

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 17 February 2005

The **SPEAKER (Hon. I.P. Lewis)** took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

TSUNAMI AND EYRE PENINSULA BUSHFIRES

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I move:

That this house acknowledges the great contribution of many hundreds of South Australian public servants, health professionals, police and fire officers who provided invaluable assistance, both at home and abroad, in the provision of emergency relief and aid to victims of the recent Asian tsunami, and the disastrous Eyre Peninsula bushfires.

In moving this motion today, I wish to pay tribute to the very real courage of many hundreds of South Australian public servants who assisted in so many ways in the tsunami relief efforts. In my contribution to the debate on the Premier's condolence motion in relation to the Eyre Peninsula bushfire last week, I said that was one of those situations where we will always remember where we were and what we were doing as news of the fire broke. I am sure members would be hard pressed to find anyone who does not know what they were doing as the terrible news of the tsunami broke on Boxing Day 2004.

I am sure we all felt the same amazement as the news filtered through, firstly, of maybe 10 000 deaths, then thousands more, then hundreds of thousands—incomprehensible numbers of people killed: mothers, fathers, brothers, sisters, sons, daughters, babies, grandmas, grandpas, families wiped out, communities wiped out; and, in some areas, nearly their entire next generation gone, locals gone, holiday-makers gone, homes and businesses gone—all of it quite incomprehensible. The events of Boxing Day 2004, like September 11, transcended the boundaries of nations, wiped away our religious and cultural differences and removed the divide of skin colour. They reduced us all, as it should be, to people caring for each other.

It highlighted our sameness, not our differences. I am sure there was not a mother anywhere who did not shed tears for the mothers of Aceh, Sri Lanka, India and Thailand who lost their children. I am sure there was not a mother anywhere who did not shed tears when that tiny 18-month old baby was found floating on a mattress some two days after the tsunami. This time tears of joy that, above all, miracles and great hope survive above all else. Our news services are constantly full of tragic events. I think sometimes we become immune to them, but every now and again something such as this happens and we are reminded of how lucky we are; how our own sometimes selfish wants are just that. We are reminded of what is really important—and that is clearly our loved ones.

We are reminded of our place in the world. I guess it is a perverse sort of comfort that, with the upheaval which occurs daily, we can still be moved. Our state's public servants from many disciplines and in many ways responded to the devastation in real and practical ways which made a difference. A call went out for public servants who could assist the Red Cross at its call centre. They needed people to help take the calls from those wanting to donate to their emergency fund. Within an hour, over 400 people had answered that call—400. I visited the call centre with the Premier and spoke with those public servant volunteers who were on holiday or days

off, but who so badly wanted to do something practical to help. It was their way of managing their grief and of saying to those people who they would never know and never meet, 'We care about you.'

Their generosity was quite amazing, but not surprising. Their generosity and preparedness to give is a hallmark of our community, where daily we see people willing to give of themselves and to give their time to make our community better. Public servants volunteer in many ways, but these were exceptional circumstances and their efforts were by any measure outstanding. The call centre operated from 6 a.m. to midnight over a two-week period and took credit card donations of approximately \$4 million. During our visit, the Red Cross could not express strongly enough its appreciation of the efforts of our state's public servants—those who volunteered at the call centre, those who helped with the data entry and those who worked at fundraising events—over 1 000 new volunteers assisting the Red Cross: something those involved can be truly proud of.

Within 48 hours of the request being received, 23 people—a team leader, four surgeons, four anaesthetists, eight operating room nurses, an emergency physician, a paediatric infectious diseases physician, an emergency nurse, two paramedics and a fire service officer—left Adelaide for Banda Aceh where they undertook nearly 200 surgical procedures. They performed major craniofacial procedures, orthopaedic reconstruction, and skin grafting of extensive wounds to arms, legs and other parts of people's bodies. They did this in circumstances which I am sure none of them ever imagined.

Surrounded by the most despairing devastation, they worked to establish a functioning hospital. They worked without anaesthetic machines and without anaesthetic gasses. They had no running water; sometimes they had power, sometimes not; and, as members can imagine, major problems with hygiene and cleanliness. They stayed 14 days caring for the people of Banda Aceh. I was privileged, along with the Premier and Minister for Health, to welcome these people home upon their return. The excitement on the faces of the children as they saw their mum or dad coming through the arrivals passage was a joy to behold, as was the love and pride on the faces of their family members waiting to take them back into their arms.

A team of two scientists and a microbiologist also provided critical assistance in Aceh. They took with them the supplies and equipment needed to establish a microbiology laboratory. This was vitally important in the testing of water for safe consumption, the control of infectious disease, the diagnosis of malaria, dengue fever and pneumonia, as well as treatment of wound infections. Their work was life-saving work.

Our South Australian police also made a major contribution, working with the Australian Federal Police in their Missing Person's Unit within the forensic major incident room in Canberra, initially with the primary responsibility for the investigation of South Australians listed as missing, as well as assisting the overall management of inquires concerning Australians. Five officers were also deployed to Phuket, where they worked from the mortuary—fingerprinting victims, photographing and recording victims and their identifiable features. We know that police officers often have to perform tasks that involve distressing situations. Like doctors, nurses and ambulance officers, they are trained to perform their duties in situations most of us would never encounter and never want to encounter.

I venture to say, however, that no amount of training, no level of experience, could prepare or steel anyone against the level of grievance and despair these people faced. I cannot help wondering what would keep you going in a situation like this. I venture to say that these were circumstances where people showed real courage and bravery. I am sure they were helped by the knowledge that they were helping so many loved ones at least have the comfort of finding their family member. Many police officers have also been working with families at home to help locate and identify missing persons.

As I said in my opening remarks last week, this has been one of the most bewildering Christmas/new year periods I can ever remember. Our entire community responded in the most magnificent way to both the tsunami relief effort and the West Coast bushfire through their volunteering efforts and donations. There is little doubt that we are at our best in times of crisis. My reason for putting this motion to the house is to honour the many hundreds of public servants for their magnificent efforts. We need to remember that our public servants are not separate entities within our community. They are very much a part of our community and their efforts throughout this disaster and the Eyre Peninsula bushfires are real examples of just how much a part they are, how skilled they are, how professional they are, how much they are in times of need prepared to sacrifice and how generous they are. It is important to remember we would not have coped as well as we did without their efforts and their commitment.

Some might argue, or level a tiny amount of criticism, that this was not a useful exercise in parliamentary procedure but rather a time-wasting exercise. I make no apology at all for putting this matter to the house. I know of no-one more deserving of commendation and I am sure those assisted by our medical and scientific personnel, police and fire officers, would agree, as would those ably assisted on the West Coast. We had of course our wonderful emergency service volunteers over there on the ground risking their lives, but we also had police, paid staff in the SES and CFS, and SA Ambulance managing critical issues at the height of the crisis and beyond.

Our health services swung into action with the Port Lincoln Health Service providing immediate medical assistance, counselling and support. The Eyre Regional Health Service, including its mental health team, provided trauma counselling. The Tumby Bay Hospital and the Cummins District Memorial Hospital provided clinical care, mental health services, emergency and disaster response.

Agencies outside the area also assisted with assessment, counselling and support, namely: nursing staff from Noarlunga Health Service, Port Augusta Mental Health Services, Rural and Remote Mental Health Services, Children, Youth and Women's Health Service, Northern and Far Western councillors and the western ASIS team. We had DAIS staff providing on the ground support that ensured basic but vital equipment was available, from cars to generators to portaloos. Housing Trust officers and CIFs officers were working above and beyond the call of duty to ensure the suffering being endured was minimised as much as possible. PIRSA staff slept in swags in the local office, only to be up again at the crack of dawn to carry on with one of the most awful tasks: that of destroying injured livestock.

People from SA Water and ETSA, while no longer part of the Public Service per se, performed a great public service. I have received the most glowing reports of their efforts in restoring essential services to this region, working to exhaustion levels. These people not only gave of their skills

but of themselves. Those public servants who responded to the tsunami relief and assisted residents of the West Coast are deserving of our admiration and appreciation.

I would very much like to record the names of all these wonderful people, but there are so many it is just impossible. I have done my best to acknowledge all the organisations involved and I apologise if I have omitted anyone. The families of public servants involved in these disasters are also deserving of our great appreciation. It is often the most difficult of tasks to try to maintain normality in your home for your children while worried about the safety of a loved one. It is distressing for children to be without their mum or dad, and the aftermath can also be a difficult time for all. These people have, in each their own way, done themselves proud. They have done their families proud and they did our state proud. This is one small way we in this house can show our appreciation and thanks and I urge all members to support this motion.

The SPEAKER: I take it that the honourable member seeks leave of the house to amend her motion to include at the end of her motion, after the words 'the recent Asian tsunami' the words 'and the disastrous Eyre Peninsula bushfires'.

Ms RANKINE: I would be very pleased to do that, sir. Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: Without wanting to impair anyone's ability to contribute to the debate, is there any opposition to the proposition? There being none, and that is acknowledged by the chair and on the record now, a way of dealing with this is to simply put the proposition and move on without it detracting from the way in which honourable members support the proposal. Unless anyone objects to that course of action, I will put the question.

Motion carried.

RING CYCLE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I move:

That this house congratulates the State Opera of South Australia for its outstanding production of *Der Ring des Nibelungen* by Richard Wagner and, in particular, General Director—Stephen Phillips, Corporate Sponsor—United Utilities Australia, Conductor—Asher Fisch, Director—Elke Neidhardt, Set Designer—Michael Scott-Mitchell, Lighting Designer & Associate Set Designer—Nick Schlieper, Costume Designer—Stephen Curtis, the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra, and all of the artists, performers, crew and donors for their contribution to the success of this production.

In moving this motion I draw to the attention of the house the outstanding success of the State Opera company in its production of the internationally acclaimed Wagner's *Ring* cycle. I do so because I think it is very important for the state parliament to acknowledge major accomplishments by our arts bodies—as indeed by sporting bodies and business entities and all those enterprises that spring from this fabulous state. This particular achievement was something of not only state and national significance but also, as I have said, of international significance, and it warrants particular note.

The *Ring* is indeed the Mount Everest of opera. It is the pinnacle and perhaps the greatest achievement to which an opera company can aspire. The costs in this particular case (and I will come back to this later) were in the vicinity of \$15 million and tickets sold for anything up to \$1 500 each. People came from all around the world to see this performance and were prepared to pay comfortably to do so, knowing that they were seeing something of an international standard.

It had a cast of 49 principal roles and a chorus comprising around 70 people. In this production, in particular, there were

about 50 extras, including a bountiful range of children and other actors drawn mainly from the local acting and performing communities. The Adelaide Symphony Orchestra expanded its number of players from 75 to 120 for the production, and it was indeed an epic for the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra as well. Cycle One took place between 16 and 22 November; then the cycle was repeated from 26 November to 2 December; and then of course the third cycle took place between 6 and 12 December.

The well-known and acclaimed international correspondent for the *Times* and the *Wall Street Journal* in Europe, Mr Paul Levy (who is, coincidentally, writing a book on Wagner's *Ring* cycle), was in Adelaide for the performance and he said:

It is quite clear to me that this was a world class production. *Das Rheingold* was a good start but when *Die Walküre* came along you certainly saw the purpose of the set. This grand, expensive gesture really pulled the whole thing into focus. Then the performances were simply wonderful.

Those sorts of accolades were repeated in the national and international press. I note *The Advertiser* on 16 December in an editorial strongly acclaimed the accomplishment and commended the opera company for its fabulous achievement. Of course, local arts writers writing in *The Advertiser* underpinned the point, extensively praising the production. I noted commentary in *The Australian* and *Financial Review*, and on the national electronic media (both radio and television), all acclaiming this as perhaps one of the best-ever performances of Wagner's *Ring*. Really, as I said, it is an accomplishment of which we should all be proud.

These accomplishments are not achieved easily. They require a talented group of people; they require sponsors; and they require an outstanding management team. I begin by particularly commending, as my motion states, Mr Stephen Phillips, the General Director of State Opera, for his outstanding leadership throughout the preparation and performance of Wagner's *Ring*. It was, indeed, the first performance of the *Ring* wholly created in Australia. Members might remember we earlier performed the *Ring* and presented a production but, of course, it was a production from overseas that we reinvented here. This was indeed something of our own creation. That cannot be done without firm and outstanding leadership, and that was certainly provided by Stephen. Of course, he was supported by the State Opera Board, Arts SA and the Major Performing Arts Board of the Australia Council which all helped to guide the company through these sometimes difficult times, as I will mention shortly, to achieve such an outstanding outcome.

Of course, corporate sponsors, and Graham Dooley, the Managing Director of United Utilities Australia, being at the head of that group of sponsors, are also to be commended. I commend also not only the corporate sponsors but also, of course, all the individual sponsors of the corporate program and the various categories (such as Gold, Swords, Spear, Valhalla, Magic Fire and so on). All made donations or contributed in one way or another to ensuring this outstanding achievement was brought to the stage.

I should also mention the conductor, Asher Fisch. He did an outstanding job. The Adelaide production of the *Ring* was Wagner's *Lohengrin*. Choreographically, it is also the last opera Wagner composed before turning to work on what became *Der Ring des Nibelungen*. The accompaniment was simply fantastic. The director, Elke Neidhardt, did an outstanding job and, of course, then you have people such as Michael Scott-Mitchell, the set designer. These sets were

unbelievable. The water curtain, the fire effects and all of the stage adornments were world class and, arguably, according to some of those Wagnerites who attended from around the world, the best that have ever been.

Nick Schlieper was the lighting designer and associate set designer and Stephen Curtis the costume designer. The costumes were brilliant, and sometimes brilliant in their simplicity and their refreshing style. Jennifer Barnes, John Brocheler (who played a fantastic Wotan), Andrew Brunson, Elizabeth Campbell, Joanna Cole and Andrew Collis—and I could go on and run through the whole of the cast—all brought it altogether and made it come alive on stage. All of them, and I cannot go through them all, were simply a brilliant combination of overseas and Australian talent. The chorus, as I have mentioned, are too numerous to name.

Then there are the conductors: the guest conductor Nicholas Braithwaite and the guest coach and rehearsal conductor Sharolyn Kimmorley. All these people need to be sent a message from this parliament—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The Attorney interjects and shows his ignorance. If he wants to make a contribution he should stand up and make one. We would be delighted to hear it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I particularly want to mention the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra. The violins, violas and cellos, all the groups that expanded specifically for this production, were to be commended. The ASO has had some difficult times and some funding problems. It has had some difficult patches, particularly in the last couple of years, but to be able to come together and support this production of Wagner's *Ring* in the way they did before an international audience attests to the quality of the ASO. Both these companies are iconic institutions in this state and they warrant funding, Treasurer.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: More money: I knew it was coming from somewhere!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The Treasurer is waving his hands in the air, going 'Oh my God, more commitments'. But they do warrant funding. It is almost impossible to imagine—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house has shown courtesy so far this morning, until the arrival of the Attorney-General and the Deputy Premier, of hearing the contributions in silence.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: I have been here from the start, sir. I have been here from the kick-off.

The SPEAKER: If the Attorney implies that we should ascribe the responsibility for the disruption to the Deputy Premier entirely, that is a matter for him, not me. I make the point that such motions are an important part of what we do to inspire the pursuit of excellence amongst those people in South Australia's community who make our state a much better place in consequence and that, in the process of doing so, one outline of that by the mover is probably adequate in the event that no member dissents from the proposition.

We have already done that once this morning and it may be a way of saving a lot of time and enabling us to get through more of the material awaiting debate on the private members' *Notice Paper*. However, by disrupting in a disorderly manner through interjecting on the proposer of the motion, the only result achieved is to make it mandatory, almost, in the minds of those who have had their thoughts

stirred and disrupted in the process of the proposition being put, to respond; and that takes up more time than would otherwise ever have been prudent or necessary to get the message across. The honourable member for Waite has the call.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The Attorney shows his lack of interest and commitment—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will simply stick to the subject.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: The production was not without its controversies. The question of funding for the *Ring* Cycle was the subject of comment in the Auditor-General's Report and also the subject of inquiry by me of the government in June and at other times in 2004, because the minister responsible for the *Ring* was the Premier, as Minister for the Arts. During his period at the helm of the budget and management of State Opera and the *Ring*, things went off track, leading to a budget blowout in the vicinity of \$4 million in the financial provision for the event. The original budget was around \$11 million and the final outcome was in excess of \$15 million.

When that was brought to light, I note that the Premier very promptly flicked responsibility for State Opera and the *Ring* to the Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts who, from his answers to questions in June, did not seem very happy with the sudden arrival of that responsibility in his portfolio office. It was another example of where, when it is good news, the Premier as Minister for the Arts wants to be there announcing it, and the minute there is any problem it gets flicked off to some other minister to wear the odium for what went wrong. I think that everyone now in retrospect believes that it was a good investment. Clearly, there was an overspend, and a significant overspend.

The message I would give to the government is that the government must take responsibility for financial management of the arts portfolio and must take responsibility for ensuring that budgets are adhered to. The time for discovering whether or not the budget of \$11 million was adequate was back in 2002 when this government came to office, not in the middle of 2004, some time later, when it suddenly had to come to the parliament and reveal a massive multimillion dollar budget blowout, which then, of course, regrettably, caused some negative publicity, which all could have been avoided if the government had got its sums right in the beginning.

It is not the problem of State Opera, which will naturally want to do the best job possible and, of course, will want to go and spend to ensure that that is delivered. And I commend it for that. However, it is the job of government to manage the purse strings, and something went wrong on this occasion. What I want to ensure now is that State Opera is not punished for this overspend. It would be regrettable if, for the next year to two years—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Waite will need to restrict his remarks to the proposition he has on the *Notice Paper* rather than wander off into a criticism of the government, which is not part of the proposition he puts to the chamber.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Very well, sir. I am referring to our capabilities to perform productions such as the *Ring*. As I have said, this *Ring* cycle was, indeed, an internationally successful event. I have congratulated the people who put it on. I am now saying that we need to build on that success. There has been discussion about where to go with the *Ring* cycle now—whether or not it should be performed again in

a few years; whether or not this same talented group of people could give us another production using the same infrastructure they have now; or whether it should simply be boxed up and left in a warehouse, perhaps sold off under licence to someone else, sent overseas, or whatever. But I think there is a challenge now: how do we build on this success? There is no question that it resulted in a considerable inflow—

The SPEAKER: Notwithstanding the desire of the member for Waite to canvass that, it would have been competent for him to give notice of his wish by leave to extend his motion to include the opportunity to canvass it. Without doing so, I will rule it out of order.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: There is nothing in the motion, may I point out to the member for Waite, which enables him to address the question of fiscal responsibility.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Mr Speaker, of course your ruling is right, but I understand that the practice during private members' time has been to give members a little flexibility, while addressing their remarks to the substance of the motion, to explore issues that link to the motion. Certainly, that has been the practice in my time here. Almost every motion that has been put in private members' time—

Time expired.

The SPEAKER: Is there any dissent from the proposition of the motion?

Mr SNELLING (Playford): I am standing, sir, seeking the call. I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I invite the member for Waite and the Attorney-General to slip out into the corridor and have a sip out of a cold water bag.

Mr BRINDAL: Sir, I rise on a point of order. Before the movement of the adjournment, I thought I heard you ask whether there was any contrary view to the previous motion. I simply seek your guidance. If no contrary view was forthcoming, why was the matter not just put?

The SPEAKER: The chair was merely attempting to help the chamber—all honourable members in the house then—to resolve the matter and place their unanimous support. If there is no dissent, it means that support is unanimous. Now that the matter is to be adjourned, we will invariably take up a minute or so every time it is called on, and I see no benefit arising from doing so. That is my subjective opinion—and you will note that I used the words 'I' and 'my', the first person pronoun, and not 'the chair'. It is the chair's desire to assist in clearing the *Notice Paper*. So, the chair will shut up and let the house proceed with its *Notice Paper*.

Mr SNELLING secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOLIK, Ms A. AND HEWITT, Mr L.

Mr CAICA (Colton): I move:

That this house congratulates former South Australian Sports Institute scholarship holders Alicia Molik and Lleyton Hewitt on their outstanding performances at the Australian Tennis Open last month.

South Australia enjoyed outstanding success at the 2005 Australian Open at Melbourne Park, when 24-year-old Alicia Molik won her first Grand Slam title with Russian partner Svetlana Kuznetsova when they defeated Americans Lindsay Davenport and Corina Moriau in the women's doubles final

of the Centenary Australian Open. Alicia is a former South Australian Sports Institute scholarship holder and, with Kuznetsova, they made a formidable pair and played solidly in the final to defeat the Americans in straight sets.

Prior to the Australian Open, Molik was ranked number 13 in the world. Her strong performance in the doubles final and her impressive victory over former world number one player Venus Williams in the fourth round confirms that she is the player that Tennis Australia has been seeking for most of the open era, because she possesses the ability and temperament to be competitive against the world's best.

Following her victory over Williams, Alicia became the first Australian in 17 years through to the quarter finals in the Australian Open women's singles. Although Alicia was unable to defeat the world's number one woman player, Lindsay Davenport, her success in the open lifted her ranking to number 10 in the world, a ranking achieved for the first time.

I would also like to congratulate South Australian tennis great Lleyton Hewitt on reaching the 2005 Australian Open final for the first time. Although a past US Open champion and Wimbledon winner, I understand that Hewitt had not previously advanced beyond the fourth round of the Australian Open. The strong Russian player, Marat Safin, triumphed on the day. However, I am sure the house will agree that Hewitt had wonderful championships, particularly with regard to his outstanding five-set victories over Spaniard Rafael Nadal and Argentinian David Nalbandian. Throughout his career Lleyton has demonstrated the heights that are achievable through sport. Also a former SA Sports Institute scholarship holder, his consistent determination and persistence in his chosen sport continue to ensure that he makes an impact on the local, national and world sporting scene.

One does not just become a tennis champion, of course. Great tennis players do not become great unless their careers are built on a strong foundation. All great tennis players—in fact, all great sports persons—were once young children hitting tennis ball after tennis ball, soccer ball after soccer ball or shooting hoop after hoop at their local clubs, benefiting from the structures fundamental to any good sporting club: the provision of good coaching, good competition and a sound and supportive administration.

Both Alicia Molik and Lleyton Hewitt were provided that foundation through their association with the Seaside Tennis Club. It may be of interest to members that another great South Australian tennis player, Darren Cahill, played his junior tennis at Seaside and, obviously, like Alicia and Lleyton, benefited from his association with that outstanding club. The Seaside Tennis Club was established at Grange in the early 1930s and moved to its current location at Cudmore Terrace, Henley Beach, many years ago. It originally had eight courts and built up to the 12 courts that it now provides.

The club has approximately 200 junior players, as well as fielding both senior men's and women's teams. I am told that many of the junior players also represent the club in the senior competition. I have been informed that, since the success of Alicia and Lleyton, the phones have been ringing off the hook with youngsters and their parents inquiring about joining. I expect that this is not a situation unique to the Seaside Tennis Club, that is, it would be a safe bet that the phones have been running hot at Henley South Tennis Club, indeed, all local tennis clubs.

That is one of the positive consequences of the ongoing success of both Molik and Hewitt. It inspires young people to take an interest in tennis and explore their potential. Of

course, not all young tennis players can grow into champions; in fact, very few will. However, if nothing else, the young aspiring tennis players at Seaside (or any other local sporting club) will be left with an appreciation of the great game and a level of skill and fitness that they can take with them beyond their youth. As I mentioned earlier, sporting clubs such as the Seaside Tennis Club provide first-class junior coaching, instil in its players a proper sporting ethos, while ensuring that there is access to competition at an appropriate level. However, none of this can be achieved without a sound club administration.

Seaside Tennis Club, like all clubs of a similar ilk, has such an administration. It is this as much as anything else that has underpinned the success of the Seaside Tennis Club. In this regard, I would like to mention just a few of the many who deserve recognition: Club Secretary Margaret Nash and President Sue Yeats head up an administration that has and continues to lead this club with distinction. Following in the footsteps of those club volunteers who came before them, such as club legend Vic Hastwell to name but one, their focus is on juniors and, in this regard, the future of Seaside looks positive. Given Seaside's record, this can only be a good thing for Australian tennis.

