover of traffic flow direction occurs progressively between 12.30 p.m. and 2.00 p.m. Transport SA has advised that traffic counts undertaken along the Expressway, South Road and Dyson Road indicate that from 10.30 a.m. to 12.30 p.m., there is a higher volume of traffic travelling towards the city than to the south. Therefore, to have the Expressway open for vehicles to travel south at 12.00 p.m. would require the transition of the reverse flow on the Expressway to start at 10.30 am. This would disadvantage more motorists than it would benefit.

I can advise that Transport SA is in the process of designing a dynamic sign to provide estimated opening time information to drivers. The sign will be installed on Main South Road at a suitable location facing south bound traffic prior to the entrance of the Southern Expressway. The sign will include variable message indicators showing whether the Expressway is open or closed and expected time of opening.

UNIONS, BARGAINING FEES

In reply to **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (22 August).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Industrial Relations has provided the following information:

The issue of bargaining fees is under consideration by the South Australian Industrial Relations Commission. The government will determine its position in light of the Commission's decision.

CROWD CONTROLLERS

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD** (20 August).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Consumer Affairs has received this advice from the Office for Consumer and Business Affairs:

To become a crowd controller a person must meet the criteria contained in section 9 of the Security and Investigation Agents Act, 1995. These criteria include qualifications and experience required by regulation. There is a technical qualification requirement that must be met. The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs has approved set units of competency by which individual applicants are deemed to have met the education requirements of the Act.

The Commissioner for Consumer Affairs may, subject to regulations, also impose a qualification and experience requirement upon an applicant.

The Office of Consumer and Business Affairs monitors crowd controller behaviour through:

(i) Monitoring of licence compliance as part of a comprehensive sweep of visits throughout the State;

(ii) Monitoring of crowd controller behaviour at licensed premises in conjunction with the Office of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner (OLGC) and South Australian Police (SAPOL), and independently at specific functions such as bike and motor racing special events.

(iii) Special across agency monitoring activities such as Operation City Safe in which licensed premises in the City of Adelaide were monitored.

As at 30 June, 2002 the Office for Consumer and Business Affairs had issued a total of 5,776 crowd controllers' licenses. Of these 610 unrestricted licenses were issued to bodies corporate. 4,912 individuals have been granted licenses to crowd control work as employees. A further 102 licenses had been granted to security agents restricted to crowd control work as employees under supervision of licensees.

Of the current five disciplinary matters being undertaken by the Office for Consumer and Business Affairs, all but one were licensed before mandatory training requirements were imposed.

Of the 15 disciplinary matters completed as at 21 August, 2002, 3 were granted licenses after 1998 (i.e. twelve received licences before 1998).

It should be pointed out that the Security and Investigation Agents Act, 1995 (SIA Act) provides no additional powers to a security agent than those of an ordinary citizen as confirmed by section 15 which provides:

15.(1) A licence does not confer on an agent power or authority to act in contravention of or in disregard of, laws or rights or privileges arising under or protected by law.

(2) A licensed agent must not hold himself or herself out as having a power or authority by virtue of the licence that is not in fact conferred by the licence.

Maximum penalty:$10,000

Crowd controllers do not have any police powers to enforce criminal law. The Security and Investigation Agents Act, 1995 establishes a licensing system whereby the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs grants licenses to those seeking to perform work of security agents or investigation agents. A licence may be issued in a restricted form such that the holder may only perform a sub-set of the activities of the full licence. A crowd controller's licence is a form of restricted security licence. It is an offence to perform a crowd controlling role unlicensed. It is also an offence for a person (relevantly, a holder of a liquor licence) to employ a person as a crowd controller under a contract of service to perform crowd controlling unless the crowd controller has the relevant licence.

Disciplinary proceedings against licensed crowd controllers by the Office for Consumer and Business Affairs commences after the alleged violations have led to convictions and those convictions are reported by SAPOL to the Office for Consumer and Business Affairs.

The Office for Consumer and Business Affairs and SAPOL are developing a new Memorandum of Understanding, limited to arrangements relating to security agents to improve the exchange of information between their respective organisations.

As to prosecutions from other states, I advise:

Queensland

There were 2,922 new licenses issued and 8,560 renewed.

Queensland does not keep statistics on crowd controller assaults on patrons in or near licensed premises. However, if a crowd controller is found guilty of an offence such as assault or another under the provisions of the drugs misuse legislation, the crowd controller automatically loses his licence and incurs a ten-year disqualification. There are no provisions for appeal.

Victoria

- 20,816 combined security agent and crowd controller licenses have issued to date.
- On matters of discreditable and criminal conduct there were 173 hearings, 65 licenses cancelled, three adjourned, 31 that led to no further action and 21 suspensions.

New South Wales

- 22,664 five-year licenses have been issued to crowd controllers and 10,972 one-year licenses have been issued to crowd controllers or bouncers to date.
- The NSW Security Industry Registry does not keep track of who is convicted of an offence.

Tasmania

- Licenses are not actually issued, however, 540 persons have gained the relevant training competencies to enable them to operate as a crowd controller.
- The training provider advises the Office of the Commissioner for Licensing in Tasmania of persons who have gained the competencies.
- No crowd controllers were struck off last financial year.

Information collected by the SAPOL's Incident Management System indicated that for the period 1 July, 2001, to 30 June, 2002, 40 people who identified themselves as security officers, security guards or bouncers were reported or arrested for assault in the course of their employment. Of that number, 38 were in or around licensed premises.

A working party comprising representatives from the OLGC, SAPOL, and the Office for Consumer and Business Affairs has begun working as a matter of urgency at developing reforms to the licensing of crowd controllers.

UNEMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (16 October).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education has advised:

1. What projects and programs are in hand that the Minister is confident will reduce the rate of youth unemployment before the end of this year?

The government is committed to providing jobs directly to young people and to ensuring that they have the skills and abilities to compete successfully for the jobs being created.

The government's Youth Employment Program is underpinned by a comprehensive Youth Employment Strategy, which assists in the maximisation of the effectiveness of the program.

The Youth Employment Program is a significant government initiative designed to improve the labour market outcomes for young South Australians. It targets 15 to 24 year olds in areas of the State which are experiencing a disproportionately high level of youth labour market disadvantage, and aims to improve the participation of young people in the labour market by identifying issues and barriers, and supporting locally driven responses.

The Program enables young people to acquire the skills, experience and support necessary to secure employment through a range of activities such as targeted training, mentor programs, work experience, job matching and individual case management.

Projects involve the commitment of local communities, businesses, training providers and employment providers to ensure the

success of the program. Currently there are eighteen pilot projects being funded through this program, with some 1327 young participants. It is anticipated that the target 410 employment outcomes will be exceeded.

The government Youth Traineeship Program is another significant component of the government's commitment to assisting young people enter the labour market, particularly those from disadvantaged groups.

During 2002-03 a minimum of 500 funded traineeship opportunities will be made available in the State public sector through the program; through the increased flexibility introduced by this government, there is potential for an increase on this number. To confirm the government's commitment to regional employment, 40 per cent of the opportunities created will be in regional areas.

The program targets young people aged 17 to 24 years of age (inclusive) and young people aged 17 to 28 years of age (inclusive) who are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, who have a declared disability, are long term unemployed, or who have been or are currently under the guardianship of the Minister for Human Services.

To date the program has been most successful, with 72.5 per cent of public sector trainees completing their traineeship and over 70 per cent obtaining employment following their traineeship.

The establishment of the Youth Conservation Corps was announced by the Premier as a new four year program in March 2002. This new initiative will link unemployed young people with employment opportunities through participation in conservation projects, structured training and relevant work experience.

Jobs for young people will be achieved over the four year life of the program.

This government also provided an additional $1.458 million over five years to attract an additional 30 trade apprentices under the Aboriginal Apprenticeship Program. While it does not specifically target young people, the majority of participants are young people.

The Minister for Youth, Hon. Stephanie Key has provided the following information regarding the second part of the question:

2. In light of these statistics, is the government reconsidering its decision in the budget to reduce funding for youth initiatives?

The overall net allocation for youth initiatives for the year 2002-03 is greater than the 2001-02 financial year.

MURRAY RIVER

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (17 October).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has advised:

The question of States referring powers to the Commonwealth for the centralised management of the waters of the River Murray, and indeed all of the natural resources of the whole Murray-Darling Basin, is very topical as the governments of the Basin try to address the declining health of River Murray. Some people call for unilateral action by the Commonwealth, while others, including the honourable member, call for a referral of States' powers to the Commonwealth government.

All governments of the Murray-Darling Basin, including the South Australian government, have very recently considered advice on the referral of powers from the States to the Commonwealth.

It is not evident that any government of the Murray-Darling Basin is giving consideration to a referral of powers to the Commonwealth to manage the water of the River Murray to the Commonwealth.

A referral of powers to the Commonwealth by South Australia (with or without the other States) would effectively weaken South Australia's authority and influence in the Murray-Darling Initiative, and therefore the South Australian government will not be pursuing this matter.

ROAD SAFETY LEGISLATION

In reply to **Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (16 October).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. Why is the minister not prepared to respond to this bill, which the Labor Party in opposition supported in this place last year when the Hon Carolyn Pickles was shadow minister for transport?

2. Will the minister give this chamber an undertaking that, next week, some 5½ months after the bill was introduced, and because he regards road safety as an important issue in this state, he will provide a response, which a government member can use to address this important measure?

The Labor Government has developed a comprehensive package of road safety reforms, which was announced by the Minister for Transport on 17 July 2002.

Apart from the legislative program which the Minister announced on 16 October 2002, and which will be the subject of detailed debate, the package establishes a number of additional measures:

A State Black Spot Program which provides $3.5 million direct State funding to correct a number of critical black spots and areas which have been identified as potential problem areas through road safety audit—many on country roads and local roads.

Introduction of a 50km/h built-up area speed limit, and the review of all 110km/h speed zones to ensure that the speed zoning is appropriate to the condition of the road.

An increase in the program for widening country roads, by sealing road shoulders. This year the program is for $5.1 million and this will increase to $6.8 million in the following three years.

Increase in the Transport SA safety audit response program, and the development and announcement of a rural rest areas program.

Campaigns targeting the use of seat belts and child restraints will be boosted. To complement the legislative program, there will be a strengthening of drink drive education and enforcement programs, and a concentration on information, education and enforcement of the new speed limits.

The Minister's announcement on 16 October 2002 also included advice that a Community Road Safety Fund is to be established. This fund will hold all the revenue from speed fines and will be used to fund the road safety improvement program, combining all related agency programs, including engineering, education and enforcement activities. governance of the fund will be through the Budget process, and will be overseen by a Ministerial council chaired by the Minister for Transport and comprising the Treasurer, the Attorney General and the Ministers for Police, Education and Health.

DUKES HIGHWAY

In reply to **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY** (22 October).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. Can the Minister explain why his government is refusing to take responsibility for this road?

2. Can the Minister give this house an assurance that the government will not pass the buck and will work with the federal government to have this road rebuilt to a satisfactory standard in an appropriate time frame?

This government has clearly shown by the high level of funding for safety works within the Budget that it is committed to safer roads and a reduction in crashes and the trauma they cause.

However, this road is a National Highway and, under current national agreements between the States and Territories and the Commonwealth government, the Commonwealth is responsible for the funding of construction, rehabilitation and maintenance works on the National Highway. While the State government carries out the necessary maintenance and construction work on the National Highway network to improve its standard over time, all work must be approved by the Commonwealth before it can begin.

From a historical perspective, Transport SA advises that there is a long standing problem of poor and variable soil strength under the Dukes Highway in this area, on both the South Australian and Victorian sides of the border.

There have been considerable and ongoing efforts, in collaboration with and funded by the Commonwealth government, to rectify this problem. Transport SA has been monitoring the ongoing performance of the road over time.

The installation of the speed signs to reduce the speed to 100km/h has been undertaken in recognition of the current poor rideability of this section of road.

Transport SA will be taking action within the next few months, once contracts are let, to make temporary repairs to the road that will improve rideability and delay further deterioration of the road until a more permanent rehabilitation can be arranged. The speed restriction, however, will remain in place until the final rehabilitation works are completed.

In the longer term, rehabilitation of the road will be required to return the road to a suitable standard. This has been the subject of ongoing discussions with the Commonwealth government and the State government will be doing everything in its power to ensure that this work can commence in 2003-04.

The rehabilitation cost for this section of road is considerable, and may be of the order of $12.0 million. The State is preparing a submission to the Commonwealth government detailing the problem and the proposed remedy for inclusion in its 2003-04 budget considerations.

HOSPITALS, ACCIDENT AND EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (16 October).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Health has advised:

There is no doubt that the environment of public hospital emergency departments (EDs) is a difficult and demanding one for all clinical staff. All public hospital EDs provide a range of supports to their nursing staff, in addition to the supports provided to the nursing profession as a whole.