However, Seaside Tennis Club, like many local sporting clubs, struggles to make ends meet. The costs involved with running such a club, maintaining and improving facilities is always a struggle. I hope that Lleyton might consider this fact when reflecting on how far he has travelled, and recognise that it was Seaside and the local tennis scene that were major factors contributing to his success. I hope that he and Alicia, as she continues to find the success that she surely will, and starts to earn serious money, will put something back into Seaside in the support of junior tennis so that a future batch of Lleyton Hewitts or Alicia Moliks can be nurtured and developed. I commend the motion to the house.

Time expired.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I rise to support the member for Colton in his motion, and to express my support of the excellent sports people that are these two young people, Alicia Molik and Lleyton Hewitt. Lleyton Hewitt reminds me so much of Jimmy Connors in his early days, when I remember watching Wimbledon at very early hours in the morning, and seeing that same thrust of the fist up to charge himself on and to get his concentration to a greater level, and to eventually, hopefully, win Wimbledon which, of course, he did. Lleyton's actions and his level of determination and concentration remind me so much of Connors.

Connors was not a large framed man either, and I think that is where Lleyton's achievements in tennis go far beyond his physique. It just shows how determined this young man is to get to the top and to win, and we can only admire him for that. Many of Lleyton Hewitt's critics, I believe, have obviously not played the game, as many of us have, and realise that the sort of actions that he undertakes on court are purely an effort to increase his concentration and to boost the intensity with which he plays—they are not directed at any of his opponents. Those who criticise him for that, I think, are quite wrong and, as I say, obviously do not have much knowledge or have not played the game.

Similarly, with Alicia Molik, I guess we could say that she is one who is now starting to bloom after a number of years. How great it is to see that it is a female South Australian who is getting to the top and leading the charge of women's tennis around Australia. I think that her efforts over the past 12

months have been outstanding. I am sure that the confidence she has gained over that period of time will take her into 2005, and we will see far greater things than we have in the past, given the knowledge that she can now perform at that level, beat the best, and have self-belief in her own tennis. It always takes a very good club to foster junior tennis, supply the coaching, and to nurture young people who are very keen on tennis through into senior tennis and then onto the world stage.

Obviously, this club does an exceptional job, and that should also be congratulated. With those few words, I again congratulate Lleyton and Alicia. I think they are excellent South Australians, and we can be very proud of them. They are great tennis players, and I am sure we will see a lot more of them in the future.

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I briefly want to say that I support the motion, and I must confess that I was absolutely glued to the TV, along with Bob, during the whole series of matches—

Mr Caica: That must have been painful.

Mrs GERAGHTY: It was, actually. I found myself being quite stressed and full of anxiety during the matches, but, as I said, I thoroughly enjoyed it. Alicia and Lleyton played with great skill, and I actually think they brought a great deal excitement to the game. My only disappointment was with a number of the line calls, but I am sure that, hopefully, those things will be rectified. I did thoroughly enjoy it, along with thousands of others, and I am sure we are all very proud of these two fine young people.

Motion carried.

BANGKA DAY MEMORIAL SERVICE

Mrs HALL (Morialta): I move:

- (a) that this house recognises the 63rd anniversary of the Bangka Straits massacre on 16 February 1942;
- (b) pays tribute to the work and commitment of the South Australian Women's Memorial Playing Fields Trust in honouring the memory of the Australian nurses killed in the Bangka Straits; and
- (c) acknowledges the Bangka Day Memorial Service held on 13 February 2005 at the St Mary's playing fields.

In moving this motion I acknowledge the cooperation of a number of my colleagues on both sides of the chamber who have agreed to postpone their motions to enable this motion to be put today given the proximity of the dates and the significance of the anniversary. As many would know, on the closest Sunday to 16 February each year the Bangka Day Memorial Service is held to honour the memory of the Australian nurses who were killed on Bangka Island on 16 February 1942.

History shows, and I guess we have all seen and heard, many of the stories of the 22 Australian nurses who were machine-gunned by Japanese troops after being ordered to walk into the waters off the island. The Australian Army Nursing Service was one of only two women's services that were active at the outbreak of World War II in 1939. There were some 13 000 trained nurses with a further 600 on reserve but in addition, by 1940, another 4 000 applications had been received from those women wishing to participate in overseas service. These nursing sisters served on hospital ships, troop transports, base and camp hospitals and, indeed, in POW camps. There were approximately 100 Australian nursing sisters stationed in the South Pacific at the time of the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbour on 7 December 1941.

The Australians serviced hospitals in Malaya, and later in Singapore, and they were stretched to breaking point, and they worked in absolutely appalling conditions. They were lacking basic medical facilities and basic medical supplies. As we know, the hospitals were directly targeted regularly by bombings at night, and the nurses were forced to work on many occasions without electricity, water. On 6 February 1942, the nurses were ordered to evacuate Singapore. Three vessels were used in that evacuation: the *Wah Sui*, the *Empire Star* and the *Vyner Brooke*. Despite the heavy bombing and significant number of casualties and deaths, the first two ships reached the safety of Australia. However, the third ship, the *Vyner Brooke*, which was overcrowded with more than 300 people and had little defence capability, was the last ship to set sail from Singapore on 12 February.

The 300 people on board, mainly women and children, a few wounded and 65 Australian nurses, were led by what I suspect were absolutely formidable matrons of the day: Matron Paschke and Matron Drummond. The nurses slept on the deck and tended the wounded. There were no washing facilities and very little cleanliness. The medical facilities and supplies were just about non-existent, and there was very little to eat. Two days after departure from Singapore, the ship was sunk within 15 minutes of the first strike by Japanese planes. Only two lifeboats managed to launch safely, the rest having been sunk or machine-gunned and unable to be launched. These two remaining boats carried the older passengers, the wounded and the remaining nursing sisters.

Matron Drummond and 21 nurses, along with a group of wounded and civilians, who were predominantly women and children, managed to reach Radji Beach on Bangka Island in a lifeboat, and they were joined by other survivors who had swum or drifted ashore. While on the beach, a group of survivors decided that the best course of action was to surrender to the Japanese. History records that the chief officer decided that he alone would walk to the nearby village of Muntok to conduct the surrender. After he had left the group on the beach, there was a great deal of restlessness. They were starving hungry as they had not eaten for such a long time, and many of the women and able-bodied men decided that they, too, would follow the chief officer and participate in the surrender. The nurses, therefore, remained on the beach to tend the wounded who were unable to move.

History records that a group of about 25 English soldiers had drifted in on another lifeboat, because their ship had been sunk the night after the *Vyner Brooke* had been sunk. When this group was discovered on the beach by Japanese soldiers, the nurses and the English troops were separated. The men were led along the beach, and history records that they were machine-gunned and, where that had not been successful, they were bayoneted. The nurses were ordered to walk into the sea to meet their fate: they, too, were machine-gunned. This tragedy has spawned one of the most remarkable stories of heroism, strength and absolute stubbornness and determination to survive, not only to tell the story of what happened to her colleagues but also to ensure that the world knew what was happening. That was the story of Sister Vivian Bullwinkel.

Many of us are aware of her story not only through a movie based on her experiences, called *Paradise Road*, but also from numerous books, accounts and television specials. I think it is truly a story of enormous courage and inspiration to many Australians, both male and female. As we know from these accounts, Sister Bullwinkel was shot in the hip. She

feigned death and remained in the water, pretending to be dead and hoping that she might be able to leave the water when the Japanese soldiers had left the scene of the massacre. She managed to creep into the jungle and, after two days, returned to the beach, where she discovered an English soldier who had managed to survive the bayonets of the Japanese. There she cared for him and, after being rejected several times by local villagers when asking for assistance, they eventually decided that the only chance of survival was to give themselves up to the Japanese and claim that they had been shipwrecked. Sister Bullwinkel was reunited with many of her fellow survivors from the *Vyner Brooke* who had been taken alive and placed in the POW camp. It was only through the coordinated silence of the party in the camp did the Japanese remain unaware of her having escaped the massacre and, therefore, able to give an eyewitness account of the tragedy in the future.

The story of the Bangka Straits massacre is truly a story of courage and loyalty to one's country and fellow man in time of war. When preparing this contribution, I found the Australian Army Nursing Service pledge of service. I shall not read it all, but I think that the last four lines are appropriate to this story. They are, as follows:

At all times I will endeavour to uphold the highest traditions of womanhood and of the profession of which I am part.

Even in the POW camp, these Australian nursing sisters continued to care for the wounded in the section of the camp set aside as a casualty room and a hospital; it bore little resemblance to the hospitals we know today.

Moving from those extraordinarily circumstances, I turn to the year 2005, because I think it appropriate that this house pay a tribute to the tireless work of another group of women—the South Australian Women's Memorial Playing Fields trust—who continue to provide a fitting tribute to those nurses who were killed in the line of duty, just as the playing fields themselves are a magnificent symbol of the honour to their memory.

Mr Speaker, we know the basic story of what has happened since because it has been recorded in *Hansard* in the past, but I do believe it is a suitable recognition for the ongoing work of those women. History of the playing fields dates back to 1953, when the South Australian Women's Amateur Sports Council was formed by the National Fitness Council as a way of improving participation in sport by women and girls. The chair of this new council, May Mills, enthusiastically and successfully lobbied Sir Thomas Playford to convince him to grant 20 acres of land for women's sporting activities. They were officially opened in 1957 and have remained a really valuable centre for women's sport in our state.

The South Australian Women's Playing Field Trust deserves the warm acknowledgment of this house, in my view, for their very valuable work which has been ongoing from its birth. It is a facility for women's sport, and an ongoing tribute to the heroes of Bangka Straits. One of the brochures put out by the Women's Playing Field Trust says that these playing fields are the only dedicated women's memorial of this calibre in Australia: and of this unique achievement and heritage, South Australians should be justly proud. I have no doubt colleagues in the house would share those sentiments. The attendance at the Bangka Day Memorial Service offers an indication of the esteem in which the Australian Nursing Service is held.

I now refer specifically to those who support this event each year. Its patron is Her Excellency Marjorie Jackson-Nelson, the Governor of South Australia; and it is very well supported by numerous women from the groups of various RSL clubs, representatives from the various veteran groups, the Returned Sisters, the Returned Service Women and many representatives of local government, and a number of members of this chamber regularly attend the service. My view is that it shows the respect this community affords not only those nurses who gave their lives but those who continue to work to honour their memory. This year, as in previous years, it was really encouraging to see so many young women who use those magnificent facilities assisting in the arrangements for the day, and I have to say also taking up collections to add to the coffers.

The current committee of the South Australian Women's Memorial Playing Fields deserves our thanks. The committee includes: Denise Chapman, Charmaine Taylor, Tess Beneke, Colin Addison, Bev Fellows, Rosemary Adey, Richard Greenhalgh, Bruce Parker, Noel Trigg, Ruth Harrington, Lieutenant Colonel Lee Martin, Peter Stanford, Robyn Granger and Colin Giles. They lead a group of very dedicated and active volunteers who work tirelessly to ensure that we never forget the events of 63 years ago yesterday. As I said earlier, I thank colleagues who have enabled this motion to be brought on today to mark the anniversary.

In concluding my remarks, I refer to the memorial service program which lists the nursing sisters who were massacred at that island and who were South Australians. They were: E.L. Balfour-Ogilvy, I.M. Drummond, F.R. Casson, I.F. Fairweather and E.L. Keats. It lists those who were lost with the sinking of the *Vyner-Brooke* in Bangka Straits: M.H.M. Dorsh and A.M. Trenerry. It also lists the person who died while a prisoner of war, namely, W.R. Raymont. The program states:

We also remember Sister V. Vivian Bullwinkel (Statham)
Sole survivor of the Bangka Massacre
Who died in 2001
Their names liveth for evermore.

I ask that this house recognises the following motion and urge its support, and I thank members for their cooperation.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I support the motion and congratulate the member for Morialta for bringing it to the house today. I also had the pleasure of attending the memorial service on Sunday. I have been attending the service for many years and it is always very moving to remember the contribution which these brave women made. I refer to the words of Vivien Bullwinkel, the sole survivor of the massacre of the 22 nurses on Bangka Island on 16 February 1942. She said:

They cleaned their rifles in front of us, and then lined us up and signed to us to march into the sea, the nurses still wearing their Red Cross emblems on their sleeves, the symbol which, supposedly, should have protected them. No-one spoke, no-one wept and when they reached waist deep water, the Japanese opened fire gunning from behind. I wish to say that the conduct of all the girls was most courageous. They all knew what was going to happen to them, but no-one panicked, they just marched ahead with their chins up.

I refer to the memorial service program, which talks about the nurses' courage and which states:

It has been said that a nation's greatness is decided by the calibre of its women. If this is so then we in Australia have much to be thankful for and much that gives us cause for pride.

The Navy, Army and Air Force each have been enriched by their own women's services. The women who served with the armed forces in two World Wars were endowed with the finest qualities.

In the study of our nurses who served in Malaya these qualities are brought into bold relief. The story of their evacuation from Singapore, of the Bangka Straits Massacre, and of the subsequent tribulations of the survivors in a prisoner of war camp is an epic to fill all Australians with great pride. . . The decision to evacuate all women and children from Singapore was hastily made when it became clear Singapore would be occupied by the Japanese.

Sixty-five Australian nurses ultimately embarked on the *Vyner-Brooke*...

As the member for Morialta pointed out, originally the vessel was to have carried 12 passengers, but by the time men, women, children and the 65 nurses boarded, there were some 300 people on board the ship. The remainder of the passengers, apart from the 65 nurses (as was indicated), were mostly mothers and young children. The ship sailed into a mine field on Thursday 12 February and became separated from the rest of the convoy. On 14 February, the ship was struck by three bombs, and obviously many people had to leave the ship when the captain ordered the evacuation.

They finally managed to reach shore. Some of the parties became separated. Some of the women and children went off to a village and the nurses stayed behind. It was at this point that the Japanese soldiers came and the horror that happened subsequently left Vivian Bullwinkel as the sole survivor who was shot and had to lie face down in the water for many hours. From reading some of the excerpts, she was too frightened even to vomit because it would have given the Japanese soldiers who were still around an indication that she was still alive. She made it to another camp and was prisoner for some three and a half years, but her secret was never revealed while she was in the camp and was later able to testify about the horror.

It is very important that we pay tribute to not only the women but to everyone in the wars who give their lives so we can maintain our freedom. The Women's Memorial Playing Fields are certainly a monument and tribute to these women. It is good they are now available for the women of this state to further their recreation and sporting abilities. I add my congratulations to the member for Morialta for bringing the motion to the house. We pay tribute to those women who died on 16 February 1942.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise to support the motion and commend both honourable members who have addressed it. I do so as the member for Waite, having attended, I think, every one of these celebrations since I was elected, it being quite close to my electorate, but also as a ex-service man who has served with Army nurses and defence force female personnel, of whom I am very proud: they served their nation well.

As members who have spoken pointed out, this celebration is based on a day of tragedy, a day of infamy during the World War II. I do not think any of those who attend the function could begin to understand why the Japanese Army in particular was as brutal as it was during the World War II, not only in Bangka but also at Sandakan, on the Burma-Thailand railway and in so many capacities. How could humans be so inhuman? The litany of massacres, bloody affairs, starvation, death marches and malicious and vicious persecution of innocent people beggars belief, particularly in the cases of Bangka and Sandakan, where only two of thousands survived. It is worthy, therefore, that the day is remembered as a day in human history that warrants remembering. I remember walking into a Nazi concentration camp some years ago and above the gate were the words, 'He who forgets history is destined to repeat it'. I have never forgotten

those words and it is worthy that we remind ourselves of what happened at Bangka.

I commend the comments made by both honourable members about the very erstwhile and capable group of women who organised the event—they are legends. I remember assisting them with a federation grant and remember a number of these elderly ladies in my office on their hands and knees putting the application together, running it off the photocopier and getting the paperwork organised to send off. Unfortunately the application for new gates entering the Women's Memorial Playing Fields was unsuccessful, but hopefully some other source of funding will be forthcoming for that venture. They show the same sort of true grit and determination that I am sure they did as young nurses and servicewomen during the World War II.

These playing fields are in a wonderful location on the boarder of my electorate. It is pleasing to see it in such full use. Young women play cricket, softball and a range of sports and are enjoying the infrastructure put in in memory of the brave women who died in the World War II serving their nation. It is a fitting memorial—something that is useful and not just a big mausoleum or big slab of concrete, but a real living memorial. It is testimony to the spirit of the woman who served. I commend the motion. It is an outstanding motion and I look forward to its swift passage.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): I commend the member for Morialta for bringing this motion before the house. From recollection she does it every year and it is important that we remember people who died in this situation, which was a great tragedy and, as the member for Waite said, an example of inhumanity. We should never forget the sacrifice of not only nurses who served overseas and here during the various wars but also all of those who gave their lives. If we look at the figures for the two world wars, it adds up to about 100 000 people who lost their lives in those two conflicts. I have often wondered what Australia would be like had we not lost any of those people, particularly in relation to World War I. Some saw it as an adventure and this country lost many of its very talented young people who would have provided a lot of inspiration, energy and ideas, but sadly were cut down at a very young age.

Likewise, after the second world war, and wars and conflicts since, we never seem to learn, as a species, that there are other ways of doing things rather than killing each other. But, some people say, 'Why dwell on the past? Let's move on,' and all that sort of thing, but my view is if you do not remember the past you will soon run into problems in the future. I do not advocate any hatred for the Japanese, even though some individual Japanese did some horrific things not only in relation to this particular episode of the Bangka Strait massacre but also the death marches and all those other horrible things.

I think we should be inspired to honour the memory of these people by ensuring we have less conflict and less loss of life, whether it be nurses or soldiers of any gender; ensuring that we do not revisit that type of behaviour; and doing all in our power as a nation to lead this region, and others parts of the world, away from conflict into peaceful and constructive activities for people. I acknowledge and recognise the importance of those playing fields. Every time you drive past, it reminds you of the sacrifice of those young nurses who were cut down so tragically many years ago.

Motion carried.

The SPEAKER: May I say for myself that I commend the members for Morialta, Norwood, Waite and Fisher, and all other honourable members, for the respect that they have shown to the people who illustrate what Australians have done not only for themselves and their country but also as an example to the rest of the world in these difficult circumstances such as confronted the women in Bangka.

I want to make the point, if I can, that Tess Beneke became known to me when I first became a member of the Adelaide Rural Youth Club late in 1962, and at that time I was encouraged—indeed, inspired—by her commitment to this cause to personally support, and advocate the continued support, of the Adelaide Rural Youth Club and other rural youth clubs for the retention and maintenance of the women's memorial playing fields at Bedford Park. I came to know the story, little realising that a few short years after that (it seemed a long time at the time) that I would visit the site. Knowing what had happened there added an extra dimension of reverence to my regard for what was done by those people in those circumstances.

Can I tell the house that Australians, great in number, though not as great in number as perhaps some other allied countries during the last century, through their personnel supporting the war effort whenever it occurred, which was made by our society and our allied societies for the purposes of ensuring our freedom, was legend and outstanding, even amongst the ranks of those who did it. It probably arose because we were a society of people determined to make good against adversity, the majority of us having migrated to this land. When I say 'Australians', let me say that I include in that Aboriginal people. But the majority of us, or our forebears, having migrated to this land during the preceding 200 years, had to make a go of the new society that was to be established, and that was against great adversity without adequate knowledge of how this land responded to the attempts that were being made to recreate it in the fashion of the European homes of the people who came here to settle.

Having made that remark, I go on to say that when the call was made, within Australia and outside it, to do something for the community, people knew they did as they needed to do and, when one gets into circumstances such as those British servicemen and the nurses in Bangka, even though you know you are in all probability facing death, you put that out of your mind and focus attention upon what you might best do to secure your survival. Once you are wounded or injured, more than ever, you focus your mind not upon the pain and misadventure that you suffer but upon what it is you must do to ensure that you will be here tomorrow, and live it a day at a time. It is not a matter of feeling sorry for yourself: it is a matter of surviving and understanding what must be done, by you and by anyone else whom you can assist in the process, to secure your survival and that of the society you belong to.

It is against that kind of training and example that these people were able to achieve what they did achieve and contribute to our better understanding of how to deal with other peoples with more bestial attitudes and indifference to individual life, freedom and liberty—freedom meaning not only the right to go wherever you please (subject to the rights of others), but to say what you choose (subject to the rights of others) and to do the things you believe you should do in the interests of yourself, your family and your community (always, again, subject to the rights of others). That is what freedom is about.

We have difficulty understanding the cultural mores of societies prior to World War II of, say, Japan, but they are nonetheless understandable if you study the fact that there the life of individuals is considered to be subservient to the needs of the whole. The notion is exactly the opposite to ours about society.

Survival of society from our point of view is to secure the rights of each individual out of compassion for that life. Society in Japanese and similar societies is to secure the citadel at the expense of the lives of those who surround it and protect it, and to take one's own life was not only acceptable but an honourable and decent thing to do. Such is the case these days in the mores of those people who traditionally have lived in the Middle East, no less than was the case for the Japanese and other Asian societies at that time. Fortunately for us, the message is getting through and, by doing what we have done here today in acknowledging the efforts made by the women in Bangka, we are able to talk about it to peoples from elsewhere, encouraging them to see that a better way is available to them and the society in which they live if they, in some measure, follow this outstanding example. I thank members for allowing me to make those remarks.

COMMUNITY ROAD WATCH

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

That this house calls on the government to introduce a Community Road Watch scheme similar to those currently operating in Queensland and New Zealand.

I guess the Minister for Police would attest to the fact that I have been lobbying him fairly hard on this issue, and I know that the member for Flinders is supportive, as are, no doubt, other members in here. This concept is being used in New Zealand very successfully and has been used more latterly in Queensland. The New Zealand model is called Community Road Watch and the Queensland model is called TRACS, an acronym for Traffic Returns Analysis and Complaints System, and is very similar in concept to the New Zealand model. Under the Community Road Watch program the public can report driving that is bad and also that which is good but, in essence, most of the reports relate to inappropriate, dangerous driving.

The scheme began in New Zealand on 15 December 1997 and was particularly designed to reduce road rage by allowing the public to report matters of concern to the police. My office has been in frequent contact with the New Zealand police and they report that the program has been very successful and gives credibility to the New Zealand police by improving the public's perception of police interest in traffic-related matters as not just being for the purposes of revenue collection. Members would be aware that often the point is made by commentators and some individuals saying that all the government and the police are on about is collecting money. The scheme has been very successful in highlighting the fact that it is not simply about collecting money but about improving road safety, saving lives and reducing injury.

The police receive approximately five to 10 vehicle reports per day and have received a total of 92 000 reports since the program began. To date, only four false reports have been identified. People report either by submitting a complaint form, which is already printed, over the counter at a police station or by lodging a complaint by email or post. They can also call a central communications centre number, and I note they go for simplicity in New Zealand: they have

a 555 number for traffic complaints. A traffic complaint form can then be sent on to the Road Watch program, as it is called.

Obviously, the police check all the details. People have to provide details of when the alleged inappropriate driving or other vehicle behaviour occurred, and when a vehicle report is made a registration check is carried out to confirm that the vehicle details correspond with the description provided. Reports that do not provide all the required detail, such as time, date and place, are not accepted. The people making the complaint have to give their details to minimise and eliminate the likelihood of vindictive and false reporting. A letter is sent both to the person reporting the behaviour and to the owner of the reported vehicle, advising that it is the opinion of the reporter that the vehicle was driven unsafely, and the vehicle is then recorded within the program.

If a vehicle is reported for more than three separate incidents of a similar nature by different people, the registered owner will be advised. There have been 33 instances of such reports, mostly for burnout incidents. One of the reasons why I am keen on this program is that it will give strength to the recently passed legislation dealing with hoon drivers who engage in burnouts, and so on. In all but one case, in New Zealand the police were contacted immediately by the owner and the vehicles were not reported again. So, it does work.