On 3 October 2002 the government released a recruitment and retention plan for nursing that addresses the nursing shortage and associated issues such as support for new graduates and career paths for nursing staff.

The public hospital system is currently short by 400 nurses and, as a result, 120 hospital beds in the metropolitan area have had to be taken off line. It is essential that additional staff are recruited to allow these beds to be reopened, and for the opening of the additional 100 beds committed by the government as part of its election policy.

A number of the recommendations that were part of the nursing recruitment and retention plan are already being implemented, with $2.7 million to be spent on the plan in 2002-03. Key initiatives that will benefit nurses in EDs include the following:

- support for future nurse leaders and managers;
- the introduction of support for the new nurse practitioner role for highly skilled nurses;
- rostering to create more flexible working environments;
- post-graduate nursing scholarships;
- support for indigenous nursing;
- grants to South Australian universities for the creation of an additional 150 undergraduate nursing placements in 2003;
- offers of employment to all nursing graduates;
- the expansion of free refresher and re-entry courses;
- protocols for the temporary recruitment of overseas nurses to help alleviate the current shortage;
- employment of undergraduate third year students;
- review of nurses' child-care needs;
- multimedia marketing campaigns to change perceptions of nursing and to promote the benefits of the profession to school leavers; and
- a new senior position in the Department of Human Services (DHS) of Chief Nursing Officer.

The two major trauma centres, the Royal Adelaide Hospital (RAH) and the Flinders Medical Centre (FMC), have the busiest EDs in South Australia and obviously need to ensure that all staff are well supported.

The risk of nurses suffering 'burn out' in such an environment is very real and of major concern to the FMC. An occupational health and safety review was undertaken in the FMC ED in 2001 to objectively assess any further areas for improvement. The recommendations of this review have been implemented and, together with ongoing strategies, the FMC endeavours to provide a safe and supportive work environment for all staff.

The following supportive strategies are in place within the FMC ED:

- The recent extension of the clinical nurse consultant cover to provide senior clinical leadership and management support over seven days of the week. This extended cover, 10 hours per day, also assists in improving the communication, mentoring and preceptoring of nursing staff.
- Flexible rostering and job sharing to allow for reduced hours, shorter shifts, family commitments and educational support are also in place. Overtime and sick leave hours are closely monitored to identify and to address any concerns.
- Sequential development programs to up-skill and extend Registered Nurse practice and extension of practice of Enrolled Nurses are in place. Nurse practitioner roles in the ED are also being implemented.
- A pilot of extended clerical support roles has been established seven days a week to minimise the time spent by clinicians undertaking non-clinical tasks. An equipment officer position was implemented in 2001, again to reduce the non-clinical task demand on clinicians.
- The provision of high quality care is at the forefront of staff's objectives. The FMC ED has a strong focus on the constant review of processes to meet best practice. This has recently been supported by the involvement of the FMC in the National Institute of Clinical Studies ED collaboration. Initiatives from this collaboration are patient care focused. Pilot projects are supported through funding from DHS.
- The FMC ED has an ongoing commitment to education, with the focus on emergency medicine supported by the introduction of emergency mental health care education packages in 2001. This latter initiative received developmental and ongoing funding from DHS and improves both the level of care provided, and the level of comfort for staff in providing care for these patients.
- Personal security in the ED is of concern to individuals and the organisation. Staff receive training in recognising and defusing potentially violent situations and are supported by personal duress alarms, linked to a grid identification system, with 24-hour monitoring by security. Security cover of the FMC ED was increased to a 24-hour security presence in 2001.
- Winter is a particularly demanding time in any ED, with high numbers of patients with high complexity illnesses. During winter 2002, ED staff were offered subsidised gym membership at the workplace gymnasium to assist them in maintaining their physical well being. This was well received by staff. The summer program will follow this strategy and will also include stress management seminars.
- It is expected that the Emergency Extended Care Unit (EECU), funded by DHS, will be completed in November 2002. This will assist greatly in improving the environment for both staff and patients. This purpose built area will extend the capacity of the FMC ED, and comes with funding for additional nursing positions. Recruitment of both general and mental health nurses for this area is now in progress.
- Monitoring of staff morale is critical, with staff surveys being undertaken on an annual basis as a minimum. The results of these surveys are discussed with staff, and strategies to address areas of concern are developed and implemented. Team-building strategies are undertaken on a regular basis and are driven by the clinical staff groups.

The FMC ED is fortunate to have a highly skilled and dedicated nursing workforce that provides excellent care to people presenting for emergency treatment. The ongoing care of these staff is of vital importance and will remain a high priority for the management group of the FMC ED and the organisation as a whole.

Other metropolitan public hospital EDs have also established a range of strategies to support nursing staff. For example, the RAH ED provides 24-hour security services, staff counselling services, staff de-briefing following critical events, regular staff support meetings and a variety of planned social events to maintain staff morale.

The Minister for Health regularly visits accident and emergency departments of metropolitan hospitals and would be happy to arrange a visit for the honourable member.

ROADS, ADELAIDE TO CRAFERS

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (22 August).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. The side entry arrester bed located approximately 300 metres ahead of the south portal arrester bed was removed to enable count down signing to be installed. It would have been confusing to attempt to sign both arrester beds.

The entrance of the arrester bed located at the southern end of the Heysen Tunnel was widened to 8 metres and its length increased by 15 metres.

2. No. At the time of the highway opening, the signs and arrester beds were considered to be appropriate.

3. The original design of the arrester beds was consistent with prevailing design standards. However, an assessment undertaken with the SA Police and heavy vehicle industry identified several improvements over the original design.

4. Approximately $375,000—including the advance warning signs.

5. No further renovation work is envisaged. However, routine maintenance will be undertaken on an as required basis.

6. Transport SA installed clearly visible signs to alert all road users to the non-functioning status of the arrester beds during the maintenance operation. A variable message sign advising of work in progress was placed 1.3 km from the Crafers side of the tunnel. This sign was operating for all the time that the south portal arrester bed was not available for use. In addition, 'Roadworks Ahead' signs were installed each day. A number of radio announcements were also made on the status of the work in progress along the highway.

7. The south portal arrester bed was unavailable for the period 22 May 2002 to 18 July 2002. However, the side entry arrester bed (which has subsequently been removed) was still available for use up until 15 July 2002.

SPEED CAMERAS

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (20 August).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. As you are aware, the proposal to attach demerit points to speeding offences is one of the key components of the government's comprehensive road safety package that is aimed at reducing the State's road toll.

This package will ensure that the State's legislation is in line with other Australian States. South Australia is the only State that does not attach demerit points to camera detected speeding offences. The accrual of demerit points and the threat of disqualification will act as a significant deterrent, as research clearly shows that speeding fines alone do not work. Without demerit points for speeding and red light offences there may be no lasting message to encourage drivers to reduce speed or obey traffic lights.

The social impact of the road safety package will be lives saved, as South Australia's per capita fatality rate is 10 per cent worse than the national average. Interstate experience suggests that there has been a positive social impact from the introduction of such measures through the modification of driver behaviour, and the consequent reduction in road crashes and trauma to individuals and families.

2. Transport SA has not made an estimate of the number of demerit points that are likely to be incurred by drivers each year.

The aim of the points demerit scheme is not to bring about the disqualification of a driver's licence, but to make drivers more safety conscious and to deter them from re-offending.

However, drivers who become liable to disqualification can avoid the disqualification by electing to accept the 'good behaviour' option, in lieu of suffering the disqualification.

Any impact on employment will only be as a consequence of the actions of the drivers and has therefore not been estimated. Not all drivers, who may be disqualified from driving, depend on their driver's licence for employment.

TRUCK DRIVER TRAINING

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (16 July).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: the Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. It is understood that the information obtained by SARTA was from a sampling of some 300 drivers. The information was not compiled from any form of driving assessment (theory or practical), but from a written questionnaire completed by the drivers.

There has been no formal study conducted or any evaluation of the SARTA results in relation to the information's reliability and validity regarding motor vehicle crash involvement. The results of the questionnaire are based on the responses from a sample of 300 drivers, who were tested by SARTA under the Driver-Safe program using the 'Accident Risk Management—Questionnaire' (ARM-Q) psychological test provided by People and Quality Solutions (PaQS) Ltd. The ARM-Q is an assessment tool which is not industry specific and can be used on any group of people. It is designed to identify overall individual safety awareness by measuring awareness, knowledge, conceptual orientation and perception of safety and risk. For any general population, 30 per cent of the tested group will score poorly (high-risk relative to the whole group) on the ARM-Q.

As with any psychological assessment, there is a risk that the results of such a test may not reflect the true position of an individual. According to PaQS, overall results will indicate that the lowest third of the people who are tested on the ARM-Q score are generally responsible for 75 per cent or more of the accidents or claims within the industry being assessed. In the transport industry, such accidents also could include any incidents that occur when loading or unloading the vehicle, getting into or out of a vehicle, or other workplace Occupational Health Safety and Welfare related accidents.

In the case of truck drivers, the ARM-Q psychological test may be a useful tool from an Occupational Health Safety and Welfare perspective, as it may enable employers to identify those drivers at greater risk of being involved in a motor vehicle accident. It is the role of the employer, rather than the government, to take steps to reduce the possibility of the employee being involved in an accident in regard to industry workplace practices. Transport SA currently has stringent driver assessment standards in place for the issue of heavy vehicle driver's licences, that are considered to be best practice within Australia.

In general, it has been shown from the analyses of multi-vehicle crashes involving trucks that, in the majority of cases, the other vehicle was found to be predominantly at fault. In relation to their exposure (number of kilometres travelled), truck drivers have a much lower risk of crash involvement than drivers of motor cars.

2. In South Australia there have been extensive changes in the heavy vehicle licensing process over the last ten years. This has included the introduction of the Competency-Based Training (CBT) course option for heavy vehicle licensing. The CBT courses were developed in consultation with the Transport Training Advisory Board, the Transport Training Centre, the Transport Industry and the South Australian Road Transport Association. The CBT courses incorporate the national competency standards for the driving of heavy vehicles, while having regard to current national licensing practices and standards being applied interstate.

South Australia's licensing system currently is considered to be 'best practice' in Australia for the licensing of heavy vehicle drivers.

CBT courses for licensing were introduced into South Australia as an option to a practical driving test in 1994 for class LR (light rigid/small buses), MR (medium rigid) and HR (heavy rigid) vehicles in 1997 for class HC (heavy combination) and in 1999 for class MC (multi-combination) vehicles. Over 80 per cent of all heavy vehicle drivers currently choose the CBT option, while all class MC applicants are required to complete the compulsory MC CBT course that complies with the Austroads national curriculum for the licensing of drivers of multi-combination vehicles.

In addition, South Australia provides exemptions from the minimum driving experience requirements for the issue of the class HC (heavy combination vehicles) licence. The exemption requires an applicant to complete a comprehensive training course, called the Training-In-Lieu-of-Experience (TILE) course. Around 80 per cent of all new class HC drivers are licensed through the TILE course. The TILE course comprises 18 hours of classroom instruction, including commercial road law, loading, tarping and industry based training, together with approximately 20-25 hours of the on-road training in an articulated motor vehicle.

3. There were 21 fatal crashes and 79 serious injury crashes involving trucks and semi trailers on South Australian roads during 2001-02 financial year.

There were 12 fatal crashes and 50 serious injury crashes that occurred on rural roads. There were 9 fatal crashes and 29 serious injury crashes that occurred on metropolitan roads.

The Hon Diana Laidlaw, MLC asked a supplementary question:

1. The national common licence classes, introduced in 1998, provide for a hierarchy of licence classes, with progression through the classes dependent on holding a prerequisite licence for a particular period. For example, in order to progress from the basic car class (class C) to a heavy-combination class (class HC), an applicant is generally required to hold the class C for at least 12 months, followed by an intermediate class (class MR or HR) for a further 12 months.

The average age profile of employees in the transport industry is a matter essentially for the industry itself to address. government agencies work closely with the industry and driver training providers to ensure that an applicant for a driver's licence, or a particular class of driver's licence, meets certain minimum competency standards relevant to that licence class.

Applicants who wish to proceed from class C to class HC, without the need to hold the intermediate class, are able to gain an exemption from the minimum driving experience requirements by undertaking a comprehensive training course, called the Training-In-Lieu-of-Experience (TILE) course.

In a collaborative effort to showcase career opportunities in the transport industry, the Department of Education, Training and Employment (Office of Employment and Youth) and the Transport Training Centre recently developed an interactive multimedia CD, 'Career Opportunities—Transport Logistics'. The CD will be made

available to high schools, libraries, transport associations, employers and unions. The CD provides information about the transport industry, such as warehousing, freight and passenger transport, licensing and information technology. It also explains career opportunities within the industry and the various training courses available for entry into the industry.

It also needs to be recognised there may be significant insurance issues for younger drivers involved in the transport industry. The cost of insurance and the excess applying in case of claims may be prohibitive for some employers.