Program achievements of note include identification and payment of outstanding fines on vehicles; the observation of a speeding vehicle subsequently negating the alibi of a murder suspect; and identification of a large number of vehicle conversions. New Zealand police believe that the program is not abused, as there is little to be achieved by filing a false report. If a person were to report a vehicle 100 times it would have no effect because, for the process to work, reports must all come from different people and relate to different incidents.

The Community Road Watch program is a cheap and effective way of dealing with reports of traffic-related incidents from the public. The program is staffed by a manager and 2.5 staff, and the staffing level has not changed since the program began in 1997. That is a very small number of people to run a program—and that is for all of New Zealand. Community Road Watch allows citizens to report inappropriate driving, and it assists the police. The first incident results in a warning letter and a copy of the road rule pertinent to the bad behaviour. It is left to the police to take action if there is repeat reporting of a particular car or driver.

Queensland trialled its model, TRACS (which I mentioned a little while ago), from 28 May 1999 to 30 June 2000 in south-eastern and northern police regions, and began a state wide program from 1 July 2000. It was implemented initially as a result of the introduction of the 50 km/h residential urban speed limit in south-east Queensland. It provides a generic state wide mechanism for the recording of traffic complaints made by members of the public against other road users, and it is administered by the state Traffic Support Branch. A feature of the Queensland model is that the complaint has to be responded to. The Central Coordinating Traffic Branch will report something to the local police, who must respond to that complaint.

What happens in South Australia at the moment seems to be somewhat ad hoc. I have heard reports from constituents who say, 'I report this, and nothing seems to happen,' or they are fobbed off, whilst some police, as individuals, in police stations here, do respond much more vigorously. The reason for suggesting either a TRACS or a Community Road Watch

type program is to systematise the reporting of bad driving and other inappropriate behaviour with respect to vehicles. That is not to say that the police here do not respond; they can. But I would argue that the response is variable. I understand that there is no consistent approach, as happens in New Zealand or Queensland.

It is important that issues are followed up, and that is what gives the systems in New Zealand and Queensland credibility. If someone says, 'I have seen someone travelling at 200 km/h down my street,' the police must respond to that complaint. It gives the public a lot of confidence when they know that their concerns are taken seriously.

With respect to the Queensland model, there is a specified process. I have sent to the Police Commissioner and the Minister for Police the detailed material that was presented to me by the officer in charge of traffic for Queensland Police. I do not need to go through all the mechanics of how they process complaints. However, I was very impressed by the fact that it is a thorough and fair system; it does not allow for misuse and abuse, because safeguards are built in. As has been the case in New Zealand, there have been very few situations of false reporting. I think members would agree that four false reports out of 92 000, in statistical terms, is barely significant.

I think this is a very inexpensive and effective way for the community to have a say on issues. From time to time we hear people say that there are not enough police on the beat. I have said that at times. I think it has been a catchcry for as long as I have been in this parliament. I do not think we will ever have enough police because, really, what people want is a police officer in uniform in their street 24 hours a day. It will not happen. But with a TRACS or a Community Road Watch type program, members of the community become the eyes and ears supporting the police. It gives them a link to the police in a positive way.

We could have the New Zealand model, where people report good driving as well. I know that the issue of rewarding good drivers has been considered here in the past, but I think that could become a little messy. I do not know what you would offer them. If you gave them a sticker saying, 'I'm a good driver', and the next minute they did something wrong, that would be a bit difficult.

This also is cost-effective. With respect to the New Zealand figures that I provided, one sergeant with 2½ people assisting to run that program for all New Zealand, I think, is very cost-effective and a good investment. As I said, it provides a link between the community and the police in a productive and constructive way, and I think it would do a lot to reduce the number of accidents, tragedies and injuries on our roads.

I commend this program to the government. I believe that a lot of members of the police force are supportive of it. If it is a question of extra resourcing, I would hope that the Treasurer (who happens to be the police minister) would be able to find some dollars to make this happen. I know that the member for Flinders was happy to trial it on the West Coast. I do not have a problem with its being trialled somewhere, but I urge the Commissioner and the police minister to fly to New Zealand and Queensland and have a look at their programs. The police in Queensland were fantastic; they were very friendly and very supportive. They told me that the program has made a big difference in terms of behaviour on the roads and it has helped enhance confidence in the police force.

I commend this motion to the house and hope that members will support it. We must bear in mind that, as I said,

it will introduce what the community has been seeking, that is, something to deal with hoon behaviour on the roads. I think it is well worth supporting, and I commend it to the house.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

MATERNITY LEAVE

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

That this House calls on the state and federal governments, and the private sector to endorse the concept of paid maternity spanning a period of up to 12 months.

I should declare a little conflict of interest because, recently, as members know, I became a grandfather. I know that members are saying, 'You only look 25.' I am not advocating this simply because my son and his partner have a little eight week old baby named Elise—it shows that we are pro female in our family.

The need for this concept should not have to be argued at great length. I will cite some of the statistics in a minute, but Australia is way behind the eight ball on this issue. I am not blaming one government or another, or one political party or another, but this motion reflects the fact that we as a community do not take seriously enough the importance of looking after young children and babies. There have been some positives in recent times, and I fully commend the Minister for Health for the recent initiative of home visits for newborns. I think it is a great step forward, and I would like to see that expanded so that, in the period between birth and school, whether it is a nurse or another properly trained professional, someone visits the one or two year old in their home to see how they are coming on. It is fine to do a check straight after the birth, and I would certainly commend that, but it is important to see how the youngster is progressing at, say, the age of one or two.

Clearly, a trained professional cannot visit every few weeks, but my proposal would pick up a lot of indicators of inadequate parenting, and some medical and abuse issues. It is also a positive way of reinforcing the good things that most mothers and fathers seek to do with their child. We are an affluent community and, in terms of priorities, we should put a bit more effort into making sure that every newborn has a great start in life, and that means, wherever possible, supporting the mother and the father in carrying out their roles to look after the newborn. All the evidence now suggests that early intervention is what is needed. That is not simply in terms of possible offending: it is really an early focus on things that are very important.

Whilst it is not the thrust of this motion, increasingly we are aware of the effects on the unborn of people smoking, drinking alcohol and so on. I noticed recently—and again I commend the minister—a big poster campaign—and I am not saying that posters change the world overnight—targeting foetal alcohol syndrome, which is a huge problem, particularly but not exclusively in the Aboriginal community. I know the consequences of that first-hand because of Aboriginal children who are part of my extended family.

Through her department, the minister has started promoting, on a greater scale of focus, the dangers of consuming alcohol when pregnant and saying (I think this is the slogan), 'Pregnancy and alcohol don't mix'. I guess we could use the slogan 'Pregnancy and smoking don't mix', because, increasingly, evidence suggests that there can be long-term harm to the baby from smoking and/or alcohol.

I am suggesting that we get serious about this matter of paid maternity leave. I believe that we as a community can afford to ensure that the newborn is looked after in a way that takes stress and pressure off the parents, particularly the mother. The paid maternity leave standards in the public sector across Australia are as follows: in the commonwealth, 12 weeks; Victoria, 12 weeks; Queensland, six weeks; Tasmania, 12 weeks; New South Wales, nine weeks; and Western Australia, nothing. In terms of paid maternity leave standards, we are the second worst, if you like. Western Australia does not see the worth in doing anything to assist mothers with newborns, which is surprising because it is one of the wealthiest states in this country and it literally has money coming out of its ears.

Australia is one of the only two OECD countries that does not have a paid maternity leave scheme. As members would know, the OECD represents the more affluent and developed nations, for example European countries and the United States. The only other OECD country that does not have a paid maternity leave scheme is the United States. It should embarrass us that there are 120 countries that do. So, we have not even got to the starting blocks in terms of this issue. Only 39 per cent of women in Australia have access to paid maternity leave of some kind, and the average is seven weeks; 77 per cent of women in the finance and insurance sector have access to paid maternity leave; one per cent of women in retail—there is a challenge for Don Farrell and the SDA; and three per cent in hospitality, compared with a country like Sweden which has 15 months paid maternity leave at 75 per cent of salary. Someone said, 'Who is going to pay?' Well, you pay one way or another if you do not look after the newborns.

I am happy to pay tax. I pay quite a lot of tax. I know how to minimise tax if I want to, but I am not into that. I know how to legally reduce one's tax but I am happy to pay tax because it does good things—or it can do good things—although sometimes the money may not be spent in the way that I want. I am happy to pay tax if it means that we have decent services and standards in our community for something as important as a new life. My son recently spent a year in Sweden and he said that they pay a lot of tax in Sweden. They do in most of those Scandinavian countries. He says that one of the things that you notice there is that you do not see the social problems that we have here because they are more committed to ensuring that people are not thrown out on the street. He said that you are less likely to see people who are homeless and all these sorts of things because they put money and effort into things like paid maternity leave. In fact, some of the Scandinavian countries have a limited paid paternity scheme as well. So, if Sweden can provide 15 months of paid maternity leave at 75 per cent of salary, I am sure that Australia can do a lot better than what we are currently doing, which is, by international standards, not much at all.

The challenge, I guess, is how do you fund it? I would not expect small business to pay significantly towards that sort of scheme. I do not think that that is fair or reasonable. I think that we live in one nation, or you would hope so—or one country, you would think so—but as you heard from the statistics on Western Australia it does not appear as though we do, and they do not even have one vote, one value in Western Australia yet. I think that a scheme like this has to be funded by the federal government in the same way as other schemes relating to pensions and so on. I cannot understand why there is resistance, if people are paying their fair share

of tax in a fair and reasonable way, and a lot of people are not. We hear this catchcry that we are overtaxed; some people are, and a lot of people are not paying much tax at all. We have a nation, in many respects, of skilful tax dodgers. If people are paying a reasonable amount of tax, a fair amount of tax as a company or an individual, then the fairest way of running a national paid maternity leave scheme is just that, through the commonwealth, and through the federal government.

Whether the length of time is one year or less, I would be happy to see some significant improvement on where we are at the moment; at least to bring all women up to one level so that we do not have discrimination according to whether you work at Woolworths or for one of the big finance companies. Why is it that the babies of women who work in retail are not as important as those who happen to work in the finance sector? I suspect it is because the finance sector unions have had a bit more clout. That is my suspicion and I have got not proof of that. So, I would like to see some action on this and the sooner the better, and I think, like most things, the return is commensurate with the investment, and with the effort and resources that you put into something. If we want people in this country to have fulfilling lives, and to realise their talents, then the most important thing is to ensure that during the critical years—zero to three especially, and I guess the most critical is the first year or so—that those babies are cared for in a way where the mothers and the fathers are not under financial stress or other pressures, and that they can devote themselves to ensuring that their baby or babies have a good start in life.

So, I make that plea to the house. I trust members will support it. I know that people will trot out the catchcry, 'How can we afford it?' That was the argument used as to why we could not get rid of child slavery, 'We cannot afford it.' It is the same argument used to keep women in the home, 'We cannot afford it. We cannot afford to pay women the same as men. It is beyond our economic capacity.' It is a load of hooy. We can afford a lot of money for a lot of things to indulge ourselves—DVD players, VCRs, flash motor cars, and in many ways we have never had it so good—yet when it comes to important things like caring about our fellow humans, particularly the most vulnerable, we seem to run out of money, or the argument is trotted out, 'We cannot afford it.'

Let us change the mindset and move Australia towards a society which is prepared to give a higher priority to looking after its citizens, particularly the youngest, and ensure that they get a good start in life, and that their mother and their father are not stressed out worrying about trying to juggle child care, work and everything else at a time when they are under a lot of pressure anyway trying to look after a newborn. I commend this motion to the house.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

SATELLITE CITY DEVELOPMENT

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

That this house requests the state government to re-evaluate the concept and merit, or otherwise, of a Monarto or similar style satellite city development.

This issue would be very close to your geographical heart, sir, in terms of your electorate. The site that was to be the satellite city may well be within your electorate, but you will correct

me if I am wrong. The reason I raise this issue is that members would be well aware that there is a lot of pressure on land for housing within the metropolitan area, and that is reflected in its price, just as it is in the price of cemetery plots, where the same principle applies: not enough land, supply and demand, and the price going up. Over time, governments have tried to do all sorts of things to stop the so-called sprawl. That is never easy and upsets some people, because there are winners and losers.

It may be too late to revisit the concept of a satellite city, and I am not saying that Monarto is necessarily the location, but I am looking at the concept. I do not know whether it was the idea of former premier Don Dunstan or whether it was someone else's, but I think the concept was dismissed too easily and too readily. As you would know from driving along the old road through Kanmantoo in that Monarto area, sir, one consequence of non-urban development has been the significant planting of trees and some shrubs. In recent times, there has been a whole range of animal husbandry developments in that area, so I am not saying that that particular site would be appropriate now. The library has a lot of material on this issue that members might wish to look at, including the Monarto New Site Selection report, which states:

Terms of reference

The Minister Assisting the Premier on the 13 April 1972 asked the Authority—

and by 'authority' it means the State Planning Authority—

'to provide. . . a recommendation on the designated site' for Murray New Town. The 'designated site' means an area, of land of not more than ten thousand hectares, proclaimed under Section 3 of the Murray New Town (Land Acquisition Act) 1972 and being within an area of land lying within a radius of thirty kilometres of the Murray Bridge Post Office, known as the 'establishment area'.

Subsequently, when the act was introduced, the area for acquisition was increased to 16 000 hectares. The report continues, as follows:

During April 1972, the Director of Planning carried out preliminary investigations throughout the establishment area, in consultation with officers of other government departments. The State Planning Authority received a preliminary report from the Director of Planning on the 9th May, 1972 and approved a program of detailed studies and consultations confined to the area south and west of Murray Bridge, (the 'study area').

Obviously, I cannot read all the report but, on page 3, it states:

The Premier, The Hon. D.A. Dunstan, in introducing the second reading of the Murray New Town (Land Acquisition) Act, said:

'Australia is one of the world's most highly urbanised countries, and our major cities continue to grow larger.'

After speaking of the growing awareness in Australia for the need to provide new cities as alternatives to the continued spread of the suburbs of capital cities, the Premier said that 'The Government is determined that the future city dwellers of this State should not be condemned to living in a metropolitan area characterised by congestion, noise and smog, with the tiring long journeys to and from work and those are the evils that are so readily apparent in large cities throughout the world.'

Further points made by the Premier were, as follows:

The 1962 Metropolitan Development Plan forecast that Adelaide's population will exceed 1 000 000 by 1981, and will reach 1 384 000 by 1991. The South Australian Government has initiated the Murray New Town project to siphon off some of Adelaide's growth and to create an alternative urban environment.

The report then discusses some of the natural features, the agricultural activities and so on. I suggest that members read it, because many aspects were to be considered. A document, entitled Monarto Planning Studies, will make the member for Davenport smile. Page 45, Discussion Draft, states:

Railways

The Adelaide-Melbourne railway will remain on its existing alignment for the present.

The report is dated December 1974 and was for public consultation until February 1975. It further states:

However, studies to upgrade and re-route this line in South Australia have been commenced. Its possible re-alignment in relation to Monarto will form part of the studies, in particular the present route through Rocky Gully is incompatible with the conservation and establishment of a park in this area. It is intended to close the Monarto South-Cambrai line which crosses the site from south to north.

The study discusses the need for a freeway and states that, within the vicinity of the city of Murray New Town-Monarto six lanes may be necessary on the road. We know that there is now a freeway there. One of the interesting aspects in relation to Monarto that I came across in a newspaper clipping was a plan to build a railway tunnel from approximately Clapham, just south of Mitcham and through the Adelaide Hills, coming out on the other side.

The cost of that would have been enormous. Obviously, it did not happen, but it was one of the interesting aspects of that proposal. The intention was to provide a rail line under the Adelaide Hills, as I say, leaving from near Clapham (Springbank Road) and going straight through under the Hills to come out on the eastern side of the ranges.

There is other material available on Monarto such as the Monarto Concept Plan, which was produced by Kazanski and Associates, Shankland Cox Partnership and Professor Rolf Gutbrod. It is an interim report to the Monarto Development Commission, Greenhill Road, Unley, dated August 1974. The main point is: should we as a community, and should the government in particular through its planning resources, be actively looking at the concept of a satellite city; or are we going to increasingly consolidate in the current metropolitan area under the policy which some people seem to like—urban consolidation—and other people do not?

What we are seeing is often smaller and smaller blocks, with less area in which young people can kick the footy or throw a netball and often less room to have any significant vegetation in the front or rear yard because of the size; and so, rather than having the tall trees, we might simply have the odd rose bush and a few other exotics (and, incidentally, I have some, as well as natives). I do not believe it is too late. The government needs to look at options for the possibility of a satellite city. I guess, in a way, Elizabeth was meant to be a satellite city, but it is a satellite which is very close to the mother station. In relation to Monarto, I am not sure whether it is still possible to have a satellite city development there or anywhere in that general area. I do not know whether the options have completely gone.

I am not sure of the private land holdings and the activities. I know that some piggeries and things have been developed in that area. Big W has a big warehouse in that general area. Only a government agency with professional expertise could tell us whether or not that particular general area is suitable and whether there are other areas which we should be thinking about—not just for next week but for 50 to 100 years ahead—and how we would link a satellite city. The technology has changed with high-speed rail and things such as that. You do not have to think of it purely in terms of slow broad gauge: you can think of high-speed narrow gauge rail, light rail—all sorts of things. I was intrigued when reading one of these booklets that it was suggested there should be a horse trail from Monarto, presumably to come the

city. I had visions of you, sir, on a horse, with a cape, coming down to preside at our parliament. But that did not eventuate either.

The challenge is for us to be, in a sense, like Don Dunstan, who was a visionary. Many people criticise Don Dunstan. I have never understood why there is animosity towards someone who was so creative. I think it is a result of prejudice and suspicion about what his personal behaviour might have been, or whatever. There have been a lot of slanderous comments made and innuendo about what he might or might not have been interested in or involved in, but Don Dunstan was a person of great vision. I think that, in some ways, we as a state have lost some of that visionary aspect in terms of looking a long way ahead.

In terms of housing people, we have Premier Bob Carr saying that they do not want more people in Sydney, which is a fairly welcoming statement. He is saying, 'Go somewhere else, because we just cannot cope.' The quality of life in Sydney has deteriorated. The same thing can happen here over time. We will have more pressure on road systems, other transport systems and land prices. The time is right to revisit this notion of whether or not we could have and should have a satellite city. Whether it is in the Monarto region or somewhere else, that is for the experts to determine: it is for them to make suggestions and to have a vision. At the moment we seem to be plodding along a step at a time, rather than looking 20, 30, 50 or 100 years ahead. It is safe to say that our population will continue to increase. It may not be at a rapid rate in Adelaide and South Australia, but it will increase. If the options are available to consider some innovative thinking in regard to planning, we should do so.

In conclusion, I commend this motion to the house and trust that the minister and her advisers will look at the concept of the possibility of a satellite city type development, rather than simply incrementally trying to tinker with what we have in the metropolitan area, which eventually will catch up with us and which may result in our having a standard of living that is not as optimal as it could be. I commend this motion to the house.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEDICAL PROFESSIONS

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

That this house calls on the state and federal governments to ensure that suitably qualified local students get the opportunity to train in various professions, including medicine, nursing, dentistry and pharmacy.

My concern in regard to this matter is that I certainly do not support the idea that anyone can be a doctor, nurse, dentist or pharmacist, but the evidence coming to me from people in programs and from those who have missed out is that we are not giving enough opportunity to not only our local young people but to any local people to train in the professions. This applies to not only the professions I mentioned but also to any of our professions. Our first obligation is to our own, which is not to say that we should not have people from overseas and interstate.

With regard to medicine, there has been some contention about the selection process, the UMAT test, and it may be appropriate to look at that. That does not really prevent locals per se from getting into medicine, but the process obviously works against some people. Years ago when minister for

further education I was appalled when meeting with some of the medical students. I said, 'Why are you doing medicine?' These were people in third and fourth year, and one character said, 'I want to be a surgeon because surgeons are arrogant and they don't have to talk to people.' I was appalled. He was not joking, he was serious. Because of that uncaring attitude the universities decided to change the way in which they select people for medicine and as a result Adelaide University require people to go through a selection process in addition to year 12, so it is not purely on academic merit. It is a question of whether or not the university assessors believe the person has the attributes as an individual to be a good doctor, however you want to define that. They are looking for indications of empathy, understanding, compassion and all those sort of things.

I have met some wonderful young people who I would have thought would have got into medicine without any problem because of their academic score. I had a wonderful young woman working for me in the office on a temporary basis. She could not get into medicine (she wanted to do paediatrics ultimately) because she did not fulfil the criteria of the special test. She ended up doing law and another degree and recently joined the Public Service. That is fine.

I do not highlight the challenge of getting into medicine to cast doubt on that selection process in any absolute sense, but maybe it could be looked at to make sure no injustices are being perpetrated against people who would make good doctors. Flinders University has gone down a slightly different path in that it does not allow people from year 12 to come straight into medicine. Its process is to encourage older people who have done some other study to come in. That is fine, but it means that by the time you graduate and earn a dollar as a doctor you will probably have a few grey hairs. You get a few as a medico anyway, but you would probably be getting on a bit.

I have a niece who graduated last year in dentistry from Adelaide University. In that program there seemed to be very few local students. The policy, which is insisted upon by the federal government (and has been a long-standing policy), is that universities are not allowed to discriminate between states in terms of their enrolment. You are not allowed to say, 'Look, you are from Victoria, on your bike.' There seem to be impediments that are making it difficult for our own young people to get in. We have a select committee looking at nursing, so I will not transgress in detail, but a lot of local people want to do nursing but cannot get into it. We are bringing in nurses from overseas—from South Africa and the UK. If we keep bringing in people from the UK there will be no one over there as we are about to get some of their police also.

I find it amazing that we are bringing in nurses from overseas, yet we have young people here who want to train as nurses. I know a young lass who works in TAFE and wants to do midwifery, but to get in you have to be a super-duper student. She enrolled into a registered nursing bachelor's degree and was told that if you want to switch to midwifery you basically have to get a distinction. Without putting midwifery down, we have to take into account that not everyone needs to be a Rhodes scholar to be a midwife, medico, dentist or pharmacist. I have a niece studying pharmacy this year, but there are few local students in the course. Some people may say that people do not want to do it, but I do not believe that is the case. Either there are not enough places in total or there are some impediments in terms of them getting into these professions.

One of the greatest tragedies in life is for people to miss out on what they really want to do and are capable of doing. My mother was one of 10 children (and there is some lesson in that) and wanted to be a teacher but could not as they could not afford it. I also had an aunt who wanted to be an artist but could not afford it. It is not new that people have gone through life and missed out on doing what they wanted to do and were capable of doing.

I think both the state and federal governments need to ensure that there are no impediments to people who are able, capable and appropriate to do these various professional careers. The state government, over time, and the member for Finnis when he was minister, provided scholarships to assist extra people to do nursing at the university, but I think this whole issue needs to be revisited. I correspond quite a bit with the federal minister (Dr Brendan Nelson), whom I have always found to be a reasonable person to interact with, and I think he and the state ministers need to look at the tertiary education sector in terms of opportunities.

I note with some concern that the universities, in order to tempt people, are offering double degrees where students do not have to do the work of two degrees. It is not a practice confined to one university but I think if you get a double degree you should have done the work equivalent to two degrees, not one degree plus a little bit extra.

I know I have spoken in generalities and I have not given much in the way of specifics in terms of numbers. I have some of that detail in relation to dentistry, and obviously in relation to nursing through the select committee, but I hear too many examples of people having to go interstate and overseas in order to fulfil their desire to qualify in a profession for which they have the ability and the necessary attributes, yet here we deny them the chance to train locally in their own universities to become a medico, nurse, dentist, pharmacist or any of the other professions. I think that is very unfortunate and a waste of talent if it means that that person can never achieve what they want to do and are capable of doing, and I think it is time that both the state and federal governments had an open look at this whole issue to ensure that we are not in any way impeding the opportunities of our local students. As I said at the start, like charity, I think education begins at home. It begins locally. So I commend this motion to the house.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): I rise to speak to this motion and support the sentiment of it, which is primarily to ensure that we provide appropriate and adequate access for South Australians to be trained in areas of significant need in the community, particularly in medicine, nursing, dentistry and pharmacy. The health area is in chronic need of skills in this state. It is particularly important because, overwhelmingly, we train younger people in our community in these disciplines through university degree courses and we still have a net exodus every year of young people out of the state—unlike places such as Queensland, which continues to have a net entry into the state. We lose something like 5 000 net a year, and Queensland receives 18 000 net. So it is a matter of concern.