UNEMPLOYMENT

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (23 October).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education has advised that:

The government is conscious of the high levels of youth unemployment. We are currently undertaking a skills inquiry to consider labour market needs for the future and as part of that process we are reviewing our employment programs.

We will consider further action when this work is completed in the next few months.

GOVERNMENT SPOKESPEOPLE

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD** (12 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Premier has provided the following information:

1. Monsignor Cappo as Chair of the Social Inclusion Board has regular meetings with the Premier to discuss this important initiative of government.

As part of these discussions the Premier has stressed the need for the Social Inclusion Unit to work actively with relevant areas of government and the community. As one of the key themes of social inclusion work is to strengthen policy and service delivery across government, resources that already exist within government agencies need to be brought together to effect these objectives.

As the Social Inclusion Initiative is developing, appropriate resources have continued to be provided and interagency working groups have been established for the current references. This has reinforced opportunities to develop across agency and across sector responses as part of the initiative.

2. The government has appointed David Cappo, Robert Champion de Crespigny and Tim Flannery to chair boards in Social Inclusion, Economic Development and Science and Technology.

They are well known community leaders and advocates for social policy, economic development and science and technology in this state. They have each made a strong personal commitment by agreeing to give their time to these important bodies.

These eminent members of the community are bringing their expertise and passion to the future of the state. Their aspirations for the community are shared by a large number of fellow South Australians.

Their role is to chair groups of community leaders and to bring expert policy advice and community views to the government. They provide the public face of the respective boards. The government listens to the people of South Australia and values the input it receives.

The government has confidence in the integrity and professionalism of these people and their capacity to advise it on social, economic and scientific matters in the interest of the future of South Australia.

3. The role of the board Chairs is to advise government and this role does not in any way bypass the elected executive of government comprising Ministers as members of Cabinet and Executive Council or parliament itself.

4. The Hon Terry Roberts, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation answered the honourable member's question. The Minister is responsible for the Aboriginal Affairs portfolio.

5. Ministers have responsibilities for their portfolio areas. Any inquiries should be directed to them.

SCOTT, Mr A.

In reply to **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (13 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Premier has received the following advice from the Minister for Industry, Investment and Trade:

My officers have advised me that the Scott Group of Companies confirm that they will continue to invest in South Australia in accordance with their commercial judgment.

The group are proceeding with a major transport depot at Monarto and are working very cooperatively with a government team lead by the Department of Premier and Cabinet to secure the expansion of a transport and storage facility at Gillman.

Mr Scott and his Group of Companies continue to have access to such Ministers or public servants as they need to assist in the growth of their business, as would any similar group or individual.

The government is aware of Mr Scott's serious and public criticisms of the former Liberal government, of which the honourable Rob Lucas was a senior member.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Hon. R.D. LAWSON** (13 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

1. Slippage/Savings occurred against the following SAPOL major projects:

	Slippage $m	Savings $m	Total $m
Adelaide Police Station	0.952	0.557	1.509
Call Centre	1.861	-	1.861
Netley	-	0.932	0.932
Total	2.813	1.489	4.302

2. Of the above projects, Adelaide Police Station has now been completed. Netley was completed in 2001-02 with savings of $930k. The Call Centre project is currently ongoing. To ensure that these and all other major projects are monitored, SAPOL has improved its capital reporting for all projects in excess of $50k.

1. The formula used to calculate long service leave liability for 2001-02 has not changed from that used to calculate long service leave liability for 2000/01. However, different assumptions were used by the Department of Treasury and Finance in their preparation of SAPOL's actuarial assessment of long service leave.

The key changes in the assumption include:

- Salary inflation 4.0 per cent (3.0 per cent in 2000/01)
- Real discount rate 2.0 per cent (3.0 per cent in 2000/01)

2. The change in the Real Discount Rate was requested by officers of the Auditor General's Department in line with Australian Accounting Standards and follows the general reduction in interest rates.

These changes have resulted in an increase in long service leave liability. As advised by the Department of Treasury and Finance, the 2001-02 liability corresponds to using a "short hand" method of 12 years, ie SAPOL's liability is equivalent to the value of long service leave accrued to employees with 12 years or more service. This was 15 years in 2000-01.

3. Long Service Leave expense increased by $4 million as a result of the adoption of the revised actuarial benchmark in 2001-02. The other significant factor affecting the long service leave liability is the 4 per cent Enterprise Bargaining Agreement increase in police and non-police salaries.

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD** (13 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Government Enterprises has provided the following information:

1. Following the implementation of a new lotteries system in 1999, SA Lotteries scheduled the development of promotional software to facilitate the distribution of the Unclaimed Prizes Reserve. This software was first utilised in June 2002, in time for the Powerball 'Buy One, Get One Free' promotion. For each Maxi-Pick ticket purchased in a Powerball draw, a bonus Maxi-Pick ticket for the same draw was provided to the player. These bonus tickets were funded out of the Unclaimed Prizes Reserve. The promotion ran for three weeks, beginning with the $20 million jackpot draw on Thursday 13 June 2002. Response to the promotion was greater than anticipated, with $2.79million being drawn from the Unclaimed Prizes Reserve for the cost of providing bonus tickets.

Without the Powerball promotion, the draw down from the Unclaimed Prizes Reserve during 2001-02 would have been $2,232,106.68. This amount is $668,128.62 greater than the previous year, and is a reflection on the move to reward existing players.

2. In accordance with the State Lotteries Act, 1966 as amended, South Australian players who participated in the promotions received the monies.

3. Distributions from the Unclaimed Prizes Reserve increased from $1,563,978.06 in 2000-01 to $5,024,341.58 in 2001-02. This is an increase of $3,460,363.52.

Distribution of the Unclaimed Prizes Reserve during 2000-01 was as follows:

2000-01	Drawdown	Brand	Promotion
Jul-00	$53.00	Instant Scratchies	
Jul-00	$50,000.00	Keno	
Aug-00	$102.00	Instant Scratchies	
Nov-00	$690,821.30	SA Lotto	Double Dividend
Nov-00	$54,545.45	Keno	Rav 4
Dec-00	$700,000.00	SA Lotto	$1M Top-Up
Dec-00	$5,000.00	Keno	
Feb-01	$5,210.20	Instant Scratchies	Cash Bonanza
Mar-01	$14,550.43	Instant Scratchies	Cash Bonanza
Apr-01	$14,154.40	Instant Scratchies	Cash Bonanza
Jun-01	$12,681.60	Instant Scratchies	Cash Bonanza
Jun-01	$11,405.13	Instant Scratchies	Cash Bonanza
Jun-01	$5,454.55	Keno	Rav 4
Total :	$1,563,978.06		

Distribution of the Unclaimed Prizes Reserve during 2001-02 was as follows:

2001-02	Drawdown	Brand	Promotion
Jul-01	$1,735.06	Instant Scratchies	Cash Bonanza
Oct-01	$150,690.00	Instant Scratchies	Scratch, Match 'n Drive
Nov-01	$803,106.80	SA Lotto	Double Dividend
Dec-01	$504,541.57	SA Lotto	$1M Top-Up
Jan-02	$120,000.00	Lotto	Tour Down Under
May-02	$22,372.00	The Pools	World Cup
May-02	$21,191.00	Easiplay Club	SMS
Jun-02	$608,470.25	Lotto	Easiplay Club Joint Promotion
Jun-02	$2,792,234.90	Powerball	Maxi-Pick Promotion
Total :	$5,024,341.58	"	

MAWSON LAKES HIGH SCHOOL

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (13 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following information:

The previous government had listed the project as a $15.6 million project, but had proposed spending of only $5.5 million in the years 2001-02 to 2003-04.

The Labor government confirmed in the recent budget that it has allocated $7.6 million to establish permanent facilities for the provision of early years and primary education at Mawson Lakes.

The previous government allowed the school to develop an expectation that over time it would provide a range of educational programs beyond the primary school. This was done with no firm budget commitment to provide the necessary facilities for secondary students.

When the Labor government took office in March 2002, land had not been purchased for the primary school, let alone for anything beyond that. Nor had the project been before the parliament's Public Works Committee - a necessary legal step before construction can begin. I have sped up the project and land has now been acquired. Construction will begin soon.

My department advises me that historically no new secondary facility of any kind has been instituted in the absence of an existing and significant enrolment that cannot be accommodated elsewhere. I am aware that the school was attempting to run a secondary program in conjunction with local secondary schools, however, it was very clear to all concerned that significant funding and facilities would be required to continue and/or to extend this concept any further.

The main priority for my department now is to get the new Mawson Lakes Primary School site built and to support the establishment of the fine educational approach that the current school is pioneering.

The Labor government is committed to a strong public education system in which every student is able to progress. This government believes that education is the most important investment any community can make for its future and is fundamental to its social and economic advancement. As Minister, I have an obligation to ensure that resources available to support public schooling are used in a manner that will provide maximum benefit for all students.

I am sure that over the next few years the establishment of the new primary school will continue to enjoy the same level of forward thinking and support from the Mawson Lakes community that it has given so far.

VENOM SUPPLIES

In reply to **Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** (13 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has advised that:

1. A review of Fauna Permits commenced 24 September 1998. The review recommended that royalties be invested in the Wildlife Conservation Fund and used to further research related to wildlife conservation. Prior to this review a single fee of $30.00 was charged to take animals from the wild. This was considered to be inappropriate because it did not take into account the number of animals or their conservation status. As a result, the following payment schedule was implemented under the *Wildlife Regulations 2001*.

(Schedule 9 *Royalty*):

Animals taken in accordance with a notice under section 52 of the (*National Parks and Wildlife*) Act (*1972*) or pursuant to a permit granted under section 53 of the Act being—	Amount of Royalty
(a) An animal of an endangered species	$200.00
(b) An animal of a vulnerable species	$100.00
(c) An animal of a rare species	$50.00
(d) An animal of any other species of protected animal	$25.00

Imposing royalties would ensure that those who derived financial and/or personal benefit from the taking of animals from the wild would contribute to their conservation.

2. There was a very broad consultation involving interest groups, such as Herpetology Groups and Museums, and conservation and wildlife management and licensing agencies from around Australia. Recommendations arising from the consultation were reviewed and approved by the Wildlife Advisory Committee and the South Australian National Parks and Wildlife Council. The Competition Policy Review, undertaken shortly after, was also strongly supportive of this amendment.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Hon. R.D. LAWSON** (13 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

On receipt of the Auditor-General's report SAPOL initiated a review of its data collection with respect to sick leave. This showed some inconsistency in methodology, definitions and data to that reported. In consequence a further analysis of sick leave over the last four years was conducted.

The review showed:

- sick leave was highest in 2000-2001, particularly for unsworn members;
- sick leave was lowest in 2001-2002; and
- sick leave for unsworn members is higher than for sworn members for each year.

SAPOL is in the process of developing a range of measures to assist in monitoring and reporting on sick leave trends, together with active management strategies. These strategies aimed at supporting genuinely sick employees while monitoring the level of uncertified sick leave and any evident excessive trends. Workplace consultative committees, comprised of management and employees, have been reviewed and will be used as an active monitoring strategy. Executive reporting is being improved, within the limitations of the existing human resource management system and sick leave policies/instructions are being reviewed.

Conjointly, a range of voluntary flexible working policies have been drafted and recently endorsed for wider consultation. A separate draft Drug and Alcohol policy is currently out to employees and unions for consultation. A major review towards improved management of longer term sick and injured employees has been conducted and is being progressively implemented. Options include a health maintenance scheme, alternative employment within the public sector for sworn employees and improved return to work programs.

Two new corporate projects on devolving some centralised HR functions and the development of an individual performance management system are expected to impact on sick leave patterns through better reporting and higher individual accountabilities.

A new Human Resource Information System is required within SAPOL and functional specifications for a new system have been prepared which incorporate better reporting and more timely data entry. This will assist local managers to more easily monitor sick leave trends at their local level—currently being done centrally.

SAPOL acknowledges its liability to reduce sick leave within its organisation and will work with other police agencies nationally on this joint problem.

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (13 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I provide the following information:

As reported in the Auditor-General's Report on page 765, expenditure on Adverse Events for 2001-02 was $7.8 million compared to $12.5 million in 2000-01. The $4.7 million reduction in 2001-02 relates principally to the completion of the plague locust eradication campaign during 2000-01 at a cost of $6.6 million, partially offset by increased expenditure in 2001-02 for Branched Broomrape ($0.9 million) and Ovine Johne's Disease ($0.3 million).

For 2002-03, $3.6 million has been budgeted for biosecurity activities. The 2002-03 budget reflects a reduction from the high activity levels in 2001-02, particularly in relation to fruit fly and Ovine Johne's Disease as well as a lower State contribution to the national Branched Broomrape program. As you would be aware, this year's budget provided for an expanded Branched Broomrape program under the Department of Water, Land, Biodiversity and Conservation.

Clearly, expenditure on biosecurity activities in 2001-02 was significantly less than in 2000-01, with the 2002-03 budget being significantly less than in both of the preceding two years.

As the honourable member would be aware, the government has little control over the level of expenditure for biological threats such as plague locust and fruit fly, as it is subject to the unpredictable nature and severity of biosecurity outbreaks and incidents.

It should be noted that the base level of funding for biosecurity in 2002-03 remains at the same level as provided by the previous government. If however, funding allocated for biosecurity incidents during the year proves to be inadequate, additional funding will be sought from Cabinet. This is consistent with the approach adopted by the previous government.

COMMUNITY LAND EXCLUSIONS

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (13 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Urban Development and Planning has advised that:

1. In light of the advice I have received to date on this matter, I am satisfied there have been no breaches of the *Local Government Act 1999* and the council has taken appropriate action to respond to the community's concerns. As a consequence, I do not believe that my formal investigation into the council's conduct of its community land exclusion process is warranted at this time.

2. No.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (13 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has provided the following information:

In relation to State government funding, $10.783 million for controlled items was transferred from Primary Industries to the new Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation for 2001-02. A further amount of $13.609 million in State funding for administered items was transferred for 2001-02. These amounts represented 9 percent of Primary Industries' controlled appropriation (before the split) and 14 percent of Primary Industries' administered appropriation (before the split).

GOVERNMENT STATEMENTS

In reply to **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY** (13 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Housing has provided the following information:

The Women's Statement was tabled before both Houses of Parliament on 20 November 2002. A delay with the consultancy postponed the finalisation of the statement.

The Premier has provided the following information:

The question was answered by the Hon. Paul Holloway in the Legislative Council on 17 October 2002 as follows:

The Arts Statement has been completed and will be posted on the Arts SA website as soon as the redevelopment of that site is completed later this year.

The response remains correct.

BURNSIDE BUS STOP

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (12 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. Why has the bus stop in question not been moved as requested by the local council and college?

The Minister has been informed that the Passenger Transport Board (PTB) investigated the location of the bus stop shortly after the accident occurred.

The current location of the bus stop complies with the Australian Road Rules as it is more than 20 metres from the intersection. The South Australian Police (SAPOL), who interviewed the bus driver

following the incident, did not consider the location of the bus stop to be a contributing factor to the accident.

The PTB found that relocating the bus stop south of the intersection would not necessarily improve pedestrian safety, as there is no pedestrian crossing south of the intersection. Pedestrians would therefore be more likely to jaywalk across Portrush Road, rather than walk back to north of the intersection to use the signalised pedestrian crossing.

The PTB also found that if the bus stop were relocated south of the intersection, other large vehicles, such as semi trailers, would possibly use the kerbside travel lane and would also obscure the view of the kerbside traffic lights and any pedestrians who may be waiting to cross at this location.

2. Considering the bus stop location was identified as a key factor in the cause of a previous death, will the Minister direct Transport SA to take immediate action and have it relocated?

The Magistrate found the driver guilty of committing two road offences as charged, namely driving without care and failing to stop at a stop line which resulted in a pedestrian fatality at the pedestrian crossing.

None of the evidence presented to the Coroner or Magistrate mentioned the location of the bus stop as contributing to the accident. The bus could be travelling in this lane approaching the intersection, even if the bus stop was not there.

The Magistrate found that in changing lanes to move around the bus, the driver was not paying attention to the traffic lights. As a result, the driver collided with three pedestrians. In his remarks on the penalty, the Magistrate stated that, "although I accept that the bus attracted your attention and diverted your attention from the lights, your failure to see the lights was a serious departure from the standard of care".

Traffic lights at this intersection are located so that all oncoming vehicles can view them in the centre median of Portrush Road and Cator Street. If the driver had been paying appropriate attention, he would have seen the traffic lights and stopped at the red signal.

Any person driving a motor vehicle has a duty to drive with attention and care. In this tragic case a motorist made a mistake that he will no doubt regret for the rest of his life, and this resulted in the death of a young person.

The PTB considered the location of the bus stop following the incident, and for the reasons outlined decided that relocating the bus stop was not necessary. The bus stop has been in this location for more than 50 years. To the PTB's knowledge, there has been no other incident involving a public transport bus that has resulted in concerns being raised about the bus stop's location.

3. As a matter of simple courtesy, will the Minister write to both Burnside council and Loreto College explaining what action he intends to take?

Shortly after the incident, the City of Burnside wrote directly to the Passenger Transport Board asking that consideration be given to relocating the bus stop. The PTB investigated the matter and provided a response explaining its decision not to move the bus stop.

The council and Loreto College will be kept informed of any decisions regarding the bus stop.

ATTENTION DEFICIT HYPERACTIVITY DISORDER

In reply to **Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** (18 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Health has provided the following information:

Attention Deficient Hyperactivity Disorder is a complex issue that requires a considered cross portfolio response. This has required the Department of Human Services, the Department of Education and Children's Services and non-government sources to provide input to develop a comprehensive response to the Inquiry into Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder Report. The Department of Human Services has recently provided me with a detailed response to this report's recommendations and I am currently considering this information. The Member should additionally note that prescribing rates in South Australia are in line with other jurisdictions in Australia.

There has been no designated funding set aside this financial year for the Social Development Committee recommendation to provide a grant for ADHD support groups. It is anticipated that access to one-off grant funding may become available in the 2003-04 financial year.

TORRENS TRANSIT

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (18 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. The Labor government's transport policy statements released at the last election set out the government's commitment to public transport. The transport policy stated that a Labor government would work towards developing high public transport patronage.

The Minister for Transport has stated that one of this government's immediate transport priorities is to improve the public transport system.

The Draft Strategic Transport Plan that is currently being developed will further establish the government's transport priorities.

The government is committed to responsible economic management and delivering balanced budgets. For 2002-03, this involved close examination of public sector expenditure and identifying savings in many areas. The government's commitment to public transport is demonstrated by the fact that public transport services have been maintained and in some cases improved in this financial year.

For example, from 14 October 2002, many Adelaide Metro customers have benefited from improved services. Service improvements have included more buses on popular routes, express services from the outer metro area and increased routes to popular destinations.

For the 2002-03 financial year to date (July-October), public transport patronage has increased by 3.1 per cent compared to the same period last year. The government will endeavour to facilitate further patronage increases by working with public transport contractors and local communities to identify further improvements that can be made to the public transport system.

2. Yes. The government's Contract Review Cabinet Committee will review contracts (across government) to ensure that the contractors are meeting their obligations under the contracts. This is part of the government's commitment to accountability and transparency in government. The Adelaide metropolitan bus contracts are within the scope of the review.

The Prudential Management Group, on behalf of the Cabinet Sub-Committee, has asked the Passenger Transport Board to provide information relating to the tendering, evaluation and contract management processes that relate to the bus contracts. The Passenger Transport Board has now provided this information.

RELATIONSHIP VIOLENCE

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (28 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Social Justice has advised that:

1. Does the minister acknowledge the urgent need to promote services to homosexual men who have suffered criminal assault in the home or in public at the hands of loved ones or strangers?

The minister acknowledges that people who are gay, lesbian, transgender or bisexual can experience violence within their relationships and in the community, and that these experiences are often linked or compounded by their sexual orientation. The government will ensure that the issues for gay men and lesbians and people who are transgender and bisexual are incorporated within policy directions to address violence and abuse in South Australia. In doing so the government is committed to working with the gay community to develop and ensure that services are accessible and appropriate.

2. Will the minister give an undertaking that appropriately targeted promotion for services will be set up and funded as a priority of her government?

Currently there are a range of services funded by the government to respond to the experiences of violence and abuse in the community, including the experiences of people who are gay, lesbian, transgender or bisexual. Some of these are provided through regional Community Health services, Women's Health services, SHine, DASC and Child and Youth Health (The Second Story).

The development of a whole of government approach to violence and abuse which is currently under consideration will include people who are gay, lesbian, transgender and bisexual as a specific population group and develop responses that recognises the unique issues that people who are gay, lesbian, bisexual or trangendered face. Community education and the promotion of services that are able to respond to the needs of specific population groups will be a key facet of this approach. In doing so, the government will work in partnership with the community.

3. Will the minister ensure that training and education is made available to service providers, including the police, who deal with homosexual relationships and street violence?

A whole of government approach to violence will require development of a training and education strategy to support and develop the work already undertaken across the sectors. Training and education are essential to ensure that services provided to the community are accessible and appropriate for all population groups. A key aspect of this training is the role attitudes and values can have on the way services are delivered. The training provided by SHine and some Community Health Services (eg Challenging Heterocentrism) are examples of current sector training activity.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (18 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Social Justice has advised that:

1. Where a carer has lodged an appeal, will the minister provide information as to the number of appeals that have ruled in favour of the carer?

Since 2000 there have been 12 appeals lodged. Six appeals have upheld the previous decision and two appeals have modified the outcome of the previous decision. Two of the appeals that were upheld were completed by the Ombudsman's Office. There are four appeals yet to be finalised.

2. Where the decision is in favour of the carer, does the department reimburse the reasonable costs of expenses incurred by the carer? If not, why not?

The Department of Human Services does not have a specific policy regarding reimbursement of costs incurred by the carer, with this decision being made on a case by case basis. This issue will be considered within the current examination of Special Investigation processes.

WOMEN IN BLACK

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (27 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Social Justice has advised that:

The government supports the right of women to engage in peaceful protest.

STURT HIGHWAY

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (27 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Transport has provided the following information:

1. Over recent years the Sturt Highway has suffered a decline in its operational effectiveness due to the significant growth in freight traffic associated with the growth of the wine industry in the Riverland and Barossa area.

In the May 2002 Federal Budget, the Federal government had announced funding of $2.0 million for 2002-03 and notional future funding of $2.0 million in 2003-04, $6.0 million in 2004/05 and $8.0 million in 2005-06.

In August 2002, the Federal government gave formal approval for total funding of $18.48 million for the construction of 17 new overtaking lanes plus the extension of two existing overtaking lanes.

The state government is seeking accelerated funding for the construction of these overtaking lanes by 2004-05. The RAA is vigorous in its support of this position.

2. The state government is funding a traffic study of the entire length of the corridor between Gawler and the Victorian border and a study of the Renmark Township. These studies will identify and prioritise the upgrading needs for the corridor and the township of Renmark and provide justification for seeking funding of these interventions.

Likely interventions include shoulder sealing, which studies have shown can reduce 43 per cent of "leaving- road" type crashes (which also compliments the State-wide Shoulder Sealing Program), improvement to road junctions and the installation of rest areas to reduce fatigue related crashes.

The information from these studies will be used in discussions with the Federal government on additional funding for the Sturt Highway to implement safety improvements along the corridor.

South Australia Police surveillance will continue, aimed at encouraging safe driver behaviour.

SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (14 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Social Justice has advised that:

1. *Does the minister recognise that staff and clients of the supported residential facilities in South Australia are at risk of security breaches from people who are mentally unwell?*

The profile of some people living in Supported Residential Facilities can mean there is a need to consider safe working and living conditions for staff and clients. This is a part of the responsibilities and challenges of managing such facilities.

I recently met with members of the Supported Residential Facilities Association—the industry group representing a number of supported residential facility owner/operators. The discussion at the meeting was wide ranging but the issue of staff and clients being at risk of security breaches from people who are mentally unwell was not raised as a specific concern of the industry.

2. *Does the minister recognise the need for extra security and support measures for staff at supported residential facilities who deal face to face with difficult clients, sometimes on a daily basis?*

I recognise the particular challenges facing supported residential facility providers in undertaking their day-to-day duties. However, it is the responsibility of the managers of supported residential facilities to take responsibility for the day to day management of the facility and ensure the proper care and safety of staff and residents. It is a requirement of all service providers, regardless of the nature of the activity, to comply with the Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act 1986.

3. *What current after-hours security and support measures are in place for these facilities, and does the minister deem them adequate?*

The particular work practices and environments pertaining to individual supported residential facilities are the responsibility of the manager and proprietor of the facility. The Department of Human Services does not have access to this information. In administering supported residential facilities, there is a duty of care on employers to ensure safe work practices and environments for employees and residents at all time.

The Mental Health Services provide an Assessment and Crisis Intervention Service (ACIS) on a 24-hour statewide basis. This is primarily a telephone support service. A Memorandum of Understanding exists between ACIS and the SA Police regarding the management of clients requiring emergency intervention after hours.

The Mental Health Unit, DHS is currently developing a range of new emergency demand management policies and procedures that will apply to supported residential facilities.

4. Why was ACIS on answering machine: how long did it take ACIS to respond to this particular incident; and what was its response?

The main triage number for ACIS was not, and is not at any time, diverted to an answering machine. There is, however, only one telephone line available for the triage and if this line is busy callers are provided with a message advising that the call will be answered as soon as possible.

It appears that the SRF staff member used the incorrect contact number and used either the reception number or the bed coordinator number, both of which divert to an answering machine after hours. Consequently, no call for assistance was logged with the relevant ACIS team requiring a response. I am therefore unable to comment on how long it took for ACIS to respond to this particular incident or the nature of its response.