Every year we hear in the press of examples of people who have missed out on opportunities. I refer to the medical school examples. Last year was no exception. We heard of people who have exceptional talent and qualification who had missed out. When I made inquiries at the medical school at the University of Adelaide, which trains a number of our medical practitioners and which provides the degrees, I was

told that for the 2004 intake—and no doubt it is similar for this year because there has been no change—there were 99 places provided under federal government funding (that is, for students undertaking what is ostensibly free education), and there were 35 international student places—and they are, of course, in addition to the university provision via the federal government grants and they are fully paid students.

Of the 99 students, 80 were students who paid their HECS (which, of course, is the optional payment upfront to support their degree or through taxation upon obtaining employment); there were 13 bonded places (which means that after six years of medical degree and four years of general practice they are then required to do six years' service in the country, so there is a subsidy there); and there were six rural bonded scholarship places (and these students receive \$20 000 scholarship and are bonded to undertake six years of work in the country). Interestingly, of the 1 852 students who applied for the medical school entry, which is a figure that is adjusted after the duplication has been removed, 40.9 per cent were South Australian residents and, of the 99 students that I have referred to who were accepted, 48 per cent were South Australian.

It is clear that the university had previously inquired of the federal minister (Hon. Brendan Nelson) on the question of a quota on the understanding that that may be available in other states to protect places for our local young people, but of course there are some constitutional issues in relation to that and they cannot be ignored. We have specific legislation, particularly in our constitution, in relation to restraint of trade, and it is important that no action is taken that would be in ignorance of that because, of course, that would declare it null and void.

But the state government, in reaction to the outcry last year, announced that it was actually doing something about this, and on 24 May 2004 the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education advised the house that this was a priority of the government and that the substance of the stories of those who are missing out was a concern. She went on to say:

These concerns are currently the subject of a working party convened between the Department of Further Education and Employment, Science and Technology and the Department of Human Services. The working party is reviewing a number of matters, including the South Australian year 12 performance in the University of Adelaide selection process for admission to undergraduate medicine, the undergraduate student retention for the duration of the program, the retention of medical graduates in South Australia and the graduate destination for those who do not remain in South Australia.

In relation to these issues, it was part of the working party's job to come up with a range of strategies to attract and retain medical graduates in South Australia. Unfortunately, there are no quick fixes, but we will certainly be working through these issues.

She refers to those in the community who advocate quotas and points out, as I have today, that there is an issue in relation to the constitutionality of that. This was 24 May 2004. Nearly a year later, we still do not have any answers. We have still another intake of students for this year and we have another array of concerns that those students raise. Let me give one example of a student this year who has, I suggest, exceptional talents and skills of benefit already to South Australia, and who is a sad loss to South Australia because he has missed out on a place to study medicine in this state. His name is Christopher Wong. Last year he completed year 12 at Pembroke school. He had attended that school under a dual academic/musical scholarship, so he is a young man of significant talent.

He has been the recipient of numerous community awards for his community service and outstanding contribution, not the least of which was the David Tonkin Memorial Scholarship. He is fluent in his musical talents: he had been the leader of the Pembroke Symphony Orchestra and performed at the official opening of a new school in China, which was attended by some of China's top education ministers. Here is a young man of exceptional talents who had participated in the 2003 Young Achievement Australia's business skills program and yet, even this year, having acknowledged someone who had achieved eight 20 out of 20 results over two years in his education and who only a few days ago was recognised at Government House as one of the 10 students in year 12 who had achieved five 20 out of 20 scores, there is no room for this young man to undertake a medical degree in our institution.

Some would say that that is fine, he has a position somewhere else. But why is it that he is able to qualify and be welcomed and accommodated at Melbourne university to undertake medicine? This young man is South Australia's loss and Victoria's gain, and it is clearly time that the government actually did something about this and not just tell us, as it did nearly a year ago, that it has working parties on these issues, and not come up to deal with it. I expect that, when the young people of South Australia are enrolling in these important areas for support in the human services area for 2006, they will have a clear resolution of this issue and we will be able to assure them, if they are qualified, as this young man is exceptionally qualified, that they will continue to be strong young citizens in this state and not lost to our neighbours.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

JACOB'S CREEK TOUR DOWN UNDER

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That this house congratulates the organisers, sponsors, supporters and, in particular, the participants from Australia and countries across the world who contributed to the success of this year's Jacob's Creek Tour Down Under.

This year the tour has again proved that it gets bigger and better, with an estimated 430 000 people lining the routes during the first five days of racing. This is truly an exceptional support base. The Jacob's Creek Tour Down Under is an internationally accredited race endorsed by the world cycling federation, the Union Cycliste Internationale (UCI), which not only generates an enormous benefit to our state of some \$12.5 million but also assists to encourage young people to be more physically active. I would like to acknowledge the efforts of all the organisers, sponsors and supporters for the success of this major annual sporting event in South Australia.

The South Australian government is very pleased to be a sponsor partner with Jacob's Creek and, indeed, all the sponsors who contribute to this event's success. The efforts made by the event organisers, state and local cycling bodies, volunteers and spectators are also greatly appreciated. This year South Australia was again well represented in terms of elite athletes in the Tour Down Under. As with Alicia Molik and Lleyton Hewitt in the tennis, the presence of our home town heroes continues to be a critical ingredient in the event's success, assisting it to attract even greater success and exposure in the media. Our home town heroes also generate additional parochial interest and help draw the crowds.

Dual winner and Olympic gold medallist Stuart O'Grady was again a crowd favourite. He was always in the hunt for a third victory and he remained fiercely competitive throughout the tour, racing with his Cofidis team from France. His presence and competitiveness are synonymous with the Tour Down Under. The UniSA team was another true home town team, featuring all local riders. The UniSA team finished a credible fourth place in the teams classification. Former SASI scholarship rider and Junior World Champion Gene Bates was the UniSA team's lead rider. Bates won yet another award in this year's tour, winning the King of the Mountain jersey and finishing 11th overall.

Other UniSA team members and local South Australians were Russell van Hout, Chris Jongewaard, James Hannam, Adrian Laidlaw, Corey Sweet, Steve Cunningham, and up and coming young SASI cyclist, Mathew Rex. A woman's criterium series was also held in conjunction with this year's tour, and local SASI scholarship cyclist Alexis Rhodes continued to build on her reputation as a leading female endurance cyclist on both the track and the road.

Debate adjourned.

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

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The SPEAKER: I lay on the table a report of the Auditor-General pursuant to sections 32 and 36 of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987 entitled 'Matters associated with the 2001-02 proposal concerning the establishment of an ambulance station at McLaren Vale'.

Ordered to be published.

WORKCOVER

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yesterday after question time I provided the house with information regarding WorkCover's current financial position following the opposition leader's comparisons between WorkCover and the State Bank. When this government came to office, WorkCover was in serious difficulty. Under the former government, the levy rate was reduced from 2.86 per cent to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable members on my left might listen to the Deputy Premier in silence. It is no laughing matter.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. Under the former government, the levy rate was reduced from 2.86 per cent to 2.46 per cent, despite a growing unfunded liability. I am advised that, together with the employer rebate of \$25 million in 2000-01 (just before a state election, of course) and the loss of \$110 million in levies, up to \$135 million in total was lost.

As soon as this government came to office, the rebuilding work began. In June 2002, the minister commissioned a report from the Department of Treasury and Finance, which examined the financial and corporate governance practices critical to the financial and risk management of WorkCover Corporation. A new board was appointed, and included the appointment of a new chairman. The new board then selected a new chief executive officer. Turning around an organisation that has been neglected for so long is not an easy task. There

are no quick fixes. The Chairman, Mr Bruce Carter, has stated publicly:

The operational turnaround that WorkCover may take several years.

He further stated (this is public, as I am advised):

We are very cautious about the speed with which change can be made and outcomes achieved in terms of turning around the funding position and delivering real improvement and return to work outcomes.

I am advised that the increase in WorkCover's unfunded liabilities in recent years can be attributed to: poor investment performance prior to 2002; a significant reassessment of claims liabilities; the use of the APRA approved risk-free discount rate to value liabilities; and the adoption of prudential margin in accordance with best practice in this area.

I am advised that, whilst increasing the reported unfunded liability, the adoption of these measures has provided far greater confidence about the adequacy of the liability estimate. Yesterday, I outlined that the quarterly figures to 31 December 2004 show that WorkCover is ahead of budget due to a higher than expected levy income, despite a slight increase in pay claims. I also advised the house that, as at 31 December 2004, the corporation is ahead of its budgeted funding target of 60.2 per cent, and has recorded an actual result of 64.2 per cent. That is the advice I was provided with yesterday; that is the advice I provide again today.

These figures are based on the actuarial assessment as at 30 June 2004, and will be updated following the WorkCover board's meeting in March 2005 when it considers the actuary's most current assessment of the claims liability. Quarterly results are subject to volatility and should be considered in that light. I encourage members opposite to support the board and the government's efforts in turning WorkCover around.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Flinders Medical Centre—

Financial and Statistical Report 2003-04

Report 2003-04

Independent Living Centre—Report 2003-04

Leigh Creek Health Service Inc.—Report 2003-04

Metropolitan Domiciliary Care—Report 2003-04

Northern and Far Western Regional Health Service—

Report 2003-04

Penola War Memorial Hospital Inc.—Report 2003-04

South East Regional Health Service Inc.—Report 2003-04

The Women's and Children's Hospital—

Report 2003-04

Statistical and Financial—Report 2003-04

Wakefield Health—Report 2003-04.

MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: South Australia faces a significant challenge in managing the River Murray in a way that best protects the environment, particularly during times of prolonged drought. Issues such as bank erosion, parched flood plains and restricted fish movement have resulted from low river flows. One way we are striving to improve river health is by changing the way we manage river flows by using weirs and locks to manipulate pool levels. In 2000, a

trial was undertaken between Lock 5 at Paringa near Renmark and Lock 6 near Chowilla to raise water levels to create a localised mini flood, which had a positive effect on vegetation and wildlife in the surrounding flood plains.

Since then, a study into the strength of the locks and weirs has been undertaken to ensure that they can withstand raising or lowering of pool levels. All weirs, except Lock 4 at Bookpurnong at Loxton, were assessed as being suitable. A community reference group has identified the section of the river between Lock 5 and Lock 6 as the highest priority for flooding, due to the dozens of important wetlands in this region. Preparatory work is underway to raise water levels in this area if South Australia gets above entitlement flows next spring.

The current health of flood plain vegetation in the region is being assessed so that improvements can be measured once the operation begins. During the flow adjustment, any impacts on the bank, ground water and fish movement will also be monitored. Work is also being undertaken to ensure that there will not be a detrimental impact on irrigators who need to pump when river levels are raised or lowered. The other potential benefit of this action is that it will help alleviate the environmental impact of recreational boating. This is important particularly given the recent concerns regarding wake-boarding. Keeping the river at a static pool level means that the wash from boats is constantly eroding the same part of the river bank, whereas adjusting the river level can diminish this impact. Importantly, the results of this project will assist in determining how best to manage the river when 500 gigalitres of environmental flows per year eventuate through the First Step commitment under the Living Murray program.

QUESTION TIME

PORT RIVER BRIDGES

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Treasurer. Does the government intend to proceed with building opening bridges over the Port River?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): That is a matter more correctly answered by the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:—Minister for Infrastructure, who is the minister responsible for this project. He is not in this house; I will seek an answer from him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Supplementary question, sir, to the Treasurer. As the Treasurer was the one who assured South Australians that we would be opening bridges, does he stand by that assurance?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We have an Auditor-General's report today into the activities and conduct of the member for Mawson—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Point of order, sir—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Point of order, sir: it is very obvious the Treasurer does not want to answer the question. He was debating.

The SPEAKER: The honourable Treasurer will address—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: And, sir, the emphasis having not yet—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable Treasurer must address the substance of the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is what I am doing, Mr Speaker, if I can be allowed to answer without the opposition jumping to their feet. I have not yet read the full report at all of the Auditor-General but it is about ministers of the Crown and matters relating to their electorates. On the whole issue of the Port River Expressway, I have been very careful in ensuring that the minister responsible has carriage of this. He is the minister who should be responding to the question and will come back to the house.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: A supplementary, sir, again to the Treasurer: can he confirm that the bridges will be closed bridges?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am not the minister responsible. No decision has been taken. Tenders are being evaluated and we will come back to the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

OVERSEAS STUDENTS

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What numbers of overseas students are attracted to study in South Australia, and what benefits are there to the state's economy?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): The marketing of Adelaide to overseas students continues to be one of the state's success stories with numbers of students continuing to grow strongly. The latest figures from Australian Education International show that there were 15 345 international students in Adelaide in 2004, and this is an increase of 13.95 per cent over the previous year. The growth rate is more than double the national average of 6.41 per cent. The sectors with the greatest improvement were the higher education area with an increase of 21.32 per cent, and a school jump of 9.9 per cent. This is particularly pleasing considering that the national market has been contracting and that there has been increased competition. The growth has also occurred in a year when the increasing value of the dollar against the currencies of our Asian neighbours means that it is now more expensive to study in Australia.

The Asian region remains South Australia's main source of international students, representing about 80 per cent of the total market, with continuing high growth from China, India and South Korea. Adelaide's lower living costs, together with our world-class education industry, relative safety, accessibility and lifestyle, make us an increasingly attractive overseas destination for students wishing to study in Australia.

International education is now a major export industry and is worth about \$250 million to our state's economy and also directly supports 2 000 local jobs. Our government has been aggressively marketing Adelaide as a study destination, and overseas enrolments are expected to remain strong this year.

However, circumstances can change very quickly, and I know that members in this house would remember that we have come from a very low base in regard to international students. So, it is pleasing that we are doing well, but we certainly need to keep up the effort. It is still too early for us to measure the full economic impact of the tsunami in our region and how it may be reflected in overseas student numbers. Despite my cautionary note about international student numbers in South Australia, I think that all of us welcome the growth achieved to date. I know that members will continue to help with that effort.

WORKCOVER

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is out of order.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): He is a speed reader! Will the Minister for Industrial Relations inform the house what criteria were used to identify the 40 WorkCover claimants who were recently each offered payouts of \$100 000. I am informed that, on 31 December 2004 (New Year's Eve), emails were sent to the four claims agents asking them each to nominate 10 claimants to be offered redemption packages of \$100 000 each—people referred to in the industry as the 'lucky 40'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There are some people who have been playing up who will win a prize if this persists.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I am a bit surprised and disappointed that the Leader of the Opposition would want to make fun of injured workers. What we have identified—

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I ask that the minister withdraw that comment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister should not ascribe views and misconduct to members who have not engaged in such conduct; if they have, they should be the subject of separate, specific motions accordingly. The minister should withdraw that remark.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: Yes, sir; I am happy to withdraw. These are entitlements, and I would have thought them a very serious matter, as is redressing the problems that WorkCover has been experiencing for quite some time. It is easily identifiable. It goes back to about 1995, and the way it can be readily identified is by looking at how long people have stayed on the system. From about 1995 onwards, people have been clearly staying on the system longer and longer. This is referred to as 'continuance rates'.

As has been highlighted, both yesterday and today (by me yesterday), in regard to questions asked of the Deputy Premier and me, what this government is doing is getting on with the business of fixing up the mess left by the previous government. The way in which we have gone about addressing those problems is that, at the very first opportunity, a completely new board was put in place. That board is performing very well.

However, having said that, there will be bumps along the way because that is the nature of the system. Just as there will be bumps, there will also be good measurements, as has been highlighted regarding investments. So, we will see this occurring. Much has been done but there is still much more to do. A structure has been put in place. I think I said

yesterday that a new management team had been put in place, and at the time I thought one more appointment had to be made. That appointment has been made, by the way, so there is now a new executive team in place. There is more to do, but we are getting on with the business of fixing up the mess left by the previous government.

Mrs REDMOND: The question from the leader was about the criteria used for selecting the cases which were settled and instructed on 31 December. So far, nothing I have heard seems to go anywhere near answering that question—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Was that a question or a point of order?

Mrs REDMOND: Standing order 98 on relevance.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen's point of order is taken by the chair. I thought the minister was coming to the point of saying what the criteria were. The point is taken but the minister has retired. I do not know that the member for Heysen, me, or any other member will now know one way or another what the criteria were. I am not even sure that the minister knows.

MAGIC MILLIONS CARNIVAL

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing inform the house about the government's support provided to the racing industry and the Magic Millions Carnival?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): The excitement of the Magic Millions Carnival will begin again this week, with what I believe is fast becoming one of the most talked about events in our festival proud state. Enthusiasts of horseracing and horse breeding will converge on Adelaide to be part of the Magic Millions Carnival and attend the richest Wednesday thoroughbred race meeting in Australia at Morphettville. That is a huge achievement and something about which we can all be extremely proud. The state government has been pleased to provide substantial promotional, tourism and marketing support to this fast growing and well-supported carnival. The government has also been receptive to proposals to change the date of the Adelaide Cup public holiday so as to combine cup day with the Magic Millions sales and race day from March 2006 onwards.

I was also delighted to be able to launch the Magic Millions Yearling Sale Catalogue in Singapore in December of last year; and I was able to talk to and personally extend invitations to a number of prominent Asian breeders and trainers to visit Adelaide, particularly for the yearling sales. Both John Singleton and the company's managing director, Mr David Chester, have expressed their confidence that the number of Asian buyers will be well up on the previous years. The carnival centres on the Magic Millions Adelaide yearling sales, conducted over four days at the Morphettville sales complex. However, the highlight of the carnival, without doubt, is the Magic Millions race day when Australia's racing enthusiasts will gather at Morphettville to revel in the party atmosphere and the excitement of this superb day.

The program includes not only the \$400 000 Magic Millions Adelaide two-year-old classic but also the \$300 000 Robert Sangster Stakes, which has recently achieved coveted Group One status and a name change in honour of one of the greatest racing figures who has supported South Australian racing. Also the \$60 000 Coolmore Classic will provide further support to this impressive program. The total prize money for this day is approaching \$1 million. As I said, this

is the richest Wednesday meeting Australia-wide which is certainly something about which all South Australians can be proud. During the Magic Millions Carnival, Adelaide will be the focus of the Australian thoroughbred racing industry, and this event will also provide a wonderful opportunity to promote Adelaide as a tourist destination and a great place to do business, work and live. Both the Premier and myself will be attending and I hope other members will also be in attendance next Wednesday for this important day.

POLICE, COMPLAINT

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Minister for Police advise the house what progress has been made with regard to the events outlined in a letter to him from the Hon. Angus Redford MLC regarding an incident involving a random breath test unit and a police officer? On 3 November last year the Hon. Angus Redford MLC wrote to the minister giving details of an incident in northern South Australia in July 2001, in which a police officer stopped his vehicle and hid in the bushes alongside the road in the vicinity of a random breath testing unit. The minister responded six days later acknowledging receipt of the letter and indicating that he had referred the matter to the Attorney-General. There has been no subsequent communication with the Hon. Angus Redford.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): No wonder the member for Mawson could not ask the question! He is now preparing his resignation for the disgrace of this report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will not cast aspersions of that kind on any honourable member, regardless of the electorate they represent or the organisation with which they may be affiliated.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am happy to answer the question and I have a full answer to provide to the house. The interesting thing is that when I received this correspondence I acted immediately. Interestingly, I am being accused by Mr Redford in another place of something which I have not done, namely, not to have acted for some three months. On the advice with which I have been provided, Mr Redford received a letter himself about this issue in August 2004. He did not write to me until November 2004. So, while Mr Redford is so worried about a lapse of time, he sat on it for three months. I understand Mr Redford is busy as he is a barrister or whatever else he does to fill his days, but he has accused me of sitting on something for three months, when on my reading—I may be wrong and perhaps Mr Redford can correct me if I am—it appears that he took three months to write to me. That letter was received in my office on 5 November.

On 9 November a response was sent to Mr Redford—four days later—saying that, because it was a matter that related to the Police Complaints Authority, I immediately referred that matter to the Attorney-General to allow it to be responded to by the appropriate authority. Equally, I am advised that at the same time we also sent a copy of the letter to the Police Commissioner. We wrote back to Mr Redford on 9 November advising him that it had been referred to the Attorney-General for advice.

On 19 November advice was sent from the Attorney-General—a detailed response—regarding a full investigation that had been undertaken into this matter, as is appropriate—hands off by the government—by the Police Complaints

Authority. On 29 November I also received back into my office advice from the Police Commissioner on the said matter. Complaints about conduct of police officers from time to time are received by me and by others and are referred by statute, as statute requires, to the Police Complaints Authority. As is often the case, people are not satisfied with the work and findings of the Police Complaints Authority. That is certainly the case in this matter. Having got that advice back from the Attorney-General and the Police Complaints Authority, having got some advice on 29 November from the Police Commissioner, I considered that matter and was on leave for most of January. I apologise that I was not around for a lot of January as I was away until the end of that month.

The first opportunity I got to properly raise this matter directly with the Police Commissioner was on 2 February in a one-on-one meeting in my office, where I had the police complaints material and his response to me. I knew Mr Redford would not be completely satisfied and I asked the Police Commissioner on 2 February whether he could further review the matter himself, and that is exactly what the commissioner undertook to do.

The advice from the Commissioner today is that he is still looking at the matter. It is one of significant conflict between officers. It does involve the spouse of an officer who is not satisfied with the response, and it is a matter that has been thoroughly investigated by the Police Complaints Authority. But for Mr Redford to allege, argue and say publicly, and for members opposite to say, that I sat on this for three months is absolute nonsense. I acted immediately and appropriately. I simply ask the question: was Mr Redford too busy for three months to write to me if it was such an important matter?

NEONATAL CARE

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is to the Minister for Health. What is the government doing to assist premature and sick babies and their parents in South Australia?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the honourable member for Wright for the question. The care of tiny, premature and sick babies and their families has been enhanced thanks to the creation of a second neonatal intensive care unit at the Women's and Children's Hospital. I was pleased to officially open the new unit on 16 December last year. The new unit cost \$500 000 and was funded by the South Australian government and private donors. It has created more room for the 16 intensive care baby cots, enabling parents more space and more privacy when visiting their babies. Each cot in the new unit can be curtained off so that the mothers can feed them comfortably or just spend some quiet time with their baby.

In the new unit each cot has a brand-new monitor, purchased through the hospital's equipment committee, which is linked to a central monitoring system in the nursing bay. The central monitoring system has a split computer screen so the details of each baby can be viewed simultaneously. Some smaller but important touches make life easier for parents. These include: a portable phone, which means that parents do not need to leave the cot side when they receive calls; a new pharmacy fridge; a resuscitation trolley; a rounds trolley for patient notes; and storage for medical equipment. These all add to the efficiency of the unit.

The neonatal intensive care team cares for about 60 babies weighing less than 1 000 grams and about 110 babies weighing between 1 000 to 1 500 grams, and they do this each year. While the average length of stay in the unit is five

to six weeks, some babies stay up to three or four months, which is usually two or three weeks before their due birth date. Premature babies need prolonged intensive support of all their immature body systems and very detailed attention to their nutrition. That is why it is so important to provide both parents and babies with the support that they need at a particularly difficult time, and we very pleased to be able to deliver on that.

CROWN SOLICITOR'S TRUST ACCOUNT

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Attorney-General. Did the former CEO or acting CEO of the Department of Justice allocate funds for additional police on the AP lands without cabinet or ministerial approval?