The correct contact number for ACIS (131 465) is normally provided as a matter of course to accommodation providers dealing with clients of Mental Health Services. It can also be located in the Telstra White Pages Business Listings under Mental Health Services, 24-hour Statewide Emergency Crisis. The number is also listed in the 24-hour Emergency Numbers listing on the inside front cover of the Telstra White Pages.

In order to ensure that the correct ACIS contact number is brought to the attention of staff working in supported residential facilities, a notice will be submitted for publication to the editor of the Supported Residential Facilities Association newsletter. The newsletter is distributed to all members of the Association.

A notice will also be published in the December edition of the Supported Residential Facilities newsletter published by the Supported Housing Unit, DHS, which is mailed to all supported residential facilities in South Australia.

ACIS 24 hour emergency contact number stickers and/or refrigerator magnets will also be distributed to all supported residential facilities in South Australia in due course.

It is the responsibility of supported residential facility managers to ensure that all members of staff are aware of the correct emergency contact number for ACIS.

CROWN LAND

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (27 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has advised that:

In my conversation with the journalist in question I explained that the Select Committee on Crown Lands has reached a unanimous agreement on how to deal with the freeholding of perpetual leases. I also explained, without going into detail, as the committee, at that stage, had not reported to parliament, that not only would concessions be made to encourage the free holding of perpetual leases but the budget bottom line would be protected.

The language used in the article does not reflect the important compromise that was reached. The arrangement agreed upon by the committee offers significant incentives to perpetual lessees to freehold their properties.

The $300 annual service fee will only apply to those perpetual lessees who are eligible to freehold their land but who choose not to. It is estimated that the majority of perpetual lessees who are eligible to freehold their land will do so, therefore avoiding the $300 annual service fee. Special provisions for families affected by the drought are included in the package recommended by the Select Committee.

BLACK SHIRTS

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD** (27 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Attorney General has provided the following information:

1. No.
2. No.
3. No.

SERVICE SA

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (14 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Administrative Services has advised that:

1. Transport SA and the Department for Administrative and Information Services have jointly conducted a review of the Customer Service Centre and Call Centre networks existing in each agency. This review has a primary objective of examining the benefits and risks of consolidating the networks into one agency.

Both the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Administrative Services are aware of the review, however the final report has not yet been finalised.

2. Transport SA staff and the Public Service Association are aware of the review. Every effort will be made to keep staff informed to alleviate uncertainty. Decisions will not be made in haste and appropriate time will be provided for consultation. The findings from the review will be referred to Cabinet for any decisions about the future of the customer service office networks.

3. Following consideration of the review a Submission will be put to Cabinet early in the new calendar year if there is a need for decision by Cabinet.

URBAN STORMWATER

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (26 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has advised that:

1. The government is a keen advocate of integrated stormwater management, a component of which is the reuse of stormwater for appropriate purposes. Some examples of the way in which the government is encouraging stormwater reuse include:

- Recent gazettal of a 'Stormwater in Urban Areas' Plan Amendment Report PAR
- The release of Guidelines and a Planning Bulletin for Urban Stormwater Management as support documents to the 'Stormwater in Urban Areas' PAR.
- The Water Proofing Adelaide Project, which over the next several years, will develop a plan for the integrated water resource management in the Adelaide region. The plan will promote stormwater as a resource.

2. The government will develop a wastewater management statement, that will set out a consistent framework for wastewater management and reuse in South Australia. This will be done in accordance with the State Water Plan 2000 policy statement 4.6.4, which has a target completion for this work of 2005.

MUSIC INDUSTRY

In reply to **Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (26 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts has advised that:

On 24 October 2002, the Hon Kevin O Foley announced that $500,000 would be applied towards programs that will be of benefit to the live music industry. These funds will apply from the 2002-03 financial year. The funds will be used for programs designed broadly to benefit the live music industry.

The government will convene, in February or March, a meeting with musicians, promoters, agents, venues and the entertainment media to map a new framework for the development of live music in South Australia.

We will continue to work with the live music industry to consider ideas regarding live music development. The coming years promise to be an exciting period for live music in South Australia.

MOUNT GAMBIER PRISON

In reply to **Hon. R.D. LAWSON** (21 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I advise the following:

Will the minister indicate whether the government has undertaken any evaluation of the cost effectiveness of the arrangements which operate in relation to the Mount Gambier prison? If the government has not undertaken any such evaluation, will he agree to do so?

Prior to renewing the contract with Group 4 in June 2000, key staff from the Department considered a range of data on the operation of the Mount Gambier Prison and concluded that it was proving to be cost effective in its operation and service provision.

The Department for Correctional Services will continue to monitor the cost effectiveness of all its prisons including Mount Gambier Prison.

In reply to the supplementary question asked by Hon. J. Stefani: Will the minister advise the chamber how many prisoners are held presently at Yatala?

On 21 November 2002, 377 prisoners were being held at Yatala Labour Prison. Of those, 51 were Dual, 189 Remand and 137 Sentenced.

HOUSING TRUST

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (20 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Housing has advised that:

1. *Is it true that there has been a Housing Trust hike, which takes almost all the CPI increase away from aged pensioners?*

It was announced at the time of the State Budget that Housing Trust reduced rents would be set at a flat 25 per cent of assessable income for the majority of reduced rent payers. At the time of the announcement a large number of Trust tenants already paid rent at 25 per cent of assessable income.

To minimise household impacts and to allow households to budget accordingly those tenants paying less than 25 per cent are having their rents increased in two stages to coincide with six monthly Centrelink pension, benefit and allowance adjustments.

Income that was previously excluded from rent calculations, such as the Pharmaceutical Allowance or the Commonwealth GST supplement, continues to be excluded. There is also no change to the proportion of Family Payments that are added to rent. The proportions will remain at 15 per cent of Family Tax Benefit part A and 13 per cent of Family Tax Benefit part B.

As a result of this rent adjustment some tenants have experienced a rent increase that consumed a larger proportion of their pension or allowance increase than would normally be the case.

In establishing the new rent scales the government recognised the impact such a move would have on very low-income households and tenants in Cottage Flats, which are smaller and have less amenity than larger house types. The rent scale for Cottage Flats (with separate bedroom) and Bedsitter Flats (without separate bedroom) is now set at 19 per cent and 17 per cent of assessable income respectively, and very low income households (those earning less than $183.85 pw) have rent set at 19.5 per cent of assessable income.

The rent adjustment ensures that no Housing Trust tenant pays more than 25 per cent of assessable income in rent. This is the nationally accepted benchmark of housing affordability for low-income households. Trust rents continue to be considerably less than rents in the private rental market for similar household and dwelling types in similar locations.

2. *If so, given Labor's much trumpeted concern for those on low incomes, how is this increase in Housing Trust rental justified?*

The major source of funding for public housing is the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement (CSHA). Commonwealth funding under this agreement has fallen from $92 million in 1991/92 to $74.3 million in 2000/01, which represents a 31 per cent decrease in funding in real terms.

An important factor in the decision to adjust Housing Trust rents is the need to ensure the long term financial viability of the Housing Trust. This has been highlighted as a major issue in the Triennial Review of the Trust conducted in 2001 by the previous government, and tabled in parliament by the former Minister for Human Services.

The Triennial Review noted that out of the overall CSHA grant to South Australia, the Trust received around 50 per cent less funding in 2001 compared to 1991. In addition to this, the Housing Trust has needed to target housing assistance to those in greatest need. This has meant the proportion of tenants eligible to pay a reduced rent has increased over the past decade from 70 per cent to 84 per cent and as a result the Trust has diminishing rental income. The Triennial Review recommended an increase in rents to assist the Trust's long term viability.

A consequence of the declining CSHA funding available to South Australia has been the reduction in the total numbers of publicly funded social housing stock (public housing, community housing and Aboriginal housing) from 64,151 in 1993-94 to 54,900 at the end of June 2002.

3. *Has the member for Giles approached the minister on behalf of her Whyalla constituent on this issue and, if so, what has been explained to the constituent about why she is left with 60c per fortnight to cover all increases in the cost of living?*

The member for Giles raised this matter with me in October and I have provided a written response to the member explaining the reasons for the rent rise.

RSPCA

In reply to **Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** (14 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has advised that:

1. The funding provided to the RSPCA has not been decreased. Funding remains at $500,000 per annum plus GST. We provide the Society with a higher level of funding than any other Australian jurisdiction, in recognition of the excellent service they provide in enforcing an Act of this parliament, on behalf of the government, and for the people and animals of this state.

2. Not applicable.

3. RSPCA Officers do use the telephone, in the first instance, to investigate some complaints as this is often the most appropriate course of action. The Society receives in the order of half a million enquires relating to the welfare of animals each year. Some of these are frivolous or even malicious in their intent, while other reports are the result of neighbourhood disputes or a consequence of differing standards within the community. It would be inappropriate for an investigator to attend or be issued a warrant to enter a premises without reasonable cause, or where there is no evidence of an offence.

4. To ensure that those who are neglecting or harming animals in this State are held accountable for their actions, I intend to:

- assist the Society to ensure that Inspectors receive the training they need to be proficient in their work, and;
- ensure that the legislation is enforceable and reflects the standards and expectations of the majority of people of this state.

GAMING MACHINES

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (4 December).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Deputy Premier and Treasurer has provided the following information:

This matter was extensively covered during debate on the Gaming Machines (Gaming Tax) Amendment Bill 2002.

The amount of gaming tax revenue collected in a given year depends on the distribution of net gambling revenue (NGR) by venue as well as the aggregate level of NGR.

At the time of the Budget the underlying gaming machine revenue estimate, based on aggregate NGR and tax collected, was based on 11 months data.

The estimates of the impact of the proposed gaming machine tax measure included in the budget forward estimates required venue distribution data and that was based on venue distribution data for 8 months of 2001-02.

The final budget forward estimates included the sum of the underlying revenue projection plus the estimated additional revenue from the proposed tax measure and as such they were dependent on the NGR venue distribution data for 8 months.

This is consistent with my statements quoted by Mr Stefani in his question.

SOCIAL INCLUSION

In reply to **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY** (4 December).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Premier has provided the following information:

1. In June 2002, the Drugs Summit was held over 5 days at the Adelaide Entertainment Centre, chaired by the Premier, the Hon Mike Rann, Mr Rory McEwen, Hon Bob Such, Hon Jennifer Cashmore and Hon Carolyn Pickles. The focus of the Summit was on illicit drug use, with an emphasis on increasing use of amphetamine type substances, including 'designer drugs', and broad substance use issues in relation to young people and Aboriginal people. The focus worked as a catalyst for reflection on drug use in the widest sense. Prior to the Drugs Summit itself, a state-wide consultation was undertaken which included, face to face opportunities for people to bring drug use issues to the attention of the Summit organisers and a call was advertised for written submissions.

Following the Summit, the recommendations were made public on the Drug Summit website as part of the communiqué.

On 25 November, Cabinet considered and approved the initial government response to the Drugs Summit and initiatives for immediate action. On 5 December, the initial government response was launched by the Premier and the Chair of the Social Inclusion Board, Monsignor David Cappo. As part of the launch, the Premier announced that the government had committed more than $3.25 million in the first year for early intervention programs involving problem drug users, Aboriginal communities and prisoners, all areas identified as critical points during the Drugs Summit in June.

The Social Inclusion Board has also been asked to advise the government about ways to support young people to stay at school and complete 12 years of education reflected by a measurable increase in school retention rates.

The Social Inclusion Board and the Social Development Cabinet Committee have been briefed with reports on progress being made on this task: A School Retention Inter-Departmental Reference Group has been developing an issues paper which the board has agreed requires significant consultation within government and especially with relevant stakeholders in the community such as schools, school councils, parents, youth organisations, young people, academics and tertiary institutions.

This consultation has now commenced and will continue into early 2003, with the board receiving an action plan in March, which will from the basis of its recommendations to the Premier for government action.

In the meantime, the Premier and the Minister for Education and Children's Services, the Hon Trish White MP have also announced a number of strategies to be implemented in the schools sector, aimed at improving attendance and assuring safety and security in schools.

2. As part of the Drugs Summit launch, the Premier announced that the government had committed more than $3.25 million in the first year for early intervention programs involving problem drug users, Aboriginal communities and prisoners, all areas identified as critical points during the Drugs Summit in June.

The Social Inclusion Initiative recommendations made to government by the Social Inclusion Board will be considered as part of the deliberations of Cabinet leading up to the development and announcement of the State Budget in early 2003.

3. As stated above, the government has made an announcement on the government's response to the Drugs Summit on 5 December.

The Social Inclusion Board will be receiving major reports on school retention and reducing homelessness in early 2003.

FISHERIES ACT

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (5 December).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The government of South Australia is seeking community input into a review of the Fisheries Act 1982 and has released a Green Paper in which a number of options to improve the legislation are discussed.

To assist with public consultation, a second round of community meetings were held in Adelaide and in regional South Australia during late January and February, 2003. These meetings provided interested persons with an opportunity to ask questions about the management of South Australia's fisheries and to comment on the Green Paper. Representatives of the Steering Committee that is providing the government with advice on this review and the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (PIRSA) fishery managers attended the meetings to respond to issues raised at the meetings.

Advice was sought from several stakeholder organisations about where to hold these meetings and, having regard to this advice, a program involving 3 meetings in metropolitan Adelaide and 14 meetings in regional South Australia was developed. I am pleased to inform Honourable Members that meetings are planned for Maitland, Port Pirie and Port Wakefield in February 2003. This will provide people with an opportunity to contribute to the review.

GENETICALLY MODIFIED FOOD

In reply to **Hon. IAN GILFILLAN** (5 December).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I can advise the honourable member that the last field trials of GM crops conducted in Tasmania occurred in 1999. These trials were conducted under the voluntary arrangements requested by the Genetic Manipulation Advisory Committee (GMAC), a technical committee that provided guidelines for the management of genetically modified organisms prior to the Gene Technology Act 2000 coming into effect and the establishment of the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator.

The regrowth of canola on some trial sites from this era has been a problem of record, especially in Tasmania, and I would join the Tasmanian Minister for Primary Industries Water and the Environment in his support for the firm actions of the Office of the Gene Technology Regulator in insisting that the crop areas were destroyed rather than risk unmanaged multiplication and movement of genetically modified canola.

The Tasmanian government has some time ago invoked an order under the Plant Quarantine Act 1977 (Tas) to impose a moratorium to prevent the growing of GM plants (except for specifically authorised plants under fully contained research). This was done by declaring GM plants to be pest plants under the Act. This order is legal and would remain so unless successfully challenged through the courts, perhaps on the basis that the inclusion of GM plants under the definition of 'pest plants' may go beyond the intention of the Act. Legal advice would appear to vary on how well it might stand up to such challenge should one be forthcoming at some point. As I have previously mentioned in council, advice from the Crown Solicitor's Office suggests that this regulatory strategy may not be soundly based and has not been recommended as the best strategy that this government should pursue at this point of time.

SCHOOLS, OB FLAT PRIMARY

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD** (5 December).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following information:

The member for Mount Gambier had been aware for some time prior to the Minister for Education and Children's Services announcing that OB Flat Primary School would be closing at the end of the 2002 school year.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen wrote to the Minister for Education and Children's Services on 14 November 2002 supporting the decision of the School council of OB Flat Primary School to move to close the school. In his letter, the Member acknowledged that due process had been followed in arriving at the decision to close the school.

In reply to **Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (5 December).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following information:

The member for Mount Gambier has been informed throughout the discussions between the School council of OB Flat Primary School and the Department of Education and Children's Services.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen wrote to the Minister for Education and Children's Services on 14 November 2002 supporting the decision of the School council of OB Flat Primary School to move to close the school. In his letter, the Member acknowledged that due process had been followed in arriving at the decision to close the school.

McEWEN, Hon. R.J.

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (5 December).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Trade and Regional Development has provided the following information:

1. The independence of the Minister's position is clearly set out in the agreement secured with the Premier, which has been provided to all Members of Parliament. The parties to that agreement concur that:

'the Minister will have a special position in Cabinet in that, by reason of his independence, there is a class of issues in respect of which it will not always be possible for the Minister to be bound by a Cabinet decision'.

The agreement is intended to reduce such matters where Cabinet cannot agree, but the Minister can absent himself from Cabinet when such a circumstance arises. The Minister may also criticise any policy decision made by Cabinet, over which the Minister has absented himself from Cabinet, following its public announcement.

In addition,

The Minister is not obliged to support the government in the Parliament nor to vote with the government in relation to:

- matters which he has absented himself from Cabinet; or
- votes concerning Issues about which he has given notice to the Premier.

2. At the next election, the Minister will be campaigning as and for the Independent Member for Mount Gambier and will support policies that will benefit his constituency.

WINE GRAPE IRRIGATION AND SOIL NUTRITION PRACTICES

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (5 December).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The first booklet in the Grape Production Series published by Winetitles on grapevine Diseases and Pests was printed in 1994 with funding support from the industry via the Grape and Wine Research and Development Corporation. This has proven to be a very valuable publication for grape growers and has been reprinted several times since that time with updates and revisions. The second booklet in the series entitled Wine Grape Irrigation and Soil Nutrition is currently under preparation by officers of the SARDI Viticulture group. This booklet is being prepared wholly from the available time and financial resources of SARDI, with no funding support from the industry. SARDI has not received any funding from the Commonwealth Irrigation Education Program to support the preparation of this booklet. Those involved in the preparation of the manuscript for this book are key researchers in large industry funded projects with agreed milestones and output requirements. Work on this manual is consequently undertaken as time permits around the schedule of industry funded project activities. It is anticipated that the manuscripts for this booklet will be with the publisher by the end of March 2003.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Hon. T.J. STEPHENS** (13 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has provided the following information:

1. All of the $4.6 million funding was outlaid initially by the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (PIRSA) in the expectation that the Commonwealth funding would be received towards the end of the financial year.

2. The reimbursement of outlays for the Loxton Irrigation District Rehabilitation program form part of an agreement between PIRSA and the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation.

The agreement ensures that a net transfer of funds occurs between the respective operating accounts of each Department for financial activities relating to the transfer of functions.

POLICE, SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS

In reply to **Hon. SANDRA KANCK** (previously Hon. M.J. Elliott) (20 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

The Operations Intelligence Section (OIS) within the South Australia Police (SAPOL) is primarily responsible for 'anti-terrorism intelligence gathering' and is the conduit to the intelligence gathering activities pursuant to the National Counter Terrorist arrangements.

SAPOL activities in terms of 'anti-terrorism intelligence gathering' are governed by the Directions to the Commissioner of Police pursuant to Section 6 of the Police Act, 1998.

The Directions govern the role and function of OIS and restrict the recording and dissemination of intelligence with respect to any person who is reasonably believed to have committed or have supported, assisted or incited the commission of:

(a) acts or threats of force or violence towards the overthrow, destruction or weakening of constitutional government;
(b) acts or threats of violence of national concern, calculated to evoke extreme fear for the purpose of achieving a political objective;
(c) acts or threats of violence against the safety or security of any dignitary;
(d) violent behaviour within or between community groups.

Other directives specify and establish control for the maintenance of records.

OIS is subject to the scrutiny of an independent auditor (presently a retired senior member of the judiciary).

The Directions to the Commissioner of Police are published in the South Australian Government Gazette. They were last published at page 174-178 on 8 July 1999.

RURAL URBAN FORUMS

In reply to **Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (20 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Urban Development and Planning has provided the following information:

The State's Planning Strategy currently comprises two volumes one for Metropolitan Adelaide and the other for Country South Australia.

A third volume of the Planning Strategy is being prepared in recognition of the unique pressures being experienced by areas surrounding metropolitan Adelaide. The region, to be known as the Inner Region, arcs around metropolitan Adelaide north of the Gawler River extending to include the local government areas of Mallala, Light and Barossa; to the east of the Hills Face Zone extending to include the local government areas of Mount Barker and Adelaide Hills and south to Alexandrina, Victor Harbor and Yankalilla.

Ten years ago a number of communities in the Inner Region participated in comprehensive strategic planning process that resulted in the Barossa and Mount Lofty Ranges Strategic Plans. These Plans are highly regarded and are still used today. Ten years on, there is a need to revisit this earlier work from the perspective of current trends and opportunities

Action Plans are currently being prepared for four sub-regions (Northern Adelaide, Barossa, Central Hills, Southern Fleurieu) within the Inner Region to assist in informing the content of the Planning Strategy. The Action Plans will identify development opportunities, constraints and strategic directions to guide land use in the four areas. They will identify specific actions, and recommend timeframes and responsibilities for implementation.

The process of preparing the Action Plans has been a consultative one.

Over three hundred invitations to workshops were sent to local government, regional organisations and community and industry groups with an interest in the region. A series of workshops were held at Mallala, Angaston, Mount Barker and Victor Harbor in August this year. Each of the workshops was well attended, with 55 people attending the workshop at Mount Barker.

In addition, the opportunity was provided to stakeholders unable to attend or participate in the workshops to meet separately with the contractors.

Nominations were sought from those attending the workshops for their involvement in an on-going consultative process through membership of locally based review panels. Over 70 people nominated for the four review panels and participants attended a number of meetings held in Angaston, Hewitt, Stirling and Goolwa during September and November 2002.

The process of preparing the Action Plans will conclude this calendar year following targeted consultation currently being conducted with representatives of local government and regional development boards.

The Action Plans will be used to prepare a draft Planning Strategy for the Inner Region during the first half of next year. Preparation of the draft Planning Strategy will again involve consultation with key interest groups.

It is anticipated that in the second half of 2003 the government will consider the release of a draft Planning Strategy for the Inner Region for public consultation.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Hon. A.J. REDFORD** (13 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Treasurer has provided the following information:

Revenue from gaming machine taxation has been underestimated consistently. This is due to the difficulty in predicting when an expected levelling-off in gaming machine expenditure growth will occur. Net gaming revenue has increased on average by 11 per cent per annum over the last three years. This is well in excess of growth rates in consumer spending generally. Growth rates of this order are not considered to be sustainable in the long term.

Underestimation of the growth in gaming expenditure can mean a larger underestimation in taxation revenues because of bracket creep effects.

Treasury and Finance has undertaken additional modelling to better reflect the impact of bracket creep on forward estimates of gaming machine tax revenue but the main uncertainty continues to be how long gaming expenditure can continue to grow at levels in excess of average consumer spending. Treasury and Finance monitors gaming expenditure closely and takes into account the most current experience, both locally and in other States, in forming a view about future growth in gaming expenditure.

Gaming machine tax estimates in 2002-03 are also influenced by changes to tax rates announced in the 2002-03 State Budget and subsequently amended.

In relation to traffic infringement fines, revenue estimates are prepared by the Police Department rather than the Department of Treasury and Finance. Variations against budget reflect a variety of factors including the number of traffic infringements compared to budget and the impact of new speed detection equipment including speed cameras and red light cameras.

In reply to **Hon. CAROLINE SCHAEFER** (13 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Hon. Caroline Schaefer has asked about $2.9 million owed to the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (PIRSA) by the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation in relation to the transfer of the Sustainable Resources Group on 1 May 2002.

The payment is mainly in relation to net expenditure incurred by PIRSA on the Loxton Irrigation project for the 10 months prior to the transfer of this project to the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation.

While the payment has not yet been received, I can assure the council that this amount will be transferred to PIRSA when the accounting arrangements between the two agencies are finalised.

The Hon. Caroline Schaefer has also asked about the number of staff transferred from PIRSA to the Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation. I estimated that it was approximately 160 but I can now confirm that the figures based on the gazetted schedule are 168 staff transferred to the new department with 28 staff being retained in PIRSA.

WOMEN'S SAFETY

In reply to **Hon. DIANA LAIDLAW** (20 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Premier has provided the following information:

The Capital City Committee [which is chaired by the Premier and for which the Lord Mayor is deputy chair] continues to take the issue of safety in the city seriously as it has done for a number of years. Adelaide is a safe city but we need to ensure that this reputation is based in reality and is maintained.

The Capital City Committee established a Safe City Working Group in 2000 which has worked well to bring together key agencies in the city around safety and takes both a strategic and a practical approach to safety in the city.

The Safe City Working Group meets every two months and is chaired by Chief Superintendent Tom Osborn of the Adelaide Local Services Area. In addition to SA Police it includes the Adelaide City

council, Department of Human Services, Office of the Liquor Licensing Commissioner, and the Capital City Project Team.

The working group has taken a strong interest in safety of all people in the city and considered the recommendations of the Women in Adelaide—Women and safety report as an early priority. The report highlights that improving safety in the city is a complex issue requiring a range of actions at different levels from a range of city agencies. The Safe City Working Group has worked well to make sure that the range of actions which can contribute to a safe city are managed in a coordinated way.

Some examples of this work include:

The SA Police have undertaken a number of well publicised campaigns to support safety in the city (such as Operation City Safe etc) in the last two years which have a focus on a visible police presence, attention to behaviour around licensed premises and safety of all people in the CBD.

The Police have developed plans around licensed premises and work closely with the Liquor Licensing Commissioner. Given their recognition of the issue licensed premises the Police and Liquor Licensing make sure that these areas are well policed and that there are inspections to monitor adherence to licensing conditions.

The Police have developed an Alcohol Management Plan which is focused on proactively policing all aspects of alcohol related problems in the city including safety and behavioural offences. This includes a focus on licensed premises—the new Uniform Tactical Teams react in a timely way to any problems reported to the Police or identified by them.