The Hon. K.O. Foley: What about the unlawful act of Robert Brokenshire?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): The Leader of the Opposition engages again in the fallacy that if a minister or cabinet approves of a particular program, then it is okay for the former chief executive of the Department of Justice (Ms Kate Lennon) to take that out of the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account, even if the money was not placed there for that purpose. It is a fallacy. The government may well have approved of extra policing on the AP lands, and I will look into the matter and get an answer for the Leader of the Opposition. But it does not follow—be clear on this—that the government or a minister is thereby saying to Ms Lennon: tuck money away in the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account, pretend that it's spent when it's not and then, next financial year, having pretended that the money is spent, trot back like a squirrel to the hollow log, take out the money and spend it on something else. That is not what the government is saying in approving a particular program. It is a fallacy.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Attorney-General's Operating Account.

BAXTER DETENTION CENTRE

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is to the Minister for Health. How many Baxter Detention Centre inmates are being attended to by South Australian mental health authorities and what services are provided to them?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): My advice is that there are currently two Baxter Detention Centre detainees being attended to by South Australian mental health authorities. This number obviously does not include Ms Rau. My advice is that they are receiving acute mental health treatment at Glenside hospital.

TOURISM, SHORT HOLIDAYS

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. What initiatives are being employed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member for West Torrens and ministers on the front bench will simply shut up.

Mr O'BRIEN: What initiatives are being employed by the South Australian Tourism Commission to encourage South Australians to enjoy short stays within the state?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): Intrastate tourism is a very significant driver of the economy in South Australia because it invests money in regional and rural areas. Some 60 per cent of visitation in South Australia is by South Australians, and it accounts for about 40 per cent of bed nights, with 1.8 million visits and 5.6 million nights per year. This is an important sector that has been promoted through the Shorts program over the past 14 years, but this year we have introduced substantial changes to this important \$1 million program in that we now have increased the number of short holidays from the 150 that were holiday ideas 14 years ago to 450 in the book now.

These cover all 12 regions and are interesting this year because eight completely new products are available. In addition, there are special features that include more tourism data than just where to stay, the sites and pleasures of each region and, in addition, a special section on family travel so that families can find suitable pursuits for young children and destinations that will be pleasurable for parents who take whole families with them. The SATC Shorts advertising campaign is supported through collateral that appears in the *Advertiser*, the *Messenger Press*, *Adelaide Matters* and Shorts television advertisements. In addition, we are developing a Shorts web site that will be a one stop shop for booking and promotions, which we expect to be launched at the beginning of April.

In addition, those who wish to give gifts might wish to go to the SATC shopfront where they can buy gift vouchers to go to any of the regions. They are very suitable presents for people, rewards for family members and friends, and I hope that this variety of promotions will be particularly useful. Clearly, intrastate tourism is crucial, and if we expect to get from our target of \$3.4 billion a year up to \$5 billion, according to South Australia's Strategic Plan, by 2008, we have to nurture the intrastate market, because it is crucial to our economy.

CROWN SOLICITOR'S TRUST ACCOUNT

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to my friend the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney confirm the existence of a second set of books used by Kate Lennon in the stashed cash affair?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General has the call.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): Just for the sake of completeness, and rounding off my last answer, I should have said that I would have expected the salaries of police on the AP lands to have been met from operating accounts within the justice portfolio, such as the police operating accounts, rather than the Attorney-General's Department operating account. The question of two sets of books was canvassed with Deb Contala, a certified practising accountant, and her answer was that that is a fair conclusion.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Sir, I have a supplementary question. Given the Attorney's answer, will he now table the second set of books that he refers to?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Members of the opposition, in their failure to make their allegations stick, have now

descended into a semantic argument. To characterise what Kate Lennon did with the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Heysen and the member for Waite!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —to make it well understood by people who are not well versed in accounting, two sets of books is an appropriate way to characterise what was being done. Ms Contala is a certified practising accountant. She is now in charge of the finance section of the Attorney-General's Department, and it has been put to her whether two sets of books would be an appropriate way to characterise what is happening. Let me quote what she said. She said: 'That is a fair conclusion.' In response to being asked whether two sets of books is an appropriate way—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bragg!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —to characterise the rort that was the misuse of the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account, a certified practising accountant replied: 'That is a fair conclusion.' I do not know what is not clear about that to the opposition.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Davenport!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Indeed, when another accountant in the section was asked about the second set of books he said there was a set of information which was maintained that simply monitored the movement of funds into and out of the account. The Auditor-General concludes that the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account was misused. It was misused to give the indication that public money had been spent when it had not been spent. It was used to disguise cash balances that were held by the Attorney-General's Department but not disclosed for the purpose of the Auditor-General, for the purpose of Treasury and for the purpose of estimates committees.

As the Auditor-General quite rightly said in the report we have to the house today, it is important that all public money—taxpayers' money—remain under parliamentary control. What Kate Lennon and Kym Penniford did was take money from outside parliamentary control and put it where it was never supposed to be: in the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Bragg said 'So what? So what that it is outside the Hyperion control system? So what?'

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Waite simply does not understand what is going on. He sat in a parliamentary committee for week after week, and evidence has been led again and again that putting this money in the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account took it outside the control of the Hyperion monitoring system, and I do not think that the member for Waite can get it. He does not seem to get it. He can't have been paying attention. No one says that it was within the Hyperion system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bragg and the member for Heysen!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: What happened was that money was hidden from Treasury; the monthly reports that went to the three people in Treasury who monitored the justice portfolio, I am advised, was not a total figure for the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account; it was a total figure for

administered items amounting to over \$200 million of which the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account was only a tiny fraction—one of 29 administered items within my portfolio. Accounts were being hidden from me, from the Treasury, from the Auditor-General and, therefore, from parliament. The opposition has explicitly condoned this practice. The opposition has explicitly condoned public servants staying at the Palazzo Versace, and their stay being paid out of the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account without proper financial controls. If this money was being hidden, someone had to keep track of what the true tally was—that is the second set of books.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT BOARDS

Ms BREUER (Giles): Can the Minister for Environment and Conservation update the house on the progress of the establishment of the new natural resources management boards in South Australia?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the member for this important question. The first presiding members of the South Australian regional natural resources management boards were appointed on 16 December last year, and have already started working towards the implementation of the new Natural Resources Management Act. As members would know, this is groundbreaking legislation which, according to commonwealth ministers, will enhance the delivery of natural resources management in this state, and we have a very good relationship with the commonwealth in relation to this particular process.

The eight presiding members who have been appointed are: Ms Yvonne Sneddon for the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges region; Mr Charlie Jackson for the Alinytjara Wilurara area; Mr Brian Foster on the Eyre Peninsula; Ms Jackie Kelly on Kangaroo Island; Mr Merv Lewis for the Northern and Yorke; Mr Chris Reed for the Arid Lands; the Hon. David Wotton for the Murray Darling Basin; and Mr David Geddes for the South-East. These eight individuals have the skills and knowledge to make a real difference in natural resources management in South Australia. Between them they have a diverse range of skills and talents which will overall—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Among them; thank you very much. I am glad to see that the Attorney-General now has an assistant on the other side. It is good to see this bipartisan pedantry occurring in this place. I will now be listening very carefully to everything the member for Heysen says to see what solecisms she might commit. I have every confidence that they will make a great contribution to NRM in this state. The presiding members are helping me to work out the membership for their respective boards, and I hope to make some announcements about those board memberships in the future. The NRM Council will also be established in due course, and that council will be involved in determining the membership of the boards, as will the cabinet. In the meantime, work is under way to draft the state NRM plan, and that plan will form the framework for natural resources management and will contribute significantly to the achievement of South Australia's Strategic Plan.

CROWN SOLICITOR'S TRUST ACCOUNT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): My question is to the Attorney: will he assure the house that the disciplinary processes for all public servants involved in the stashed cash

affair have been carried out in accordance with law? Kym Penniford has alleged that he was threatened, victimised, bullied and a victim of blackmail.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): My advice is that Mr Penniford's claims are self-serving and false. If Mr Penniford believes that there was any defect in procedure then, of course, he can appeal to the courts in accordance with the law of the state. I fear that he will not be doing that because there is no merit in his claim. Of course, if Mr Penniford's barrister, Mr Griffin, were given permission by Mr Penniford to front the parliamentary committee, and to give evidence to the effect that Mr Penniford has, then that would be a different matter and would open up a question. However, at this stage there is no sign that Mr Penniford will waive legal professional privilege and allow Mr Griffin to appear before the committee and substantiate his allegations. There appear to me to be inconsistencies in Mr Penniford's account.

Let me tell the house exactly what happened in the disciplinary hearing. Mr Bleby for the Crown stated:

The parties, Mr Delegate, agree that the following constitute the facts upon which you are entitled to act: one, that Kim Penniford engaged in the transfer of unspent funds in the 2002-03 and 2003-04 financial years into the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account from which they were to be expended in the following financial years. Two, that Kym Penniford personally authorised deposits into the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account as follows:

- (1) expensive criminal cases administered line—\$130 000
- (2) rebate from Legal Services Commission, West Lakes matter—\$12 764.36;
- (3) video conferencing budget—\$165 000;
- (4) video conferencing budget—equipment—\$69 000;
- (5) video conferencing—ISDN and telephone—\$60 000;
- (6) video conferencing—balance—\$76 000;

Three, that in the 2002-03 financial statements for the Attorney-General's Department, Kim Penniford deliberately permitted the recording of unspent funds in the Attorney-General's Department, which had been paid to the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account as expenditure items, when those payments were not actual expenses at the time of the payments for the purpose of misleading the Department of Treasury and Finance. Four, that Kym Penniford oversaw production of the 2002-03 financial statements for the certification by the chief executive, Kate Lennon, and the manager, business and financial services, Paul Noon, which they signed on 25 September 2003, knowing that the financial statements for the Attorney-General's Department incorrectly recorded amounts which had been paid into the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account as expenditure.

By the above conduct, Kym Penniford cooperated in and facilitated—

Let me interpolate here. This is what Kym Penniford agreed—with legal advice from his solicitor, John Hankin and his barrister, Mark Griffin—Mr Griffin giving effect to this at the hearing. I return to the text:

- (1) avoidance of the government carryover policy by intentionally not disclosing the unspent funds to the Department of Treasury and Finance;
- (2) a system for managing the balance of funds held in the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account to allow the moneys improperly placed in the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account to be spent in the following financial year in a manner that would avoid disclosing them as a source of revenue for that year;
- (3) breach of Treasurer's Instructions 3, 19 and 21, and sections 23 and 41 of the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987.

Mr Delegate, the parties agree that, based on these facts, it is appropriate that you make a finding of improper conduct on the part of Kym Penniford. The parties consent to you taking the following action under section 58 subsection (5) of the Public Sector Management Act.

Mr Penniford has said that in respect of these negotiations, he did not speak directly to Mr Mark Johns, the Chief Executive of the department, nor was Mr Johns the delegate

who supervised the settling of this matter. The delegate was a completely different person, so I do not see how Mr Johns could bully Mr Penniford through his barrister and his solicitor. The notion is fatuous.

COURTS, CLEARANCE RATES

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Is the Attorney-General concerned by the clearance rate in the civil and criminal jurisdictions of both the Supreme and District Courts? What action has the government taken to address this issue? The clearance rate is the measure of whether a court is keeping up with its workload. The report on government services, produced by the Productivity Commission last month, reveals that the clearance rate of the South Australian Supreme Court is only 66.7 per cent. This is by far the lowest in Australia. In New South Wales, the clearance rate is 98.2 per cent, and in Queensland, WA and Tasmania it is 100 per cent. In the latest annual report of the Courts Administration Authority, the Chief Justice reports that the percentage of criminal cases in the higher courts dealt with in the targeted 180 days is only 17 per cent, down from 46 per cent in 2002.

The SPEAKER: Much of the explanation is debate and is disorderly, as I have pointed out for the benefit of honourable members in recent times. Such explanations will not be found acceptable by the chair in future.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): This is exactly the same question that was asked either earlier this week or last week. It has already been asked in the parliament, and I have undertaken to obtain an answer. Indeed, I discussed the matter with an officer of the Director of Public Prosecutions only this morning.

Ms Chapman: Are you concerned?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Of course I am concerned by delays in the courts, but what I can tell the house is that the opposition seems to be absolutely entranced by what happens in the Supreme and District Courts. My number one priority is what happens in the Magistrates Court, because that is the court that deals with more than 90 per cent of the cases that South Australians bring to court. The Magistrates Court is doing well; it could do better. I am appointing a Supreme Court judge to replace Ted Mullighan, and I am appointing a District Court judge very soon. I am confident that clearance rates can improve in the coming year.

I am concerned that, owing to delays in the Supreme Court and the District Court, the trials of some accused are delayed. I think it is important that those clearance rates improve but, make no mistake, the most important court for the purposes of the public of South Australia is the Magistrates Court, and that court is doing very well.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a supplementary question. Noting the Attorney's concerns, will he confirm that, when the Chief Justice raised this issue with him, he was reading the TAB form?

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Bright for the fifth time.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The question is a vile smear made under parliamentary privilege.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bright!

PUBLIC SERVICE SALARIES

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): Will the Attorney-General advise the house who the public servants are, and what disciplinary action has been taken against them, who have used taxpayers' money to 'pamper themselves and their mates', to use the minister's response to a question yesterday?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): Kate Lennon chose to resign as chief executive of Families and Community Services, rather than face up to a disciplinary hearing. Ms Lennon could have faced the usual disciplinary process and explained whether her conduct regarding the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account was in order or correct. She chose not to: she went on holiday and then flung herself into the arms of the Liberal Party.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I tell the Attorney-General that the Liberal Party does not own that pub. The question was explicit: it referred to which public servants stayed in that flash pub in Queensland.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Yes. Mr Speaker—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I suggest you read the transcript of the committee. Clearly, Mr Lucas leads Ms Lennon in her evidence—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: —by pre-arranged questions. As to the member for Unley's question, Mr Pennifold, who was in charge of that section and in charge of the balanced scorecard project, has been disciplined according to a disciplinary process, which, in the end, was agreed between the parties. I read out the substance of that agreement to the house, omitting nothing relevant. It is all there before the house. It took some time to read out. However, the member for Unley should be aware that Mr Pennifold was demoted from executive B to executive A. That is what happened.

Mr BRINDAL: My question is to the Attorney-General. In light of my clear understanding gained from both the press today and the Attorney's answers, a number of public servants were detailed as pampering themselves. Obviously, that number exceeded Ms Lennon and Mr Pennifold. If the Attorney knows the number, what were the names and what was the disciplinary action taken for the so-called abuse of public money by the Attorney—not by this side of the house, by the Attorney. He says they rorted the public system: let him answer who they were.

The SPEAKER: Order! The question is pure debate. The substance of the inquiry may have merit but the manner in which the matter was raised was not by way of an inquiry at all—rather a simple statement of opinion about, in rhetorical terms, what the Attorney ought to do. The question is out of order.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Mr Speaker, I would like the opportunity nevertheless to try to answer it.

The SPEAKER: In the interest of balance and natural justice, I will leave it to the Attorney to deal with it.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Mr Speaker, it is simply not contrary to the Public Sector Management Act to be pampered. What is contrary to the Public Finance and Audit Act and Treasurer's Instructions is to use an account outside the Hyperion monitoring system to stash cash and then to take the

cash that one has pretended to have been spent and use it for different purposes, or for purposes not authorised by—

The SPEAKER: Order! If the Attorney does not have the names of the public servants, he can sit down and move on.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Mr Speaker, it is not my intention—

The SPEAKER: Then sit down.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: It is not my intention, Mr Speaker, to upbraid public servants for being pampered: it is simply not right to do that. What is right is that Ms Lennon and Mr Pennifold be disciplined—and they have.

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There is no question before the house, your having ruled that the question is disallowed, and I ask that the Attorney conclude now.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens, for the last time.

Mr Koutsantonis: For what, sir?

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland has the call.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What is the budget allocation for the collation, dissemination and analysis of new information being sought from parents and primary carers of school-aged children, and for what purpose will this information be used? The state government, through the education system, has distributed forms to all parents and primary carers of school-aged children, seeking private information relating to their individual and educational qualifications and occupation. I am advised that there are privacy implications in seeking this type of information and I am further advised that this is the first time this information has been sought from guardians of schoolchildren.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Newland for her question. I think she is referring to an article in *The Advertiser* from November, which discussed—

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I think the member for Newland is referring to an article that first appeared in *The Advertiser* in November relating to a common agreement across all states made with MCEETYA and Brendan Nelson about enrolment details and collation of information. I am highly critical of the data collection, mainly because I have large handwriting and there are about two millimetres between the lines to fill it out: it is not a particularly well designed form, and I have asked that this year's form be better spaced and presented. I am informed that essentially the information is the same as last time. The privacy declaration has been simplified. The purpose for which the information is collected is national data collection agreed by MCEETYA. The material and questions are not of my choosing: it is part of a national agreement. My only input into the system—

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: My only input, my only impact—

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland has asked her question.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I am rather a stickler for the aesthetics. I found the form badly designed and asked that it be made easier to read.

HEALTH FUNDING

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the minister explain to the parliament what specific projects or lines of expenditure represent the \$11.446 million that was underspent in 2003-04 and was not approved for carryover expenditure in 2004-05? An answer tabled by the Deputy Premier on 7 February this year shows that in health \$64.5 million was underspent in 2003-04 but only \$53.1 million of that was approved for carryover to the next financial year, leaving a gap of \$11.446 million, which was not approved for carry on finance.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Carry over, not carry on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): Certainly we do not get money for carrying on in terms of our budgets.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: When he was minister it was carry on cutting beds.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: That is right, it was carry on cutting beds. I will be pleased to provide that information to the house.

HOME CARE

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question again is to the Minister for Health. Is the minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Is the Minister for Health aware that 78 year old pensioner, Mrs Aileen Penna of Balaklava, who has received 1.5 hours of home care per fortnight for the past 10 years from the Lower North Community Health Service, has had that care stopped completely due to the lack of funds? Mrs Penna has a serious heart condition and her doctor says that she needs more home care, not to stop it.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): Certainly, I am not aware of that particular issue and I will look into it for the deputy leader and come back to the house.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

HOME CARE

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to grieve about the situation of Mrs Aileen Penna. Here is a 78 year old frail, aged pensioner living in Balaklava who has had home care now for 10 years. For 10 years she has needed that support and care so that she can live independently rather than move into an aged care facility. When I spoke to Mrs Penna she highlighted how important that care is. But, suddenly, she has found that from the beginning of this year home care has been cut off completely, even though her heart condition has deteriorated just recently. In fact, she told me about how she sees a heart

specialist on a regular basis and the heart specialist had highlighted to her that she needed more, not less, care in terms of helping her stay in her own home.

So, I find it astounding that here is a health system under such stress and strain that this 78 year old pensioner suddenly finds that the home care she has had—enjoyed and appreciated—for the last 10 years has been cut off with very little warning indeed. I am sorry that the minister feels that she should leave the house when it is her department that has cut this very vital service indeed. It is her department that has said that Mrs Penna, at the age of 78 years, does not get the home care that she has received for the last 10 years, even though her doctor says that she needs more home care, not less. I might also add that she also looks after her husband, and her husband is aged as well and can move around the house only with great difficulty with walking sticks.

So, Mrs Penna has asked me to plead her case to get increased home care—or some home care, even if it is put back to where it was before at 1.5 hours per fortnight. It is totally unacceptable that she should be left, with her husband, high and dry without that support at home that she has enjoyed. I find it offensive that the minute I raise this issue the minister should get up and leave the house and not show any interest at all in relation to the plight that Mrs Penna and, I suspect from what I hear, many other people are facing in terms of cuts to home care services.

I ask the minister to investigate this case as a matter of urgency. I have given the details as to where that help has been coming from. It has been through the Lower North Community Health Service, which is part of the Wakefield region. It is fully funded by the state government. In that region all the budget comes from that area, although some of it would be a mix of federal and state money. It is inappropriate for the minister not to be aware of a cut in services to older people such as this. We hear many statements about how this government wants to help older people to stay in their home and have independence. Here is a classic example of someone who wants to do that, and it is not that when she needs extra support she cannot get it: she finds that the support she has enjoyed for the last 10 years has suddenly been stopped. I ask the minister to come back to this house as a matter of urgency.

The other point I pick up very quickly is the fact that \$11.446 million was underspent last financial year. Despite the increasing waits for surgery and the financial pressure our hospitals are under, \$11.446 million was underspent last year and not approved by cabinet for transfer to this year for expenditure. It was by far the largest amount and, in fact, it was almost the only department that suffered such a cut in expenditure that could be carried over for funding this year.

Once again, our health system is suffering because this minister does not have the clout to argue for the finance that was underspent from last year to be carried forward for this year so that they have the desperately needed money. It is ironic: here is \$11.4 million lost from the budget last year, not carried forward for this year, and here is Mrs Penna who has had her home care cut.

Time expired.

HOSPITALS, QUEEN ELIZABETH

Mr CAICA (Colton): As this house is aware, I have spoken on many occasions about the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. Without belabouring the points I made previously, I would like to recap a few of those most important points

before speaking about research at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I find it quite ironic that I follow the deputy leader, given that it was accepted that his vision (and the vision of the previous government) was to transform the Queen Elizabeth Hospital from a tertiary teaching hospital offering a full range of excellent medical services into a community hospital that was to offer nothing more than the services expected of a community hospital. That was their vision, although it clearly was not visionary.

What I said was not at all meant to denigrate the role of a community hospital. It is simply that the opposition, when in government, wished for reasons best known to itself to downgrade the Queen Elizabeth Hospital (QEH). The former government promised for years a much-needed QEH upgrade, but it was a promise made on the never-never. It was left to the current government, a government that truly recognised the value of the QEH, to commit to this hospital and the people it serves from the western suburbs and beyond. During the decaying days of the previous government, yet another commitment to upgrade the QEH was made. No-one can say what might have transpired. However, on form, it is most likely that there would have been an upgrade and that upgrade would have resulted in simply a community hospital.

The fact is that this government is committed to this outstanding hospital and its future is now secure. Notwithstanding the problems that have been experienced—for example, how to fit subsequent stages of construction into a structure never intended to accommodate any such stages—these issues will be resolved. Because of the commitment of this government to the hospital and in recognition of the outstanding services that the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and its equally outstanding staff are able to provide, the future of the QEH looks positive.

I wish to focus now on medical research at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital and I will declare an interest here: I am involved with the Queen Elizabeth Hospital Research Foundation. Every member of the house will be acutely aware of the QEH's enviable reputation, recognised well beyond Australia, particularly in but not isolated to the area of kidney research. Again it was left to the current government to commit to a continuation of the world-class research that is conducted at the QEH. Had the QEH been downgraded to a community hospital as intended by the former government, there would have been no tertiary teaching or research. Thankfully, this did not occur and, in complete contrast, this government has made the single largest commitment of funding to research in the history of our public hospital system.

The QEH is to get a new purpose-built research facility that will meet the needs of providing modern medical research as we progress through this century. As members would know, in this ever-changing, modernising and increasingly commercial world, the challenge is what ought to be the specific focus of research so as to maximise both the medical and commercial benefits that can accrue from that research. The commitment to research is there. The challenge is where best to locate the facility from two aspects, from both the medical and the commercial perspective. What is the best location in the hospital precinct in which to locate the research facility so as to maximise integration with a range of other medical services to the benefit of those services and, thus, the patients who require those services?

Secondly, what is the best location for this facility so as to exploit the commercial aspect of the research into the future? This is a matter that will have to be properly considered and,

in my view, it would not make sense to land lock that facility. If we believe—and I do—that South Australia can become one of the world's leaders in medical research and that the new facility at the QEH is crucial to this happening, the facility must be located where it can accommodate growth. Although there is obviously a process that still needs to run its course, I am confident that all these factors will be taken into account and that, in the end, we will finish up with a hospital and supporting research facilities that will be a major factor in placing the delivery of health and medical services in South Australia at an equivalent standard to anywhere else in the world.

AUSTRALIANS AIDING CHILDREN ADOPTION AGENCY

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I rise today to speak briefly about an issue that was the subject of a rally on the steps of Parliament House at lunch time today, that is, the minister's decision to close an adoption agency that has been operating in this state for some 12 or 13 years: the Australians Aiding Children Adoption Agency. In this state that has been the licensed agency through which people wishing to adopt children from overseas are able to proceed to do so. That differs from the other states of Australia: the other states, in fact, manage that whole process through the department.