The Adelaide City council has made a commitment to an urban design and lighting program to make sure that the city is well lit at night—a key concern highlighted in the Women and Safety report. Rundle Mall has additional closed circuit cameras installed, lighting has been improved in the Mall. The Adelaide City council has produced information about safety in the city for the public and has worked closely with the Police to address issues when they arise.

The Safe City Working Group has met with the Taxi Board and the Passenger Transport Board to discuss the important role taxi drivers play in contributing to a safe city. The location of taxi ranks has also been considered.

The Public Spaces, Public Life Report undertaken by Professor Jan Gehl—jointly commissioned by the government and the council—recommends actions to support a diverse, safe and lively city. The Capital City Committee has agreed to make the implementation of that report a standing item on its agenda. The Adelaide City council is ensuring that the recommendations inform any development work it undertakes in the public realm and there is also strong commitment from the Department of Transport and Urban Planning to supporting the recommendations through action. It is recognised that it will be important that these recommendations will be implemented consistently over a long period of time.

There is also a reference group established which includes WorkCover, Adelaide City council, Office of the Status of Women, Kidsafe, RAA, SA Police, Metropolitan Fire Service and the Adelaide Central Mission which is seeking accreditation for Adelaide as a Safe City under the World Health Organisation. The concept of a safe city extends beyond crime to encompass all aspects of community safety.

All of these arrangements are positive and will create a safer city but there will continue to be issues to manage.

The volume of people in the city, alcohol consumption, concentration of nightclubs and licensed premises in the city will inevitably lead to conflicts. This is why the Police and the Office for the Liquor Licensing Commissioner pay close attention to these areas.

Police statistics indicate that the majority of women who are seriously assaulted in the city are assaulted by people they know and most of these assaults occur within or in the vicinity of licensed premises. The incidence of stranger assaults on women has declined by over 50% since 2000 (there were 10 in 2001 and 2002 compared to 21 in 2000). The number of assaults by people known to the victim are around the same number as in 2000 (17 in 2002 compared to 16 in 2000).

This is why particular attention is being directed toward alcohol management and the role of licensed premises in creating a safe environment for all patrons and for people in the vicinity of these premises.

Nevertheless the reality is that the incidence of assaults on women is still low although this government believes that every act of violence is unacceptable.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Hon. M.J. ELLIOTT** and **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (13 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Deputy Premier and Treasurer, has provided the following information:

There has been a practice over recent years to defer distributions from the South Australian Asset Management Corporation (SAAMC) and the South Australian Financing Authority (SAFA) primarily to offset the deferral of agency expenditure as advised by government agencies. This has smoothed the budget bottom line.

The Auditor General's Report has not indicated anything different to what was published in the budget papers. The 2002-03 budget acknowledges that the level of dividends in the forward estimates for 2002-03 to 2005-06 is not sustainable. This has been a point that I as Treasurer have made in highlighting the budget position inherited from the former government.

The Auditor General has commented on the practice of the former government to manipulate transactions in order to achieve published estimated outcomes. This government has committed to an accrual fiscal target that from the end of the current parliamentary term, on average, results in zero net lending over any four year term.

POLICE RESPONSE TIMES

In reply to **Hon. J.F. STEFANI** (28 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Police has provided the following information:

1. When a person rings the triple zero emergency number they are directly connected to a Telstra Emergency Call taking centre based either in Sydney or Melbourne. The operator receiving the telephone call establishes the location/origin of the call and the emergency service required and then forwards that call to the appropriate emergency service centre to be dealt with.

S.A. Police receive these and other types of calls at the Police Communication Centre in Adelaide. The vast majority of these connections are answered efficiently within a benchmark standard of 15 seconds and the current average call answering time for '000' calls is seven seconds.

Occasionally police will receive a flood of calls, some of which are unable to be answered immediately and are placed in an automatic distribution queue. These calls will be prioritised automatically depending on the length of time the caller has been kept waiting and are forwarded to the next police emergency call taker as they become available. All emergency calls are recorded and answered as soon as possible but there are times when the demand for police contact exceeds the resources available to provide an immediate answering service.

2. The call to which the member refers was one of three which at that time was briefly queued while other '000' calls were answered. The complainant's call was given a higher priority whilst waiting and was the next presented at 7.04 a.m. on that evening (13 November 2002). It was answered by a Police Officer and complete details were taken from the caller concerning the incident at the Paralowie Shopping Centre, which were entered into the Computer Aided Despatch system. The despatch operator allocated the responding patrol which attended the scene at 7.25 p.m.

On reviewing the process it is acknowledged that the callers information and details could have been ascertained much more quickly by the answering officer than that which actually occurred. The officer concerned was a trainee within the Communications Branch and did not deal with the matter as expeditiously as normally accepted. One of the reasons for this was that there was significant background noise distraction caused by a number of people at the scene which made it hard for the police officer to hear the caller. The problem was also compounded by a lack of geographical knowledge of the area both by the caller and police officer and some effort was required in identifying the correct location of the incident.

During the course of the call it was ascertained that both the assailant and the victim had left the scene in different vehicles and because neither could be immediately located, the despatch was no longer considered as an emergency. As a result the incident was allocated a lesser priority level for police attendance.

Patrol activity in the Elizabeth Local Service Area was also intense at that time and this despatch priority was not as high as other matters being dealt with. When a response vehicle became available and was despatched, attendance at the scene occurred with 6 minutes and 25 seconds.

3. At no time during the emergency call conversation with police at the Communication Centre were firearms mentioned. The

information concerning the assault related to allegations of the use of an iron bar or possibly a baseball bat against a person and a motor vehicle. As previously advised both assailant and victim had left the scene in separate motor vehicles as the matter was being reported per telephone.

On arrival at the scene the officers were more concerned with finding the victim, who on prima facie information may have had injuries that needed immediate attention, and were less concerned with the assailant, knowing that this person could be identified through known motor vehicle registration details. This proved to be a correct approach as subsequent investigations resulted in one person being reported for various offences including assault.

GENETICALLY MODIFIED FISH

In reply to **Hon. IAN GILFILLAN** (27 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Further to my reply to the honourable member's remarks about Yellow tailed kingfish in the House on 27 November I would add that yellowtail kingfish that are bred in captivity are the offspring of captured wild broodfish that have undergone repeated spawnings. These fish, which breed naturally in South Australian waters, are therefore no different in genetic makeup to the offspring of the wild broodstock found naturally in the Spencer gulf. Thus any release of yellowtail kingfish, whilst unfortunate, has been limited and poses no risk of interfering with the natural genetic pool of the wild fish.

In reply to the honourable member's first question: There is currently no use of Genetically Modified Organisms in aquaculture in South Australia, a fact that can easily be checked by accessing the website of the Gene Technology Regulator.

While selective breeding is currently practised in the global aquaculture industry, the South Australian industry is still based on wild-caught broodstock. It is likely that selective breeding will be attempted locally at some point in the future. This is a logical extension of the farming process, and would be used to improve feed conversion efficiency, growth rates and to some degree disease resistance. Selective breeding has been used widely in terrestrial agriculture.

The basis of the honourable member's question appears to arise from an article in New Scientist, dealing with CSIRO research to genetically modify carp to produce male offspring, in an effort to control and reduce the carp population in inland waters, but not to create what he describes as fast-growing super fish. He should note that it is possible to create Atlantic salmon that are triploid, ie. with a three rather than the normal two sets of chromosomes, by methods that do not involve gene technology. While these fish do have an extra copy of the growth hormone gene (and of all other genes as well), their triploidy leaves them sterile—unable to breed.

In response to the honourable member's second question, I believe that the Gene Technology Act 2000 (Commonwealth), particularly as administered by Dr Sue Meek, is quite capable of effectively regulating the commercial use of GM fish, and is of course the primary regulatory mechanism in this country for that purpose.

In addition, under the terms of the Aquaculture Act 2001 (SA) there are a number of provisions that may be used to regulate the use of genetically modified fish within this State, including the rapid development of new government policy, introduction of specific operating standards and licence conditions, or even the prevention of the use of genetically modified fish where appropriate.

Amongst other things, Sec.52 provides for the conditions of an aquaculture licence to be varied by the Minister at any time by written notice to the licensee in order to mitigate risk of significant environmental harm, should, for example, and against government policy, an existing licensed site be stocked with genetically modified organisms, or should it be decided by the Minister that the farming of genetically modified organisms is to be prescribed, to change all current licence conditions to reflect that decision.

In response to the honourable member's third question, I would point out that as no work is yet under way to develop genetically modified fish for aquaculture in this State, it will be some considerable time yet before the necessary research and development can be undertaken and any licensing outcome determined by the Gene Technology Regulator. The government will continue to closely monitor the policy and regulatory aspects of all gene technology developments, and will prepare for GM aquaculture applications if and when it becomes necessary. In the meantime the government will direct its aquaculture resources to the priorities of the moment.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

In reply to **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (28 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I wish to advise from the outset that the specific FOI request to which the Leader of the Opposition refers to was received directly by PIRSA's FOI Coordinator on 7 August 2002. Accordingly, in line with established agency processes the FOI Coordinator acknowledged the application on 13 August.

As with all FOI requests received by PIRSA, the responsibility falls to 'accredited' agency officers to assess and determine applications as designated by the 'principal officer' (Chief Executive) as defined within the Freedom of Information Act 1991. This process and associated decision-making is clearly an agency responsibility that operates independently from the activities of my ministerial office. I am made aware of FOI issues as regular reporting of applications received is provided to the principal officer.

In relation to the Estimates Committee briefing notes, I understand that the FOI Coordinator did advise my Chief of Staff, via e-mail on 4 September 2002, of his determination. The provision of the advice was instigated by the FOI Coordinator and not at the request of my office. My office did not provide any response to the 4 September e-mail from the FOI Coordinator.

Notification of the formal determination and documentation details was forwarded to the Hon R I Lucas on 10 September 2002.

From time to time my office receives FOI requests directly and for the majority are transferred to PIRSA's FOI Coordinator pursuant to Section 16 of the Freedom of Information Act 1991.

As you would be aware, within the FOI legislation meaning of 'agency' also includes a Minister of the Crown as separate to an administrative unit under the Public Sector Management Act 1995. For this reason my office also has an accredited officer who has been designated to deal with FOI requests to information in the possession of my office and which relates to the operations of the agency for which I have responsibility. So far these requests have been in the minority and in any case PIRSA's FOI Coordinator provides the expertise and assistance to facilitate these.

DROUGHT RELIEF

In reply to **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY** (28 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Grains Research and Development Corporation (GRDC) is providing $496,000 to fund a three year Climate Risk Management Frost Project. This three year project, which commenced in July 2002, is part of a $1.8 million investment by GRDC in frost research and on ground management in SA, WA and Victoria. The SARDI Climate Risk Management Frost Project leader is Ms Melissa Truscott.

In frost prone regions such as the Murray Mallee of SA the risk of frost damage to crops has been increased with farmers having the capacity with improved machinery to sow a larger crop area faster and more efficiently. Crops sown at the same time will flower at the same time and are hence exposed to greater frost risk damage resulting in economic loss.

Management practices that reduce frost risk at flowering include delayed sowing, staggered sowing dates and crop variety diversity. Management practices that may increase temperature at canopy height include bare ground, row spacing and canopy management, increasing soil moisture and clay spreading. These options are economically viable depending upon the frequency and severity of frost, and the types of crops sown.

The project will utilise frost data, and decision support tools and models, to develop economically beneficial decision rules to manage frost, and test these on farm. A national project steering committee will coordinate and formulate a southern Australian approach for frost research. The steering committee comprises representatives from Departments of Primary Industries, research bodies, industry, universities, consultant agronomists and farmers.

The project will implement farm scale research in participation with grower groups in SA to evaluate the range of frost minimisation techniques. These techniques aim to maximise temperature at head height, by utilising the soil heat bank and altering the flow of cold air. Sites will be established at severe frost prone districts at Mintaro (Mid North), Sherwood (Upper South East, SA) supported by the Sherwood Cropping Group, and Lameroo (Southern Mallee), supported by the Southern Mallee Cropping Group.

The project will review frost predicting tools to formulate frost decision rules for managing frost on a paddock by paddock basis. The project outcomes will be economic and agronomic frost decision rules that include strategic decisions as well as tactical decisions once frost damage has occurred. These outcomes will be delivered

to the farming community across SA through a climate risk management fax back service, and climate risk management workshops.

The Premier's Drought Task Force recognised that severe frost damage to crops in the Murray Mallee in 2000 and 2001 reduced farmers' ability to prepare for and manage through the drought. For that reason they recommended that the government invest a relatively small amount of funding to collate and promote existing best practice tools for South Australian farmers.

The $50,000 of funding through the government drought assistance program will fund a 'tool kit' that will enable more farmers to develop improved strategies for managing frost than they would through the existing research project.

SCHOOLS, INDEPENDENT

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (14 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Education and Children's Services provided the following information.

1. This figure (known as the 'minimum enrolment requirement') was introduced by the previous government replacing the former 'New Schools Policy' formulated by the commonwealth government.

Provisional state funding—for a minimum of 10 students for each secondary year level in operation—is provided for the first three years of a school's operation at secondary level; continued funding is provided after that period if secondary enrolments have reached at least 20 students at each year level in operation.

On making application to offer secondary school levels of education a school will have provided a five year enrolment projection plan which the minister will have approved after receiving an assessment recommendation from the Ministerial Planning Committee for Non-government Schools. In almost every case, the school's enrolment projection plan would have indicated the achievement of the minimum enrolment requirement prior to the mid-year (August) census date in its third year of operation (the date at which an assessment is made of its likelihood to achieve continued state funding status).

2. The current minister has not exempted any schools from this criterion.

In past years an exemption may have been given in a few instances where the school in question was a school of a very special nature, serving a particular community or group of parents. Clause 7(g) of the Planning Policy provides for ministerial exemption from the minimum enrolment criterion where the proposal 'will serve the educational needs of a very small, but clearly identified community group.

3. Yes, the Ministerial Planning Policy provides for such consideration (clause 7(a)) which states:

A variation to the enrolment plan on which funding is based may be approved by the minister during the first five years of operation, on the basis of changed circumstances, following assessment by the Planning Committee of a submission from the school detailing the proposed changes and the reasons underlying them.

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

In reply to **Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (18 November and 19 November).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Industry and Investment has provided the following information:

The government has recently announced its restructure of the Office of Economic Development. A copy of the announcement is attached.

All senior positions within the Office of Economic Development and the Department of Business, Manufacturing and Trade will be filled as soon as possible.

MATERNAL ALIENATION PROJECT

In reply to **Hon. A.L. EVANS** (19 November).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Health has provided the following information:

1. The phenomenon of maternal alienation was identified as part of a study into the effects of domestic violence on children and their mothers.

A collaborative, action research project was carried out in 1999 by the Women';s Health Team of Northern Metropolitan Community Health Service and the University of Adelaide. The project first identified and named 'maternal alienation' as a powerful component of gendered violence, where men who perpetrate violence, whether domestic violence or child sexual abuse, can deliberately alienate children from their mothers.

The rationale for the research was that maternal alienation is a form of violence and abuse that was not previously well recognised or understood and which has implications for treatment and recovery from the experience of abuse. 'Maternal alienation' is a term to describe a specific behaviour used by fathers/male partners to alienate children from their mothers where there has been long domestic violence or child abuse. As a form of spousal abuse it usually predates separation or any proceedings before the Family Court.

The 1999 maternal alienation project has since been acclaimed nationally and internationally. In 2000 it received an Australian Violence Prevention Award, and it has been listed in the Best Practice Database on the Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse web-site.

DHS is currently supporting a six-month follow up project, based on the research carried out in 1999. This project builds on the previous research and aims to:

- develop and document models of good practice for working with mothers and children who have been alienated from one another in gendered violence;
- develop and document models of good practice for working with adult survivors of child sexual abuse, who have been trapped in familial relations of alienation:
- develop professional training for practitioners, including staff of Family and Youth Services (FAYS) and legal institutions, to bring about greater understandings of maternal alienation, to challenge the tendency for it to be replicated in mainstream organisations, and to enable practitioners to develop more appropriate responses to women and children who have been alienated.

The current project, launched on 30 September 2002, is also subject to rigorous review through its association with the University of Adelaide and the University of North London, where one of the world's most eminent researchers in this field Professor Liz Kelly, is supervising this project. Professor Kelly, Director of the Child and Women Abuse Studies Unit, University of North London, has strongly endorsed this project proposal, seeing the work on maternal alienation as new and exciting work on an emerging issue, and has arranged to become involved in a supervisory capacity.

The following for assessing project outcomes and benefits have been identified:

- greater knowledge of maternal alienation evident in service design and delivery, particularly in human services agencies or programs such as violence intervention programs, women's health centres, women's health statewide training programs, FAYS, and legal services;
- documented models of practice for working with mothers and children who have experienced maternal alienation;
- documented models of practice for working with adult survivors of child sexual abuse;
- decreased violence from young people participating in the project towards their mother and siblings;
- improved relationships between mothers and children participating in project;
- increased child protection through supporting mothers to protect and care for their children;
- decreased violence from young people participating in the project in their relationships;
- increased skills of professionals to respond more effectively to issues of maternal alienation;
- documented evaluated training modules.

2. The Maternal Alienation Project is a relatively new DHS project. Concepts from the project may be incorporated into DHS policies in the future. Policy challenges for DHS include ways to:

- respond at a public policy level in a holistic way to the intersection of 'forms of violence'—child abuse and domestic violence, rape and sexual assault and domestic violence;
- provide an opportunity for the analysis of the intersection of these forms of violence and consideration of paradigms that encompass holistic child and family violence interventions.

3. There are no clearly defined monies targeted specifically to address this issue, however there are funds allocated directly for the provision of services to men. Included in the monies identified are:

- DHS Men's Health budget $170,000
- Men's Information and Support Centre $4,700
- Wesley Uniting Mission Male Counselling $28,700
- St Vincent de Paul Emergency Night Shelter for Men $717,100

$200,000 has also been allocated for the Violence Intervention Program (VIP), with an equivalent contribution from the Attorney-General's Department for this joint initiative. The VIP is an example of a collaborative approach to supporting families in domestic violence, including men who use violence in their partner relationship.

The program has involved the development of a continuum of service responses that addresses not only the safety of women and children and male perpetrators taking responsibility for their violence, but also aspects from prevention, early intervention, criminal justice responses, crisis, recovery and rehabilitation.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES

In reply to **Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY** (17 October).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: The Minister for Environment and Conservation has advised that:

1. A regional impact statement has not been done because Crown Lands SA will not be closing its Murray Bridge office.
2. No office is being closed in Murray Bridge.

SCHOOLS, PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

In reply to **Hon. T.G. CAMERON** (24 October).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following information.

1. A range of tools are provided to parents and the wider community to assist in the understanding of various performance measures. For example, primary schools receive the Basic Skills Test (BST) and the Primary Writing Assessment results of their year 3 and 5 students and the State Literacy and Numeracy Test results of their year 7 students.

To assist in making comparisons between their school results and other available data each primary school receives information containing means, individual test items and like school data.

Additionally SSABSA provides a state-wide (including government and non-government schools) distribution of student attainment in the SACE and a like school model of comparative student attainment.

2. Yes. However it should be pointed out that in reference to Basic Skills Test results, the National Benchmarks published each year reference data gathered one or two years prior about a different cohort of students, meaning that they are much less relevant to an individual South Australian student than the state benchmarks, which refer to the current year's cohort. Parents generally want to know whether their child is progressing at an acceptable pace and how their child's attainment compares with that of other children (of the same age or circumstance, perhaps) In the case of Basic Skills Test results, parents are provided with their own child's results and are able to receive data about the test results of the child's school and compare with like school results.
3. The Department is currently investigating ways to do this.

TEACHERS, SHORTAGES

In reply to **Hon, SANDRA KANCK** (previously Hon M.J. Elliott) (23 October).

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: The Minister for Education and Children's Services has provided the following information:

This government has been able to negotiate with the Australian Education Union and CPSU/PSA a forward looking Enterprise Bargaining Agreement for the public education sector which is about more than rates of pay.

This was done promptly, without the protracted industrial upset that typified negotiations under the previous government. As the honourable member mentions, this Agreement delivers substantial benefits to education staff by way of working conditions.

Part of that benefit includes a significant increase for administration time. Neither the Government nor the unions involved have sought to codify teaching and non-teaching duties (as per the example given by the honourable member of the UK arrangement).

This government aims to treat teachers and school services officers as professionals. The prescription of teaching and non-teaching duties would not advance schools' abilities to meet the education or welfare needs of students.

The enterprise bargaining agreement provides for non-instruction teaching time across the schooling sector for all teachers. School Services Officers work across a wide variety of tasks in schools.

However, the deployment of staff in a school, and the duties undertaken by teachers and school services officers are decisions made locally by each school. This allows for the optimum use of staff resources to meet the educational and student welfare needs of the school community.

The demarcation of the activities in a school as teaching and non-teaching would work against the effective cooperation between employees and the professionalism of both teachers and school services officers.

PRISONS, DRUG USE

In reply to **Hon. R.D. LAWSON** (3 December).

The Hon. T.G. ROBERTS: I advise the following:

Drug and alcohol courses for prisoners continue to be run as they were before the abolition of the therapeutic drug unit (Operation Challenge).

These courses are focussed on offending behaviour and based on harm minimisation principles. There are currently six programs, and prisoners attend according to their need.

There are two Brief Intervention programs—one for alcohol, and the other for drugs other than alcohol. These programs focus specifically on harm minimisation.

A Six-Week Alcohol and Other Drug Program provides therapeutic intervention for prisoners who have an alcohol or other drug related offence. This is supported by the Relapse Prevention Program, which assists offenders who are at risk of reverting to harmful alcohol or drug use.

Ending Offending (Alcohol Drugs and Crime) is an educational program to help younger offenders modify their drinking and/or drug use and offending behaviour.

Aboriginal Ending offending is similar, but targets Aboriginal offenders whose offending was alcohol related.

Between 1 July 2002 and 31 December 2002, 293 prisoners undertook these courses.

The methadone program is now known as the Prisoner Opioid Substitution Program. It is available to those entering the prison system who are already on a program in the community, and those who are assessed as opioid dependent at any time while they are in custody.

The aim of the program is to reduce the harms of injecting drug use. The Prison-based Methadone Maintenance Program commenced in January 1999.

Prior to this there was a limited reducing regimen for those on community programs prior to imprisonment, and maintenance available for pregnant women and for those who were HIV positive.

There are currently 147 prisoners on the program.

Total funding is currently $513,000 per annum, but this has been increased by $810,00 per annum as a result of funds allocated as an outcome of the Drug Summit recommendations.

The additional funds will become available from 1 January 2003.

In relation to the supplementary asked by Hon T.G Cameron the Minister for Health has advised the following:

Addiction, or drug dependence, is a complex condition which combines physical, psychological and social dimensions.

A widely accepted definition of drug dependence can be summarised as follows:

> A maladaptive pattern of substance use, leading to significant impairment or distress as manifested by three or more of the following in a period of 12 months:
>
> 1. Tolerance—the need for larger amounts of the substance to achieve the same effect, or markedly diminished effect with continued use of the same amount of the substance;
> 2. Withdrawal—characteristic syndrome present upon cessation of the substance, or the substance is taken to relieve withdrawal symptoms;
> 3. The substance is taken in larger amounts or over a longer period than was intended;
> 4. Persistent desire or unsuccessful efforts to cut down or control substance use;
> 5. A great deal of time is spent in activities necessary to obtain or use the substance, or recover from its effects;
> 6. Important social, occupational or recreational activities are given up or reduced because of substance use;
> 7. Continuation of substance use despite knowledge of having a persistent or recurrent physical or psychological problem that is likely to have been caused or exacerbated by the substance.

Both methadone and heroin are classed as opioid drugs as they produce a response in the body similar to the drug morphine. Mor-

phine use may result in addiction or drug dependence consistent with the above definition.

A significant difference between heroin and methadone is that heroin is typically injected, while methadone is typically administered orally. The consequence of this is that methadone is associated with less rewarding effects as the rate of onset of effects is slower and the peak effect is lower. This helps to reduce the 'addictive' properties of methadone, relative to heroin.

Methadone can be legally prescribed in the context of treatment for opioid dependence. This reduces the amount of time opioid dependent people spend in obtaining and using opioid drugs, enabling greater time to be given to social, occupational and recreational activities. The legal provision of methadone also enables these people to break away from criminal connections used to obtain heroin, which unlike methadone, is not legally sanctioned in any circumstances.

Following a period of sustained use of either heroin or methadone, cessation is associated with a withdrawal syndrome. The symptoms of methadone withdrawal are milder, but more prolonged, than the symptoms of heroin withdrawal. Many opioid dependent people find the prolonged nature of methadone withdrawal makes it more difficult to tolerate than heroin withdrawal.

Opioid dependent people can be stabilised on a regular dose of methadone, and methadone prescribed as a single daily oral dose in the context of a maintenance treatment program is associated with a number of benefits compared to illicit heroin use. These benefits include a reduced risk of overdose, reduced use of illicit drugs, reduced injecting drug use, reduced criminal behaviour, improved physical health and improved social functioning. On this basis methadone in the context of maintenance treatment is considerably less harmful to the opioid dependent individual and society than heroin.

Of all the treatment modalities for opioid dependence, methadone maintenance is the approach that has been the subject of the most research. This research evidence clearly demonstrates the effectiveness of methadone maintenance, as has been concluded by a systematic international review, and by the National Evaluation of Pharmacotherapies for Opioid Dependence (NEPOD) recently undertaken in Australia.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.58 p.m. the council adjourned until Wednesday 19 March at 10 a.m.