A couple of weeks ago the minister made an announcement that he was planning to close the agency; that it would no longer be licensed to conduct that function and that it would be taken over by the department. The people protesting today were parents: some parents who are in the process of trying to adopt, some who have already adopted one child or more and are still in the process of adopting more and other parents who have long ago finished with the adoption process but have been very satisfied with it. Every one of them was there because they recognised that the agency that the minister has said he will close down is doing an extremely good job at very little cost to the government. The government commits something like only \$43 500 each year to the agency: the rest of its \$600 000-odd budget is provided by the people who deal with the agency, and it does an extraordinarily good job—to the extent that, when people from this state go overseas to collect the children they are adopting they obviously speak to parents who have come from other states, and the parents from other states are absolutely envious of this state.

When the previous minister was in the portfolio she commissioned a report in relation to the inter-country adoption services in this state, and that report supported the retention of the agency. At about the same time, I understand, there was something of a complaint about the agency. That complaint was referred to the Crown Solicitor's Office, and the office then put in a report. As a result, when the current minister took over the reins he had two reports.

The minister then decided to commission yet another report—the KPMG report—and that was received by the minister, I think, towards the end of last year. That report contained 19 recommendations, and every one of them supported the retention of the agency. The whole report was predicated on the basis of retaining the agency and, indeed, the recommendations related to adjusting things such as the reporting mechanisms, quality assurance frameworks and the sort of management jargon that we like to have these days in the Public Service. All those things had to be put in place, and the agency was more than willing to accommodate them. In

fact, the report even laid out a time line over about 12 months, through which period the various recommendations could be introduced and the processes adjusted as necessary.

My knowledge of this matter has been extended over the last couple of weeks since the minister's announcement because of the hundreds of emails, letters, phone calls and so on that I have received from people who are most upset at the minister's decision. Yet the minister had the audacity to stand on the steps of Parliament House this afternoon and indicate that nothing he had heard in the house, in spite of questions from me during question time, had moved him to reconsider his decision in this matter. It is a matter that does not need any legislative change: he could easily reverse his decision.

If he listens to the will of the people and to common sense, and to the recommendations made by KPMG in its independent report commissioned by him, he could still reach the correct decision by and before 31 March when the agency is due to close down. There is absolutely nothing wrong with the agency; it runs efficiently and effectively, and it goes well beyond the call of duty in working long hours, over weekends and so on, accommodating time change differences so that they can communicate directly with orphanages in India and other parts of the world, so that they can effectively run this adoption service. It is the pride of the rest of the nation and something envied by the rest of the nation, yet our minister is not prepared to sit down and look at it realistically; and not just take the word of one public servant, who has her own agenda in the matter, and go ahead and close the thing so that it becomes part of her empire within the public service, instead of continuing to operate as an effective private agency.

Time expired.

BAKEWELL BRIDGE

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Can I say, Mr Acting Speaker, that it is a pleasure to grieve in your presence, because I know that you will adjudicate with the wisdom of King Solomon. I rise today to talk about heritage listing. I have no problem with heritage listing. I think it is a good way to save beautiful, old, unique buildings, to keep them restored for future generations to admire and respect. But sometimes we go too far.

Members interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: A bit of protection please, Mr Acting Speaker. But sometimes they go too far. I understand that my local Messenger has discovered that someone, either the West Torrens Council or the local historical society, or both, wish to historically list the Bakewell Bridge on its register, and has asked the Minister for Urban Planning and Development to put on an interim PAR. This bridge has claimed more lives than any other bridge in Australia. That is how dangerous this bridge is. Until I ran a campaign to force the former minister for transport to put up safety barriers—and I want to thank other members for their support during the campaign—people would still be dying on that bridge. This bridge is overdue for demolition; it should be replaced immediately. The government is committed to that, with a \$35 million package to build either a new bridge or an underpass.

If the local historical society or the council wants to save this bridge they are completely out of step with the concerns of their ratepayers, residents and members. I understand that there are some significant parts of the bridge that should be

saved and, perhaps, preserved, such as the plaque dedicating the bridge, and maybe the design of the lights. But to say that this monstrosity is an historical item after taking the lives of innocent South Australians is an outrage. I do not believe for a second that the local council would want it listed on the heritage registrar, because I think it wants the bridge changed.

This investment is long overdue in the western suburbs, and it has taken a Labor government to commit to it. I will fight this. I will raise every single petition that I can. I will go door-to-door in Torrensville, Mile End, Thebarton, West Richmond, and all the way down to Lockleys, and I am sure that the member for Colton will take it from there, because people who use Henley Beach Road want to see the city opened up. I do not believe that the council would want to heritage list this item. I am sure that it is a mistake, and I am sure the *Messenger* must have had some false information, because I would be stunned if anyone on the council wanted the entirety of this bridge listed as a heritage item, to be protected from future development.

I am glad that the government committed to fixing the Bakewell Bridge. I think it should be renamed in honour of those who lost their lives, or something else to do with the western suburbs. The idea that this bridge somehow leaves a glowing, warm feeling in the hearts of people in the western suburbs is not right. I understand that it is a landmark and that it has been there for a long time, but it is ugly, it is an eyesore, no-one wants it and people want it replaced. Sometimes people who want things to be listed on our heritage wish list go too far, and I think that this is the bridge too far.

AUSTRALIANS AIDING CHILDREN ADOPTION AGENCY

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): I grieve today in support of the member for Heysen. I have a couple in my electorate who have used the private adoption service for the adoption of one child from South-East Asia and who are, at the moment, half-way through the process of adopting their second child. They approached me when the announcement was made by the minister that he was terminating approval for them to continue with their adoption services, and they were very concerned for two reasons: firstly, they are half-way through the process and wonder how long it is going to take them to swap over to the government department—they wonder whether things may be held up and how that might affect the situation in the country in which they are adopting their child; and, secondly, they were extremely satisfied with the service provided by the private company and had no issue with any of the paperwork, the detail, the information that had been given to them, or the treatment of them or of the child whom they have adopted by that private company.

I agree with the member for Heysen that it seems that there are other factors that are operating within the minister's decision, and it is a pity that I was not able to be out on the steps to hear him speak this morning. However, if what the member for Heysen has said is correct—that he is not going to back down—then I think that that is a loss to the community of South Australia and, as I said, certainly a concern for the people in my constituency. I ask him to review his decision, as the member for Heysen has done, to assess the advice that he has been given to cease approval for that service through the private company and to determine whether the grounds for that advice are correct or whether there is some other process in operation.

The other matter that I would like to grieve about—and I was going to raise it with the Minister for Transport, so I am pleased that she is here today—is that, since October last year, the residents of Gawler and those people who travel along Main North Road through Evanston South just at the end of the Gawler bypass have seen work undertaken to put an increased capacity storm drain under Main North Road. This has been going on since October last year, and here we are in February. To this stage on that four lane highway, the vegetation section in the middle has not been extended past the first two lanes, and there are many days when I travel past and there is nobody working on site. Traffic has to slow down to 40 km/h to traverse through the construction area, and it is extremely inconvenient to say the least. I am surprised at the slowness of the work and I would ask the minister to make some inquiries. Firstly, is it a private tender and is there a completion date—and to me it does not look like brain science that is going on there: they are just increasing the capacity, or installing a storm water drain under the road. Secondly, if it is not a private contract, is Transport SA carrying out this work and when can we expect it to be completed? At times, I have seen cars going through at speeds of greater than 40 km/h, and I am sure it is because of the frustration caused by the time it has taken to complete the job. I would appreciate an answer from the minister on this issue.

CENSORSHIP

Mr SNELLING (Playford): Late last year, along with the member for Florey and the federal member for Makin, Trish Draper, I attended the Christmas break-up of the Valley View Neighbourhood Watch. None of us had been invited to speak and, given the nature of the event, I thought that fair enough. However, that did not stop Ms Draper, who promptly invited herself to speak on the then imminent release of the French art-house film, *Anatomy of Hell*, of which she was rather critical. I am not of the opinion that adults should be able to watch whatever they want, and I think that the government has a role in censoring films that offend public decency. However, what flowed from Ms Draper was an extraordinary attack on the state government and the Attorney-General, in particular, for not using his powers to ban the film in South Australia.

I think that there are good reasons for the state's not striking out and taking a 'going it alone' approach to censorship, the main reason being that, because of DVDs and videos, these films can be moved across state borders very easily. One has only to look at the number of X-rated or non-violent erotica films that constantly come across into our state from Canberra. What I find remarkable is that, while criticising the state government, Ms Draper, who is a member of the federal government (which has the prime responsibility for classification and censorship), seems to have done nothing to approach the federal government on these issues. I wonder what she has done to lobby the federal Attorney-General about the personnel who comprise the federal Classification Board—probably not much.

Recently, I was amazed to learn that a former deputy head of the Classification Board has taken up a position as a lobbyist for the Eros Foundation, which is one of the main promoters of pornography. It is remarkable that, upon retirement, someone who has held a position as an independent umpire takes up a position as such a lobbyist. However, my main grievance is Ms Draper's getting up at community

functions, at which she was not invited to speak, and making political attacks on the state government on matters for which the federal government has prime responsibility.

BUS CONTRACTS

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Minister for Transport): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.L. WHITE: The successful bus contracts for Adelaide's northern, north-eastern and inner southern suburbs were awarded today. Torrens Transit is the successful tenderer for the north-south area (Gepps Cross to O'Halloran Hill) and the outer north-east area (Klemzig to Golden Grove). Australian Transit Enterprises Pty Ltd is the successful tenderer for the outer north area (Gepps Cross to Gawler). Five companies submitted 57 tenders for the contracts, which represent half of Adelaide's bus services. Torrens Transit and Australian Transit Enterprises (trading as SouthLink) already operate in Adelaide and have extensive interstate bus operation experience.

The new bus contracts will not only maintain current services but both Torrens Transit and Australian Transit Enterprises have committed to improving services to better meet the needs of patrons. If that is not achieved, contractors will not receive bonuses. The contracts set new benchmarks in services by creating unprecedented incentives for strong and consistent patronage growth. Serco has provided services since 1996, but did not exercise its right to renew its contract under the same terms and conditions for a further five years. Government put the services to tender in August 2004 and Serco was not successful in this process.

I would like to thank all the committed drivers and staff of Serco who have provided excellent service over the previous years and look forward to a smooth transition to the new contractors. The new contractors will be in contact with all existing Serco staff to explain how employees can sign up with the new operators. In the first months of operation, the new contractors will listen to their passengers' feedback to ensure they meet people's travel needs. Both contractors will commence services on Sunday 24 April 2005 for five years.

PITJANTJATJARA LAND RIGHTS (REGULATED SUBSTANCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 February. Page 1356.)

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I rise on behalf of the opposition as lead speaker, and I do so with a great deal of pride also being a member of the parliamentary standing committee on Aboriginal lands. My involvement with Aboriginal communities goes back over 33 years; and, unfortunately, in my experience, the issue of petrol sniffing also goes back 33 years. I used to drive the school bus from Port Augusta High School to what was then the Davenport Mission. Even then, 33 years ago, people were suffering severe substance abuse, and the majority of that substance abuse was due to inhalation of glue and petrol. My big concern for the Aboriginal people of Australia, never mind just South Australia, is that millions of dollars have been spent over many years, yet very little seems to have been achieved.

The Aboriginal Lands Standing Committee visited a number of communities in the eastern Anangu Pitjantjatjara

Yankunytjatjara lands last year. Of course, members hear all about the bad things happening on the lands, but let me tell the house that there are some fantastic things happening in those communities. There are some absolutely fantastic ventures and entrepreneurial activities occurring on the lands. It is far more than just the Aboriginal arts and craft centres, which, of course, are producing some world famous art. The communities should be very proud of what they are producing. They have a fantastic base on which to build. The lands are situated in some of the most beautiful country in Australia. A little later in my contribution, I will be talking about gaining access to that country and the issue about media access. The opposition is supporting the bill in its amended form, as amended by a member in the other place.

This bill will significantly affect the low lifes who are selling drugs and petrol to the people in the APY lands in the northern part of our state. The bill will create a new offence of selling or supplying regulated substances on the land and the penalty is to increase to \$50 000 or imprisonment for 10 years, a significant fine and term of imprisonment, and so it should be because the damage being inflicted by solvent abuse, petrol sniffing, should be abhorred. The bill will empower the police to seize and retain any motor vehicle. We are talking vast distances when talking of the APY lands. It is not like going from here to the Bay and walking around my tiny electorate down there. The Aboriginal lands in our north are vast. The most beautiful parts of our state are in that part of the country and it is important to support the communities up there and this bill will go a long way to doing that.

I was talking to some of the people involved in the communities up there and in recent months considerable momentum has been gained both at government and community level for improved provision of service responses to manage petrol sniffing and other health issues in the AP lands. To try to give a list and prioritise them could be: first, petrol sniffing; secondly, community safety; thirdly, child protection and health; fourthly, housing; fifthly, cultural maintenance and cohesion; and, sixthly, employment and training. Over the years various attempts to respond to the incidence and consequence of petrol sniffing have been made with limited success.

Thirty-three years ago I was seeing people north of Port Augusta at the Davenport community (as it is now) who were severely affected by petrol sniffing. In 2003 a small number of adults who sniffed petrol had been assessed by DHS for brain injury. This initiative was undertaken by the Pukatja Community Council, which demanded action by direct communication with the CE of DHS. Until this direct request action by the chairperson of the Pukatja Community Council, the then department of human services did not have assessment or diversionary sources available to the APY lands communities. I will be talking about some of the things the task force is doing now in the lands to try to overcome these deficiencies.

There is a growing body of knowledge and literature with regard to the history, aetiology and the possible responses to petrol sniffing. Further, there exists considerable expertise, willingness and knowledge among community members and workers, particularly in central Australia, on these issues. This expertise and preparedness warrants government support to assist in the development, implementation and evaluation of new coordinated interventions. This is a matter of giving the communities a hand up rather than a hand out.

I was very disturbed, as a member of the lands committee, to see the rash of announcements made by members of the

ministry and government when the press started pushing hard on the issues of petrol sniffing. There was a lot of publicity out there and I would like to think it was not just media management or a publicity stunt. I live in hope that there is genuine concern over there, and I know certainly that the members of the Labor Party and the Independents who are on the Aboriginal Lands Standing committee are genuine in their concerns. It is a fantastic committee and a privilege to be on it. When the Premier went up there with a number of public servants and media in May last year meetings were arranged. Unfortunately, it appears that the media management got in the way of meeting some of the committees. I was very disturbed to get a copy of a letter from one of the ladies at Pukatja who wrote to the Premier and said:

When you visited the lands at the end of April we were looking forward to meeting you after we received a fax at the Pukatja community office telling us to expect you. I got council members ready for a meeting with you and we had the kettle boiling for a cup of tea. When you didn't arrive I drove across the creek to see where you were and found you outside the TAFE building in front of the newspaper cameras. Unfortunately, I didn't see you again.

That is a bit of an indictment on some of the attitudes of some of the people opposite, but certainly not on those on the Lands standing committee.

There is tough talk on this, and this bill will make much clearer and more easily enforceable some of the sections in the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act 1981 because the ability to confiscate cars and ban people who are pushing drugs and selling petrol is already there. To supply petrol is an offence. Admittedly, the penalties are far too low in the current act. In fact, in section 42d of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act the penalty is \$2 000 or imprisonment for two years, and that is going up significantly, as I said before. Section 42d also provides:

(1) A person shall not be in possession of petrol on the lands for the purpose of inhalation.
Penalty: \$100.

That is absolutely inadequate. It goes on:

(2) A person shall not sell or supply petrol to another person on the lands if there are reasonable grounds for suspecting that the other person—
(a) intends to use the petrol for the purpose of inhalation;
or
(b) intends to sell or supply the petrol for the purpose of inhalation.

So the prohibition is there. Section 42d goes on:

(3) A member of the police force or a person acting under the authority of a member of the police force may confiscate and dispose of any petrol that he or she reasonably suspects is to be used or has been used for the purpose of inhalation and any container that contains or has contained such petrol.

The ability to confiscate and punish is already there. The penalties are far too low, and we will change that.

The current act goes on under section 43(7) to provide:

A member of the police force may seize and impound any vehicle reasonably suspected of having been used in connection with the supply of alcoholic liquor to any person on the lands in contravention of a by-law.

The bill before us will extend that to petrol, but I would have thought that under the current act the ability to confiscate cars is still there.

In fact, the communities can actually make by-laws. Section 43(3) provides:

Anangu Pitjantjatjara may make by-laws.

And paragraph (c) provides:

providing for the confiscation, in circumstances in which a contravention of a by-law under paragraph (a) or (b) is reasonably suspected, of alcoholic liquor or any regulated substance—

They can actually make by-laws to confiscate motor vehicles involved in petrol sniffing. So, they can do it already. The communities need assistance and support to do that, and I am pleased to say that I was shown some information today where the task force has a number of initiatives. They will be going out and assisting the communities, starting at family level, to implement these initiatives.

Last year the government introduced a regulation to include petrol in the Public Intoxication Act, and that is a good thing. The Coroner suggested that, and we should recognise that a lot of the work that is going on now is because the Coroner went to the Lands and carried out extensive investigations and had discussions with various groups, and he published a report. The Coroner's report is gradually—slowly, like everything in this place, unfortunately: it seems to take far too long but we have to be thorough—being acted on, and we now need to get this bill through this place and give the police, communities and families in the APY Lands the power to rebuild the communities and get rid of the scourge of not only drugs and marijuana but also in this particular case petrol, because it is a very significant blight on their community.

The need to enforce any law is paramount. There is no point making a law if you cannot enforce it. Certainly the police presence on the AP Lands is something we need to promote. There have been moves to put in more police. They are flying in and flying out, but I think the communities, and certainly the police themselves, know—and I know having a police station in Moseley Square would make a difference—that having police stations in the APY Lands in the communities would be a much better move than having police fly in and fly out, because good community policing involves getting to know the communities, individuals and families.

Only when there is a degree of trust will Aboriginal communities, particularly, start to liaise with the police, start to talk to the police and start to open up. I heard just this week that the police now are actually getting people to name names. That is a huge step forward, because the family ties, the kinship relations up there are very strong, and we need to make sure that we are not going to destroy thousands of years of culture by heavy-handed policing. So, community policing is something we need to look at. I do have a problem if the police go in there and seize vehicles. As I said before, this is a vast area of the state we are talking about here, and I am not sure where the seized vehicles are going to go. It is important that there be a penalty whereby vehicles can be seized, but what do the police do with them then?

It is good to see that a significant section of this bill is talking about young people. I have seen with my own eyes young teenagers, and some probably not even teenagers, with cans up to their faces, sniffing away. I have seen family violence, where brother and sister were literally belting each other over the heads with chairs. In one case, another family relative came out swinging with an axe. They were all intoxicated. You cannot over-emphasise the danger to these individuals but also to their families and the communities. So, to have an emphasis here on young people is good to see.

There is provision for a mandatory referral system. It is not mandatory sentencing but a mandatory referral system, and that is something we in the opposition support. Under the bill, the minister is required to establish such assessment and

treatment centres as are necessary for the purpose of the section to provide assessment and treatment programs to the lands. I will be listing a few of the task force projects that are being initiated up there, and I assume that these treatment centres will be part of that. It is important that the young people up there do get treatment, get referred to centres where they can be given help.

I was at the Operation Flinders breakfast yesterday. They are dealing with some of the very difficult cases in our juvenile justice system. To give those young people some self confidence, so they can go somewhere and learn that they are not alone, that drugs and violence are not the answers to their questions, is very important. Operation Flinders is doing a fantastic job. I spoke to Operation Flinders about extending their services to the AP lands, and I hope we can do something there. In the meantime, these treatment and referral centres need to be more than just a quasi-prison: they need to be a place where young people can go to learn some self-respect and dignity, that they are not on their own and that life is not just one step after another.

I was a little concerned that in part 2, Assessment of a Referred Person, this referred person has to give written consent to the release of medical and treatment records, which I can live with, but also a person's criminal records. I do not really know why the referral centre needs that. I would have thought they were there not to punish, because the referral to an assessment centre is not admission of any guilt whatsoever. It should not have anything to do with a criminal record. If wiser heads than mine; if the police, the psychologists and people in these centres feel that this is something we need to be able to deal with, then we can live with that.

Non-attendance at the referral centre is where I think the logistics are going to be an interesting exercise to watch. The bill provides that the assessment and treatment service must by notice in writing terminate the person's referral to the service if the person fails without reasonable excuse to attend the service in accordance with the referral notice or with any other notice requiring the person to attend. I note that a copy of that letter in writing will also have to go to the Police Commissioner. Due to the vastness of those communities, the logistics of contacting some of these people would be incredible. I hope they have worked out a way of contacting the young people who are referred to these treatment centres and that they do not abandon them; that they do not write a letter saying, 'You can't come any more,' or 'We are giving up on you.' I hope they get them back, get them going again and involve them with the community.

It was absolutely great to see 'Undertakings' in section 3 of schedule 4 and 'approved programs' in subsection 3(6), which deals with treatment and referral centres:

Approved programs means a program, the contents of which have been approved by—

- (a) Anangu Pitjantjatjara; and
- (b) the minister.

Involving the people—the communities and the families—is something that we really need to emphasise all the time. The contentious part of this bill that we will be discussing in this house is an amendment by the Hon. Nick Xenophon in the other place regarding media entry into the lands. I have some severe reservations about how this will be conducted. I refer to the minister's second reading speech. In the first paragraph he said:

Recent press coverage of conditions on the AP lands graphically illustrates the misery the practice of petrol sniffing inflicts not only on those that participate in it but on all community members.

In the government's second reading speech it recognises the role of the media in going to the AP lands and highlighting the issue and the good that that media exposure has done. The Hon. Nick Xenophon, in his address in the other place, talking about media entry, said:

The government has acknowledged in the opening paragraph of its report to parliament in its second reading explanation that it was recent press coverage of conditions on the APY lands that graphically illustrates the misery caused by the substance abuse of petrol sniffing.

Miles Kemp, the *Advertiser* journalist, and other media outlets that have covered this story, made a substantial difference in bringing the terrible condition, the blight of petrol sniffing, to the attention of the people of South Australia.

That emphasises the fact that the media has a positive role there. In his summing up when discussing this amendment the Hon. Terry Roberts said:

There has been a suggestion that, if the lands were far more open than they are now and did not have restricted entry, the situation that has developed over the last decade—

and I have to say, not just the last decade, the last three or four decades; 33 years in my case—

would not have occurred. There would have been more people to observe the deteriorating conditions in which the APY people were living, and more attention would have been paid by a range of people, so that the deteriorating conditions people were living in would have been interrupted and there would have been greater government support, or greater support, for APY had those circumstances been known.

So, the minister recognises the fact that, if the issues are exposed, discussed and publicised—and, once again, the political pressure is there—people tend to act.

Opening up the lands is something that I think is possible, but it should be done in consultation with the communities and the families. On a visit to the AP lands last year we went to Mimili and spoke to the organisers of Mimili Maku Tours, which takes busloads of tourists out onto the lands. They teach them some of the traditional ways, they introduce them to bush tucker and they show them their art; they allow a genuine cultural interaction. What needs to be emphasised for the future of the lands, I think, is that we should be working towards an expansion of entry into those lands.

With respect to whether the media is just allowed *carte blanche* in there, I think the clause states 'in the public interest'. This is not a tourist visa; it is not a ticket to go and interrupt business there. I know that the media is sensitive to Aboriginal affairs and cultural ways. It will be sensitive to any business that is going on there. If the roads are closed, members of the media know they will not be using those roads. They would not photograph any activity that is taking place or sacred sites. They are more sensitive than that.

It is obvious from both the second reading speech and the minister's reply (and this was reinforced by the member's speech in the other place) that there is a need to open up the lands. These communities are very media savvy. They will not be bushwhacked by a bunch of journalists from down south. They will be very careful about what they present. I guarantee that anyone who misrepresents them will rue the day, because to underestimate those communities and their ability to look at people and sum up what they are all about is beyond doubt. This bill will get through this place, and I wish those involved in implementing the laws that result from it the very best. But, as I said, we need to make sure that the projects on their lands are not just a handout, but that they are

a hand up. We have to get the families and communities built up there.

At the moment, the task force has community petrol misuse programs operating in the area, with funding of \$680 000 this year. That will continue: it is funded until 2008-09. I assume that the community petrol misuse program has started. There are also family support programs, which are being well funded. They are run by the Department for Families and Communities. They are funded at \$355 000 each year, rising to \$459 000 in 2008-09. I am not sure whether that has begun, but it is a program that needs to get started straightaway because family support is vital to ensure that these programs continue.

Positive behaviour units is another program. The funding is only \$50 000 this year, but it will increase to \$279 000 in 2008-09. A program is being established to provide specialist counselling services for Anangu with violent, aggressive behaviours which incorporate their families and other members of the community. I had never seen anything like the violence that we witnessed when we were in one of the communities. It was not the community's fault; it was just the fact that individuals there had, for some reason, chosen substance abuse as a way of overcoming some of their difficulties. The psychological and emotional effects of substance abuse were clearly evident. There is everything from increased staff housing, community support services, training, ceramics programs—the art centres up there are absolutely fantastic—and a number of projects going on. Night patrols is another one and others include community transport and outback pride. I understand that there are about 25 programs to be announced in the near future. It is very important that, as part of these programs, the treatment centres are up and running so that the youth involved in substance abuse are not left on their own any more than they need be. I know that the communities are trying very hard at the moment.

This bill should be all about stopping substance abuse, and it should be seen as a starting point. We want to stop the substance abuse and start rebuilding these communities. With that, I look forward to hearing what the minister has to say about the amendments that are being moved. I indicate that the opposition will support the bill as it is.

Mr CAICA (Colton): I will be relatively brief in my comments. This bill was introduced by the government as a component of a suite of initiatives aimed at reducing and alleviating the hardships and difficulties experienced on the APY lands as a result of substance abuse. Today, I specifically want to focus my remarks on the form in which this bill has come back from the other place and, in the first instance, to specifically talk about an amendment that was introduced by the Hon. Nick Xenophon in another place, and accepted by the other place, and that is now section 5 of the proposed bill that focuses on unauthorised entry onto the lands.

My understanding is that the intent of this amendment (now this component of the bill) is to give effect to a situation that will allow the media to circumvent the system that is in place that provides permission for members of the broader community to visit and travel to the APY lands. I further understand that the purpose of the proposed amendment is to allow members of the media to report on matters of public interest (whatever that might be, from time to time) without what the Hon. Nick Xenophon believes are the encumbrances that today impede such reporting.

I am going to have a great deal of difficulty supporting this bill in its current form. The fact is that I cannot, in all conscience, support this bill in its current form. I find it somewhat astonishing that the Hon. Nick Xenophon thinks that he understands what is in the best interest of communities that make up the APY lands. That he is able to come to his conclusion without even bothering to speak with the elders and other community leaders in the APY lands is equally astonishing, but mostly, I believe, disrespectful. In his speech to members in the other place, he advised that he had not spoken with any person from the lands to get their views on the particular amendment that he proposed.

I am mindful of the advice provided by the Speaker on numerous occasions regarding the behaviour that should be observed in exchanges between and response from this house and the other place. To this end, and despite my dismay at the nature of what I find to be an ill-considered and paternalistic amendment now incorporated into a bill which is aimed at lessening the ravages of substance abuse in the APY lands, I will be measured in my contribution. There is one thing that I expect is fact: while the Hon. Nick Xenophon has not consulted with the very people upon whom he wishes to impose this measure, I bet he has spoken to his friends in the media.

Despite what the Hon. Nick Xenophon and the opposition members in another place might assert and, indeed, I think, to a certain extent what was asserted by my colleague the member for Morphett, the shocking impact of substance abuse was not first revealed recently by a caring media in the pursuit of public interest. I also know for a fact that the honourable member for Morphett, like me, does not need a caring, sharing media to point out these things. The fact is that the problems will be addressed irrespective of what they might do. The fact is that, to the everlasting shame of successive governments, for too long there has been an acute awareness of the tragedy which is substance abuse on the APY lands and, quite simply, nothing has been done.

This bill is aimed at addressing, as part of a suite of initiatives, as I said, the problems and difficulties associated with substance abuse. This government is committed to doing something; indeed, everything it can. As I said, this bill is one initiative. I believe that it is no longer in a form that I can support, and to have this bill scuttled because of an ill-conceived amendment will be to this house's shame, and we cannot allow this to happen.

I have spoken briefly about the paternalistic nature of this amendment, and there are a couple of points I wish to make in conclusion. First, my concern is what constitutes public interest. Who determines what is in the public interest? What checks and balances will be in place to ensure that a member of the media who travels to the lands reports on that matter of public interest? If I heard rightly, the member for Morphett advised the house that we can trust the media; it is not going to do the wrong thing; it is actually going to do what is expected of it and, of course, we can trust it. I know for a fact that the media abides by some form of code of ethics and is, indeed, a group of upstanding and credible professionals doing an often thankless task. It is quite likely for that to occur, but, the fact is, what guarantees do we have? What if a member of the media believes that reporting on an initiation ceremony was in the public interest? I shudder at the thought of what the unintended consequences may be of a well meaning journalist's approach to what constitutes public interest.

Finally, what is so wrong with being required to obtain the necessary authorisation to travel to the APY lands? It is, after all, the land of the communities that make up the APY lands. It is their land. As an example, if I go out to the bush, permission needs to be sought from pastoralists to travel on, what is in their belief, their land, for very good reasons. The fact is, that it is respectful, it is also a safety issue, and I am sure that a pastoralist would wish to be asked for me to come on to his land. I am sure that he or she might be interested in the reason for the visit and, indeed, the exact location of where I am visiting for safety reasons—just in case something goes wrong—and would not be satisfied if I said, 'It is in the public interest, that is why I am coming on to this pastoralist's land.' I can find no sound reason to support this bill in its current form and look forward to the amendment that is going to be moved.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): We have been aware for a long time that there are significant issues to be addressed in the Pitjantjatjara lands. As a minister back in 1993 to 1996 I visited that area and I was shocked and quite distressed by what I saw. Accompanied by Les Nayda—some members might be aware of young Les, or not so young Les now—and other Aboriginal people, we travelled through those lands, and I saw things which, quite frankly, horrified me. It is a difficult issue, and I guess that some would argue that the more you keep the activities away from wider public scrutiny the more likely there are to be abuses and so on. At the same time we are talking about activities and property which are under the control of the people themselves, so you need to have a degree of balance in regard to that access, the same as you do in relation to private property anywhere else.

I do not support the amendment proposed by a member in another place in regard to allowing the media to have greater access, and I will not be supporting it. I think that sometime down the track the whole issue needs to be worked through in relation to access, and it has to involve the people whose land it is, and not be something that we seek to impose on them.

Ultimately, I think that the lands and, more importantly, the people—and the two are inextricably linked, I know—need to have an economic base to support themselves in those lands, otherwise you will always have issues related to welfare, and consumption of illegal and inappropriate substances. Thus far we have not seen the development of, for example, tourism, and that comes back to the original point that I made about appropriate access, controls and that sort of thing. Likewise, there have been some attempts at raising stock, I think with mixed success, and maybe not a lot of success. The member for Stuart would know a lot more about that than I would but there have been some efforts in relation to craft activities, batik and so on. However, in my view unless you have an economic basis for existence you are going to be dependent on welfare, and all of the negative aspects that can go with that. As we see in other parts of our country, if a country town does not have an economic base it cannot survive, and it is not kept there just for the sake of it.

People would say that the Pitjantjatjara Anangu people have had a long association with the land but the fact remains that without a sustainable economic base people cannot live there. The people do not live in a totally traditional way; you only have to look at the amount of canned food that is consumed. So, we have this paradox of a part Europeanised culture in a traditional setting, and until we come back and

address this, with community support, and until aspects of economic sustainability can be developed, then we are going to keep hearing continually about problems with abuse of substances, and all the other unfortunate activities that are associated with people who do not have an economic base to their life. I indicate that I will not support the amendment moved in another place in relation to allowing the media more access and, accordingly, I will support the amendments being moved by the minister here.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I am speaking in support of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights (Regulated Substances) Amendment Bill on behalf of the Greens. I have some remarks to make about the nature of the legislation, the timing of it, and the amendments which were brought into the bill in the Legislative Council. First of all, let me say that the principles that I am basing my thinking on relate to harm minimisation in respect of substance abuse. That is the cornerstone of the Green's policy in relation to substance abuse. We believe that instead of punishing an individual for the adult choice to use or abuse a drug, that the focus should be on two things: firstly, the health of the person, therefore minimising any harm from misuse of any substance; and, secondly, maintaining existing laws in respect of dealing drugs.

In the context of the APY lands, it means that we should look at individuals sniffing petrol and have as our primary concern not only their health and welfare but also that of those around them. It is quite clear that, when petrol sniffing results in aggressive or antisocial behaviour, the impact is on the immediate family and the broader community in the AP lands; indeed, the same can be said for areas all around South Australia. This bill is good, because it focuses on substance abuse and, as it has come to us from the upper house, there is an emphasis on assessment and treatment.

I will also say something about the timing of this legislation, because it reflects the priorities of the Labor government. About a year ago, when the issue of the AP lands blew up, the Aboriginal lands committee was travelling to meet with indigenous communities north of Adelaide. The Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, and the rest of the committee, was as surprised as anyone to read *The Advertiser* headlines that highlighted the petrol sniffing crisis, and it was fair to describe it as a crisis. What was surprising was that this issue, which had been developing over many years, had come to prominence just at that time.

Of course, the government is extremely media sensitive and, as we know from a range of other issues, if it makes the front page of *The Advertiser*, and if there is any sense of damage to its image, the government will respond with a counteracting message and money. In this case, why would there not be damage, when the reality of the AP lands began to be publicised about a year ago, namely, young people addicted to petrol, aggressive behaviour among teenagers and adults and rampant domestic violence. A whole range of antisocial behaviours had been dealt with inadequately, because there had been no real commitment backed by the necessary funds to manage the issues from Adelaide and, at the same time, no commitment to work with the leaders on the APY lands to solve them. So, there was a lack of respect and communication, and there was neglect of issues that were gradually coming to the boil on the lands.

However, to its credit, once the crisis became public, the government did respond, and it did so in two ways—with two pieces of legislation. It formulated legislation to deal with the governance on the lands, and we all recall the Deputy Premier

blaming the Aboriginal leaders for mismanagement of the lands when, in fact, quite clearly, it was a state government responsibility, together with the health agencies, the South Australia Police and the child welfare agencies, to deal with those issues. The APY Lands Council is there to deal with issues of land use generally and to provide some democratic governance, but it is not there to provide health services, child welfare or policing directly. The responsibility for all those serious issues lies squarely at the feet of the government of the day.

When the government formulated the legislation to alter the governance of the Pit lands, it also formulated the legislation before us now to deal with petrol sniffing and related issues. The point I make is that the timing of the legislation reflects government priorities. I am sorry to say that but, clearly, the priority of the government was to alter the governance, and it also seemed that the government preferred to have a different executive in the AP lands because, for whatever reason, communication had broken down with the previous group running it in terms of indigenous democratic governance. I would say that it was not their fault that communication broke down. They had been asking for assistance with these services for a long time.

So, despite the government's rhetoric about concern for indigenous people and about drug and substance misuse on the lands, what came first (by a good six months) was the legislation dealing with governance on the lands. That is regrettable, because this legislation is necessary, and I support it. Two types of amendments were moved in the other place, and I can deal very quickly with the one that allows virtually unlimited media access to the lands.

To me, this is utterly inappropriate. It is as inappropriate as allowing media to come into your suburban backyard home and film an interview freely at any time they please. It is an invasion of privacy; it is disrespectful. We need to recognise that, by virtue of legislation and tradition, those lands belong to the APY people; and because of their special connection with the land, that whole area needs to be treated as their land. There are houses on it, but it is not a matter of just respecting the privacy of the backyard of each one of those houses. That is a very non-indigenous, a very European conception of private property. In fact, there is a sense of ownership of the lands held communally by the people. It is inappropriate for there to be unfettered access to the lands if the indigenous people, trustees and custodians of the lands choose not to allow that access. I have no compunction whatsoever in rejecting that proposition, and therefore I will be supporting the government's amendment, which effectively takes out the clause that was inserted in the Legislative Council.

The other amendment that was moved in the Legislative Council relates to mandatory referral to assessment services for Pitjantjatjara people of or over the age of 14 who have been sniffing petrol. I do not see how anyone could oppose that in principle. As I understand it, the chief argument against it on the part of the government is that there is no appropriate facility to which people could be referred; and so it is said that there is no point making a law requiring people to be referred to a facility that does not exist. Of course, the counter argument which I put forward is that a facility of such a nature needs to be established as soon as possible—and it is not outlandish: I am not dreaming this up.

The Aboriginal Lands Task Force has addressed this issue. I am aware that one of its recommendations—and, of course, this is subject to the state budget process—for use of money

is to establish a substance misuse facility, and that would be for the assessment, detoxification and treatment of people on the lands with substance misuse problems. It would also be available to their families. Some thought has already gone into this, and I am grateful to those officers of the Department of Health who have been working on this. It would have to be one of the most worthwhile items of expenditure one could imagine in relation to the lands in order to improve some of the social problems to which I have referred. There is no money budgeted for the project this year—zero to be put toward it this year, even though the need is pressing—but there is \$250 000 in terms of a recommended allocation for next year, and \$1 million a year for the three years after that.

It is expensive to build up there and it is a specialist facility. It will be expensive, but it is absolutely essential if we are to start fixing the widespread petrol sniffing problem on the lands. I think it would be better to have this mandatory referral in legislation now, and that will be a straitjacket of sorts on those who decide how and when the budget is to be spent, so that they actually do fulfil the promise of the legislation. As I said, the principle that I start out with is that we should not be punishing the individual for sniffing petrol. We should be punishing individuals for anti-social behaviour and particularly violent behaviour—we have to do that.

The primary concern for individuals who are petrol sniffing is to have them treated. It only makes sense to approve this proposition in the legislation (which was put forward, as I understand it, by the Hon. Nick Xenophon) to insist upon a referral to an assessment service. If it is not built, it should be built forthwith. Therefore, I will be opposing the government amendment which incredibly seeks to take out the clauses that require mandatory referral to assessment and treatment services.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): The amendments to the Pitjantjatjara Lands Right Act are long overdue. However, they do not go anywhere near far enough. It is about time we were prepared to face the difficulties confronting the communities in the AP lands and take some effective, strong and positive steps that will be in the long-term best interests of those people. We have 11 per cent of South Australia shut off from the rest of the community. We forbid people to go there and allow a group of people to misuse their authority and to engage in unnecessary and unhelpful practices—and who has not benefited? In the past I spent a lot of time in that part of South Australia and, as you and others indicated, Mr Acting Speaker, it is a most attractive part of the state. It has the potential for great economic benefit to the residents of the AP lands. The only way in which people will get their fulfilment is to encourage and foster that economic development. It will not be achieved by having a closed shop and not giving people access.

It is deplorable that, with few exceptions, the 69 MPs who sit in this place and federal members of parliament are the only ones allowed to go there without a permit. The member for Colton in his contribution talked about the road system and compared it with the pastoral areas of South Australia. Unfortunately, he perhaps does not understand. A public road in the pastoral areas anyone can drive on. If he wants to drive between Nepabunna and Arkaroola to Moomba, he will find that all those roads are open to the public. The road between the Stuart Highway, past Indulkana right through the lands to Pitjantjatjara is funded by the taxpayers of Australia, but the taxpayers are not allowed to drive on it without a special

permit. It is a nonsense, it is unwise and not in the best interests of the Aborigines.

If we allowed a number of South Australian people to go and see first hand what is taking place in the AP lands, they would be appalled. I remember taking the member for Morphett and others to the AP lands for the first time. They suffered from culture shock. They could not believe when we got to Indulkana that we were in South Australia. They were allowed to go there because they have become members of parliament. People driving up the Stuart Highway by the thousands and going up there by train see the lights, but they are not allowed to go there. Why? Are we ashamed? We should be ashamed, no doubt, because the conditions are appalling. There is no work. By having this closed shop arrangement my constituency has to suffer the social problems that occur when these people suddenly land in Port Augusta. We are now having an argument over it. When it is hot they come down to the sea, get stranded there and cannot get back and we have all these social problems.

If anyone believes that the next generation of young Aboriginal people will stay on those lands without the same sort of economic opportunities, they are fooling themselves—it is a nonsense. They want the bright lights of Alice Springs, Port Augusta, Ceduna and Port Lincoln. It is just a nonsense. The more you shut the place down the worse it will be. The group of political activists, the Aboriginal machine and other odd people who have got in there and got control of the place are not acting in the interests of the local Aborigines but have their own political agenda. Political activists include the Snowdons, the Ushma Scales and all those sort of people—we know all about them. I could write a book on them and the other derelicts you see when you go through there. I could write a history on them.

Ms Breuer: You are a disgrace, calling people that.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: If the member for Giles thinks that those people—

Ms Breuer: You come in here and name people.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: And I haven't finished yet. For the benefit of the member for Giles, we know that she was one of those who went out and criticised the Deputy Premier when he went there and was obviously appalled and shocked, as would be most South Australians, at the conditions, at the way women and children are treated and at the lack of opportunity. She was one of those, aided and abetted by one or two others, who wanted to perpetuate that situation, which is third world standard, which is appalling—no wonder she is leaving the chamber. The Deputy Premier was absolutely right and was forced to pull back.

Any comments I have made in relation to the AP lands are for only one purpose: I want to see fulfilled the aspirations that people like Punch Thompson, Donald Fraser, Ivan Baker and those people had when this legislation originally passed through the parliament. They hoped that this would be the beginning of a chance to create equal opportunity and economic development for those people, to raise the standard and create opportunities. Go and talk to Donald Fraser now and see what he has to say about how disappointed he is in this process. Go and see what has happened to Punch Thompson and talk to Danny Colson, one of the few Aborigines who has set up his own farm without government assistance.

The member for Giles ought to jump up and down about me. Look at the education needs up there. While you have a closed shop you will not have the progress that ought to be made. Does the member for Giles think that having people

living in motor cars, having dogs up there (which is obviously unhealthy), seeing young people walking around with tins tied around their neck with wire and sniffing petrol, with nothing being done, is a good thing? Does she think that seeing burnt out houses and abandoned cars from the highway through to Pipalyatjara, with a grader going around them, is a good thing and in the interests of these people? If she does she is probably the only one in the chamber. When people see it they are appalled.

We have a situation where you could have thousands of well-organised tourists going through there. People want to see the open spaces, want us to have eco-tourism and to see the traditional lifestyle of the Aborigines: it could be organised.

Mrs Geraghty: They are not on show. You do not want people coming around to your place and watching you having a picnic.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The Government Whip is a good, well-meaning person and I know that she would be concerned about these matters. That is not what I said and it was not my intention. If the honourable member was aware and had taken the trouble to sit down with these people and see what are their aspirations, she would find that they are concerned to ensure that the next generation of Aborigines have a chance.

You do not have to take the tourists to where they live. You can by-pass those places. You do not have to take them to Indulkana, Fregon or Pipalyatjara. If you knew anything about the area you would know that there are plenty of these areas which tourists would like to see and they would like the Aborigines to explain the significance. You do not have to: no-one has advocated that. I have been to Pipalyatjara and I have been to Umuwa—the mini Canberra, that settlement where those who want to administer the lands live apart from the people in their own surroundings. I have been there when the Pitjantjatjara community comes to the office and says they would like to see me and talk to me but they do not want the white advisers there, because they want to tell me exactly what they think. And my attitude is: I have plenty of time to sit in the creek and talk to you. I am not really interested in what the advisers have to say, because they are pushing their own agenda and their own cosy lifestyle.

I have seen what happens at Pipalyatjara where the bulldozer sits on the side of the hill where the chrysoprase mining is taking place. I do not know how often you have been there, Mr Deputy Speaker, but we were told when the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act was first passed that you could run approximately 50 000 head of cattle out there, very conservatively. Go and talk to the Aboriginal people; and they want to be involved. But no, we have all these characters out there—the misfits from around Australia and overseas. You see all sorts of people who cannot run their own countries but they get out there and want to inflict their own peculiar lifestyle onto these people. Some of them get themselves initiated into tribes and wear red headbands. What sort of an insult is that to the people?

Nevertheless, they are getting well paid. The Toyotas are arriving. Peter Kittle has done well out of it—he has done very well out of it. Go to a meeting at Pipalyatjara and you will see more Toyotas to the square metre than anywhere else I know. They come from near and far. These people just organise meetings to entertain themselves and divert attention. They are driving around and people are sitting in the back of utes and trucks, and they have all sorts of projects. They fly windmill experts from Alice Springs. Instead of

getting a few practical people to live on the lands to teach them how to look after and maintain windmills, you fly the expert from Alice Springs. You bring the supplies from Alice Springs. You build really nice shops and things. You even have take-away food in Ernabella. There is take-away food on one corner and petrol sniffing on the other.

This parliament has not only a responsibility but also an obligation to take positive steps to do something about these problems and rectify the difficulties. They will not be rectified until there is a change of emphasis, a change of policy and people have commonsense and reality. You go up there and there are people who engage in their own political extremism. How foolish these people are!

Mr Hanna: What, capitalism?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is what is going to happen, because lots of the Aboriginal people want to have sections of the land themselves and, fortunately, that is what is going to happen; and the Vice President of the Labor Party is one of the people pushing it. I know the trendy lefties will be doing somersaults down the corridors, but they have lost the round—and let me tell the house one of the reasons.

I remember many years ago I was asked to help organise for John Howard to open the Underground Motel at Coober Pedy, which I was pleased to do, and when he came he wanted to go to the Pitjantjatjara lands to meet the people, and he went there with the best will in the world. When he arrived there, Yami Lester and his girlfriend, and one or two others, organised some agitators from Alice Springs to abuse him and attack him. It was a very foolish escapade, because what goes around comes around. I will not repeat the comments John Howard made to me as we left, but I thought it was one of the most foolish escapades that one could ever imagine. John Howard at that stage was the alternative prime minister and has now become the Prime Minister—and, fortunately for this country, the best Prime Minister we have had in generations, and has given great leadership and commonsense to this country.

There is mention in the newspaper today about private ownership of land. I will tell the house some of the things that go on. Why is it that Yami Lester could get a big lease at Wallatinna? Why is it that someone like Danny Carlson could not run a few cattle? Why is it that people like Donald Fraser had trouble when they wanted to run cattle? You have the stupidity of government funding bodies. They help them buy the land but they will not give them any money to buy cattle or improve the place. There is enough trouble now in areas of the Flinders Ranges which are Aboriginal land and the state and federal governments are not giving sufficient money to maintain the fences. That is how foolish the whole escapade is up there. There is an urgent need, because they want to have enterprises.

I remember being out at Pipalyatjara years ago, and they had a couple of characters out there. I do not know where they got them from. One had a goatee beard and looked like Lenin.

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well he did, and he had the same philosophy. However, when I said to him, 'These people are saying to me they want to get some cattle out here,' he said, 'We couldn't have any wicked capitalist exercises like that.' I said to him, 'Well, son, obviously you have a problem and I cannot help you but, hopefully, the effluxion of time will.' Nevertheless he has now gone to Queensland and I understand he has a dairy farm. I wonder how he managed that. It was an interesting suggestion. There were 44 gallon drums

of chrysoprase that were suddenly put on the truck at Pipalyatjara, but they never got to Alice Springs. And I leave that to members to imagine.

Mr Hanna: Join the dots.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Well, you never know. They are pretty rough roads up there.

Ms Breuer: You are an intellectual giant, Gunny.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I would say to the honourable member: why does she not go up and advise them? She has all the knowledge and wisdom. I know a little bit about running cattle and maintaining windmills and I actually know what I am talking about in these practical things. When you see somewhere like Kenmore Park, which ought to run 16 000 head of cattle, and you see what has happened in the past, what could happen and which could do so much good for these people—

Ms Breuer: He's running camels now.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: There were a lot of wild camels up there. I do not know if the honourable member knows much about her electorate, but T&R Pastoral, who are now agisting stock and fixing up the fences and spending money there, is the only reason there are any cattle at Kenmore Park. They have leased the land out. I actually know the people who are doing it and I have some knowledge of this area. I would suggest to the honourable member that she not go there on a hot day or she may melt. But if she has such wisdom in relation to the Aboriginal problems up there, she has not shown it to us yet. We are waiting with bated breath.

We need to solve the problems at Mintabie. The Aborigines want to noodle and want to mine, but the people calling the shots in Alice Springs do not want them to because, at the end of the day, if you empower and enhance the Aboriginal communities, the advisers will lose their authority, their influence, their jobs and their opportunity. It is very sad. We have a chance to use some commonsense, open up the roads in a sensible fashion and create some economic opportunities. I am looking forward to the new arrangement whereby Aboriginal families can actually own the land. It will be very challenging and interesting and a great initiative. I look forward to the support of the member for Giles for these projects, because she will then see the benefits for the community instead of holding these people back and allowing these deplorable situations to continue.

Mrs Geraghty: You didn't do anything about it when you were in government, and I've never heard such a—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Torrens.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Here we go again. They are so fixed in their thinking; so negative; looking backwards all the time. They are not progressing. They do not want to improve things. They are real socialists: they want to distribute what is there and not create any more. They are so fixed.

Ms Breuer: All *Hansard* do is change the date on your speeches!

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: The honourable member has not made a contribution since she has been here: she has only mouthed off what someone else has prepared for her.

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

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

Motion carried.

Ms BREUER (Giles): It is always a pleasure to speak after the member for Stuart, because it gives me the opportunity to sound sane, to sound normal, to sound intelligent and to sound well balanced. My media coverage in the last few days is very good. As they say, any publicity is good publicity when you are a member of parliament, so I am very pleased. Because of this I want to start with the premise that we should allow the media to come into parliament house at any time without a pass, to be given access anywhere in this place, including the Liberal Party room, the Labor caucus and the ladies' toilets, and be able to wander through the chamber when they feel pleased to do so. I think that is what we should be doing here. The media do play an important role in this place.

They report on this place and they should have unrestricted access to Parliament House. I can see that the Clerk is looking terribly stunned there and having a panic attack! But what we are proposing in this legislation is precisely that we allow the media to do that in the Pitjantjatjara lands. People find horrendous the thought of the media wandering through here totally unrestricted, and the people on the lands, the Anangu, are feeling exactly the same about the media wandering through their place unrestricted, without having to have permits and be given permission to come into this area. Again, the member for Stuart demonstrated a fundamental misunderstanding of Aboriginal issues.

He happens to have spent a quantity of time in the past on Aboriginal lands and working with Aboriginal people, but quantity does not necessarily mean quality time. However, we will leave the member for Stuart alone. There are two issues that I am very passionate about and I have had the opportunity this week to speak on both of them. One is women's issues and the other is the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands. I do feel very passionate about this and am pleased that I can speak on this this afternoon. I am appalled at the amendments that have come down from the other place. Media journalists being allowed to enter the lands without a permit if they are investigating a matter of public interest is too dreadful to contemplate. I have to ask who defines what public interest is.

The Hon. Nick Xenophon outlined his reasons for this clause on 11 November 2004 when the bill was in the committee stage in the council. From what he said, his actions were based solely on discussions with one or two journalists. We all know that he does caucus with those journalists. What is more to the point, he has not consulted with any Anangu about this proposal, nor does his reasoning show any understanding of why the permit system was introduced back in 1981. For 25 years this permit system has been in place. For the record, in 1981 the access restriction and permanent requirements were included to make sure that people were not wandering around the lands during business—business is a very important time—and/or entering or photographing sacred areas.

The other reason the permits were put in place was to stop people getting lost in the lands. I have to report that it is very easy to get lost in those Aboriginal lands. There is no signposting. The signpost is a car door where a tiny arrow will say Umuwa, but there might be four other roads to Umuwa and it is very difficult to find your way round. Last year, when the Aboriginal Lands Committee visited the lands, one of our cars got lost. They were lost for about 2½ hours and we did not know where they were. They had taken the wrong road, on the advice of a very prominent member of that committee; they did not work out where the sun was and

they were heading west when they were supposed to be heading south. It astounds me that they could have got lost, but they did. We were really quite concerned, because we were expecting them at a certain place and they did not rock up until two hours later. It is very easy to get lost on the lands. If someone goes there without a permit and wanders around, they can get into serious trouble.

The Outback areas are very dangerous. I know that, because I spend a lot of time there; I spend a lot of time travelling on those roads. Last year, in particular, I spent many hours wandering along those roads. As I mentioned, on one trip I left Coober Pedy at 7.30 in the morning and arrived at Oak Valley at 8.30 at night, and I did not see one vehicle or person in that 13 hours of travelling. That is what it is like in those remote areas. It is very dangerous. Recently we had the very tragic loss of a person who became lost near Arkaroola. He did not know the conditions or understand what he should do when he was in trouble, and he lost his life. That was very personal for me, because I know his mother and the family very well, and I was terribly sad to hear that. But, once again, it was a case of someone being out there and not understanding what they should do.

During the debate in the council no-one suggested that a similar clause would be inserted into section 18 of the Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act 1984, and the permit requirements and conditions in that act are exactly identical to those in the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act 1984. It would be very interesting if the Hon. Nick Xenophon were to propose that we make an amendment to the Maralinga Tjarutja Act. I would like to hear what Dr Archie Barton would have to say if we proposed that in this place. I would imagine that he would have a lot to say—and I can see the member opposite smiling; when she was the minister I am sure she had dealings with Archie Barton and would know that he can be very persistent if he gets upset. It is interesting that it has not been mentioned that we stop people from obtaining permits to go into that area. The issue of access to the APY lands needs to be revisited, but the Anangu must be consulted first.

We should, preferably, be looking at the larger issue of communication across the lands. It should not be just about white fellas knowing what is going on up there: it should also be about Anangu having the right to know what is going on down here and communities being able to know what is being decided at Umuwa, in the middle of their lands. The Aboriginal Lands Task Force is currently conducting a review of the entire Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act 1981, and part of its brief is to consult with all communities in the APY lands. Maybe the issue of access and permits should be referred to the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee. We have taken a very strong interest in what is happening in those lands, and our first function is to review the operation of the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act 1981. So, we can review that act. But it should be done in consultation with Anangu.

The Hon. Nick Xenophon's clause undercuts the entire spirit of the original act. When the act was passed in 1981 it was groundbreaking because of the respect and recognition it afforded to Aboriginal people in this country. Certainly, its central tenets should not be chipped away willy-nilly.

The member for Stuart commented that this was long overdue and did not go far enough. Why, when he was the member for that area for so long, was nothing done in that time? He talked about its being a closed shop and that people cannot go in there. He said it was unwise and nonsense and not allowed. Perhaps his answer is to drive the people out of

the lands and over the border into the Northern Territory, which seems to be the consensus in Port Augusta, from what the member for Stuart said. I also want to refer to comments made on 21 September by the Hon. Angus Redford in the other place. He said:

What contributed to this parliament's neglect was the fact that we were not getting regular reporting from the media as to the human tragedy that was occurring in this area.

He said that we should have known about this and that it was the media that exposed it. Members opposite were in government for many years: why did they not know what was happening up there? I first went there in 1998, and I was absolutely stunned at what I saw. Members opposite were in government for years, and they are saying that it took the media to expose last year what was happening there. That is disgraceful. They had a minister in government, and they did not know what was happening up there. It is just appalling.

On my first visit to the lands in 1998 I had my first experience of seeing a petrol sniffer. I remember seeing a young child about 10 or 11 years old sitting on a wall sniffing a can of petrol. I was so upset that I cried, because the child was the same age as my daughter and I thought, 'This is so sad.' Yet members opposite are saying that they did not know about this—that it took the media to expose it. We did know about it. We have been talking about it for years. The Coroner's report was what really brought it to a head. The Hon. Nick Xenophon said in the other place:

It is a tragedy that should have been made apparent a decade ago, and it was not made apparent.

Why was it not made apparent? Because people did not go there. The previous government did nothing about sorting out that issue. It would have known, but it did nothing about sorting it out, and I think that is absolutely disgraceful.

I have had discussions with the minister's office about this amendment (and I certainly hope that minister Roberts, who is in hospital at present, recovers very quickly; I was very sad to hear it). The minister has done a lot of work on this. He and his officers are constantly consulting with the people on the lands and, certainly, I hope that he is back on his feet pretty soon. They have been told by the people in the APY that they do not agree with this amendment. The people are not happy that they were not consulted on this issue. The Hon. Nick Xenophon has had no contact with them and has not spoken to them at all about this, and that is an absolute disgrace. The people in the lands are saying, 'We are the ones who know where it is not appropriate for outsiders to go at certain times, because traditional business may be taking place.' They are very concerned about that. If people are up there when business is taking place it would be a terrible thing for them. Once again, their concern is that there are significant safety issues if people are wandering around without anyone knowing where they are.

The amendment states that journalists should be allowed to go through the lands. What constitutes a journalist? Just about anyone could say that they were a freelance journalist and that they were going there to do a story, and they will go up there and do a story and sell it. But we do not know who they are or where they are from, or anything else. What constitutes public interest? Does reporting on initiation ceremonies, on business, constitute public interest? We are really setting things up to fail if we let people go in and do that.

I want to talk a little bit more about when 'business' is happening in the lands. People scoff when they hear the term

'business'. I have had quite a bit of experience of being in those areas when business is happening. When it happens, they shut down roads, barriers are pulled out and drawn up, people are not there, and people stand guard. They have very, very sensitive initiation ceremonies in the whole of central Australia. It is not just the northern area or the lands: it starts down the Yalata area and works right through to Alice Springs, and the whole area is where business happens. When business is happening you keep out, particularly if you are women.

We are not just talking about a church service in the middle of the square: we are talking about something that is very, very serious and extensive. I remember that a number of years ago I was staying with a friend of mine, an Aboriginal woman in Alice Springs, and we were going to go what was at that time her family's station, Angus Downs, for a few days with our children. Her father rang up about half an hour before we were due to leave, and said, 'You can't go', and she said, 'Oh, okay, we won't.' He said, 'Business is on; you can't go. You have to wait until I ring you and tell you that you can go.' So, we sat there for about 10 hours, waiting for the mob who was going to business to go through. I really did not understand what was happening, but she just said, 'We can't go. If we go and the men go through, we are in trouble.' So, we stayed in Alice Springs, and that is how serious it was. Incidentally, this Aboriginal woman friend of mine is an Aboriginal lawyer and she is a qualified teacher, but she still listened very carefully to what her father said and kept away. We certainly could not go down because business was happening.

Recently, I was up in the lands and business was happening on my last visit. The men were all dressed in their traditional gear and painted in their traditional paint. I was there for a meeting, and we had to be extremely careful, particularly the women, about where we looked and who we talked to, because it is not appropriate for women to talk to men during business time. You cannot look or speak to a 'whitie' if you are a woman when business is happening. At the time, I spoke to one of the Anangu women who was at the meeting and asked her, 'Why can't we talk? Why can't we look at these men?' We had to make sure that we looked away. She just froze and said, 'I can't talk about it; it's sacred. You just can't; it's sacred; you just can't,' so I kept very quiet after that. It is very, very serious for these people, and I would never dare ask what is happening, because it is not appropriate.

Business really is a serious issue for those people. If you have journalists wandering through the lands, it is not appropriate. The issue of sacred places is also one which is very important to me. I would never leave the road when I am travelling in Aboriginal areas. I would never leave my car and just wander. I would never see a nice rock and think, 'I'll go and have a look at that,' because it is not appropriate. Some areas are women's areas, some are men's areas, and it is not appropriate for me to be going in and wandering into a man's area; it is just not possible. If we are to send journalists up there, we are going to have them wondering all over the place, photographing these sites which are important to Aboriginal people without permission and, once again, we are upsetting those communities. We are actually snubbing these communities, and that is most inappropriate. There are things that are very important to us. We get terribly upset if anybody steps on our patch or does things that are inappropriate for our society, and it is exactly the same for these people.

I would certainly never dare to go into the lands area without a permit. At the moment, I have a 12-month permit. When those 12 months are up, I will renew that permit once again. I ring to say that I am coming if I do go into the lands area, and I expect all of my staff to do the same. I know that, because we are members of parliament, officially we do not have to ask permission, but I think it is a major discourtesy for any MP to go into that area without asking permission.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: I don't.

Ms BREUER: I know that there is a member opposite who has just admitted that he does not, and that he just heads in. That is a gross discourtesy. I would never go onto his farmland without his permission. I would ring him up and say I was coming. For him to just wander into those lands areas without asking permission, I think, is most inappropriate. As an MP, I would never dream of going in without asking for those permits. I always ask permission, and I feel very, very strongly about this; it is so inappropriate.

I feel very strongly for the member for Morphett who, I think, has a conflict between his own party loyalty and his own personal feelings and values about this. I have great respect for the member for Morphett. I respect his work on our Aboriginal lands committee, and I know that he feels very passionate about these issues as well. I am sure that, while he would have to support his party—and I would certainly say that you should support your party on this—I do feel very strongly for him, and I know he is going to be terribly upset about having to vote the way that the party tells him to on this issue. However, I do understand. They are not like us; they are not going to get expelled from the party if they vote that way.

I want to go back to the issue of the media reporting that the things that have happened in the past 12 months would not have happened if Miles Kemp had not gone up to the lands and reported on this. I think that is not the truth; I do not think that is the case. It certainly was the Coroner's report that really brought this to a head with the government. Much is made of the fact that a journalist was refused entry. I am not sure of the exact facts of that, but I do know that the one week when there was a group of journalists up there, one of them went up there early and created all sorts of problems by wandering around the lands and into places that were inappropriate. I believe she may have been refused permission at a later date, and that may be the journalist that they are talking about. But, it was a case of inappropriate travel around the lands, going into areas where they were not really where they were supposed to be and creating all sorts of problems in that area.

We must respect those Anangu people. They live differently from us; in lots of cases they have different values from ours; and they certainly have different lifestyles from ours; however, we must respect those people. I feel so sad when all people are labelled. At the moment there are issues in Port Augusta. One of the big problems there is that people are all being put into the same box. Certainly, I acknowledge that there are some real issues in Port Augusta and some real troublemakers, but we cannot put the whole of the Aboriginal population which, I believe, is about a quarter of the population of Port Augusta, in that one box, and the problem should not be treated accordingly.

I think that this amendment, moved by the Hon. Nick Xenophon, which allows the media in without permits, is an absolute disgrace. It is ill-educated, it is misinformed, and it is completely lacking in understanding or appreciation of Anangu culture, of Anangu people, and of their rights—it is

their land. I think that it is disgraceful for any member in this place to support this, and I feel very strongly about it. I think that it is one of the most disgraceful things that this parliament would allow to happen if it were to go through, and I urge members to vote against that particular amendment.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ (Newland): I want to make a few comments on this bill, and the three amendments that the Minister for Environment and Conservation will move to re-amend it. Firstly, I will be opposing amendment No. 1 but I will be supporting amendments Nos 2 and 3. I will talk about the two amendments that I look to support. Looking at the provisions in the legislation that relate to these amendments, in the first instance clause 7 deals with regulated substance misuse offences and the mandatory referral aspects of clauses that relate to assessment service. Secondly, clause 9, which is Referral to Assessment Treatment Services, and subsequent provisions, deals with the details of referral for assessment, and assessment of a referred person, etc.

I understand that the government will be opposing (obviously, with its amendments) these two measures. However, my support for these is really a matter of, in the first instance, my understanding that they are pre-emptive clauses, because at this point in time there is no treatment or assessment centre located on the AP lands. So, it will make it very difficult for any enactment of this particular portion of legislation to take place regardless of the great detail that has been afforded the clauses that we now see in the amended bill. However, the reason that I will be supporting it is to continue to encourage the Labor government that this is an important aspect dealing with health matters on the AP lands related to petrol sniffing, and all the related health problems that we see and have seen for a number of years in that area. The Liberal Party went into the last election with a promise to build that facility on the lands, and I see no reason why the Liberal Party would ever change that proposition.

This government has had some three years to take up that aspect and have that treatment centre built on the lands. It will make it exceptionally difficult if this amendment goes through because, given the notices of referral for assessment that may be issued by a police officer, a young person from the age of 14 upwards who is charged with an offence under this particular proposition has to be sent to a treatment centre. That means the government would have to start looking at, perhaps, Alice Springs, Marree or other places, and whether or not that is feasible is another question, and it would be an expense to this government in its own right. I certainly hope that these particular clauses are passed because I believe that it is necessary for the government to have this in front of it, given that we have seen three years go by without any action being taken.

A lot been made of the fact that this measure has come about only since a certain *Advertiser* journalist brought to the notice of the public of South Australia that there were some terrible circumstances relating to petrol sniffing and other substance abuse within the lands, as well as many other health problems suffered by Aboriginal people. Of course, we know that that is an absolute nonsense because that in effect would be rewriting history. In the last months of the Liberal government in 2001, as I am sure we all know in this chamber, a petrol sniffing task force was put in place. It was well represented from every government agency which has any interest in the related matters and which could have made a difference in making sure that projects were put into place in the AP lands. It not only included state members but also

federal members directly out of the office of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs in Canberra, which gave us an edge in terms of being able to negotiate funds that could help us put programs into place.

That task force initiated police presence in February-March 2002, and a report was eventually put together by that group of officers who were given the task of going into the lands and discovering the problems that we needed to address in terms of projects, negotiations with the AP people themselves, and to see what outcomes we could put into place that would turn around some of the living standards and the health standards that people face in those lands.

That report was provided in March 2002, and of course we were no longer in government. That report still sits somewhere, probably gathering dust, but it certainly has considerable information within it and, if there was serious interest by the Labor government, it could have been picked up and run with immediately after the election in 2002. That is three years down the track and still very little has been done. Once again, it was only after seeing crisis after crisis develop in the AP lands, after all these indications had been made quite public and quite clear, after the Coroner's report, and after deaths occurring in 2003 that this government decided that it had better take some action. A considerable amount of money—\$12 million was supposed to go in there—was put in the budget to look at a whole series of projects to deal with many of the different issues. We are not talking just one or two, we are talking about many issues, and I have not got time to go into them all now.

People in this chamber with any interest in the AP lands will understand what I am talking about when I say that it is complex. There are a number of areas where that money could have been used very positively to help create better outcomes. However, months afterwards, we learnt that the money had not even been distributed or utilised; it had just become a notional amount of money on a budget paper, and no programs or projects were being implemented at that time with the money allocated. It is an issue in which people in this state should take far greater interest. I also say that those interested in this area will know that is not a simple matter to deal with; it is complex.

When we talk about the difficulties on the lands, one of the problems people do not seem to understand is that the people we are trying to help are individuals with dignity and with human relevance to all of us. You cannot force any of them to do things they do not want to, and I give the example of substance abuse, that is, drug addiction, whether it be petrol sniffing or anything else. We can send people to treatment centres, but we cannot make them take the treatment. A whole series of complexities needs a portion of evolution to take place, and you also need the cooperation of the Anangu Pitjantjatjara people themselves. It is no good bureaucrats, members of parliament, outsiders, or whiteys, believing from time to time that they have the answers to the horrors they see when they visit the AP lands. There is no simple answer, but there is hope. There is hope, because the Anangu Pitjantjatjara people themselves have asked for assistance. That means that governments, members of parliament, bureaucracy, health areas and the drug and alcohol and systems can go there with programs that will at least have the potential to provide a decent outcome, because the Pitjantjatjara people themselves have said they require that assistance—and that happened in 2001. We were asked to give them assistance, so all the doors were opened. It is now 2005, and nothing has been done.

I am quite happy to support the amendments in the bill, because I think that this government has to be seen to be doing far more than it has over the past three years. I know that I spoke initially about the fact that this is pre-emptive legislation because, if assessment and treatment are to take place, you need a facility in which it can be undertaken. We do not have that facility on the lands. However, I am aware that task force funded projects have moneys allocated to them by this government from 2004-05 through to 2008-09, but what does surprise me is that this government has allocated \$3.275 million over five years specifically to build a substance misuse facility, which is described as 'a substance misuse facility providing assessment, detoxification and treatment services to people on the lands with substance misuse problems and their families'. My only problem with this is that we are talking about 2008-09 before this facility is completed.

We have heard from many members in this chamber about their concerns, and we have heard their cries for assistance for the people on the lands. If this government is serious in any way at all about utilising those cries in a very positive and beneficial way, the very treatment facility necessary to help ensure the health and welfare of the people of the Pitjantjatjara lands, including their children, needs to be built far sooner than 2009. I am quite sure that the \$3.275 million could be brought forward, instead of being divided up from 2005-06, with a miserable quarter of a million dollars to start the facility. If this government wants to make sure that it is seen as serious in wanting to help reduce the terrible problems we have on the lands, that is one area that can be dealt with almost immediately. Do not tell me that it takes until 2009 to put onto the lands a detoxification centre that would help alleviate the very problems we see there now. Do not wait until 2009; do something now. I reiterate that that is the reason I will support leaving these amendments in this bill. I doubt that we have the numbers (I think that we can all count), and we may not get it through, but I hope that we do, because this government obviously needs reminding that this is an important part of any discussion about what is happening on the lands in relation to substance abuse.

I will talk now about the first amendment. I have said that I will oppose this clause, although some of the comments made by the member for Giles make me think that perhaps it would be a good idea to leave it in. She said that one of the reasons the permit system was first introduced when the bill was drafted was that many people were getting lost, so it was a means of tracking them. I thought it would be attractive to leave it in, particularly as it applies to the media, and it might be a very helpful reason to leave it there. However, on a more serious note, I note that there are many opinions about the ownership of land by Aboriginal people. I am not really interested in going into all the aspects of those opinions, particularly in relation to the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands and its status in terms of private ownership. The fact is that we have laws in the state at the moment which, in their wisdom (and I say it was wisdom), go back to the Tonkin years when this land was given to the Aboriginal people under their ownership in their own right.

We have heard several contributors to this debate talk about private property and the media already having a great deal of access to areas, and that some of us would question their right to that access and their interpretation of public interest. I certainly support the fact that this is private land: it is owned by the Anangu Pitjantjatjara people. It is not an area of the state which is under crown ownership or which is

public land. It is private land and under private ownership. For those reasons, the ownership of this land was not given to Aboriginal people on the basis that a group of whiteys sitting in a parliament would suddenly turn around and say, 'Okay, we're going to open up your private property and allow all sorts of odd bods access to the lands.' We as individuals in our own right try to protect our own privacy and private properties, and we have many systems in place that we could use if someone attempted to take over or enter our properties.

I believe it is an ill-advised amendment. It should never have been inserted, because it does not give any dignity to the Aboriginal people and the ownership of their land, which the Pitjantjatjara Land Rights Act and all the other acts protected. This bill denies that dignity. I held the position of Aboriginal minister for some 4½ years. It was certainly not an easy portfolio to manage, but it was one which allowed me to gain a greater understanding of the Aboriginal people both as an individual and an Australian citizen. It also assisted me to grow in a personal way. I am very pleased and proud of the time that I spent as Aboriginal minister, and I believe that I was the second longest serving Aboriginal minister in the history of this state. There were many unfinished aspects of the job that I would have liked to see carried through, but it would be highly incorrect for anyone in this chamber to insinuate that nothing was done during that period. A considerable amount was achieved during that time and I believe that, on the whole, the Aboriginal people had quite a deal of respect for me and would agree with my comments.

Some of the major problems which we looked at and which have been discussed today included the lack of employment, lack of skills, health problems and areas where tourism and trade could be developed. We looked at many other aspects, but I do not have time to talk about them now. However, I also had a further vision and it is one that I will bring to this parliament later in the year. It involves part of the plan that the Liberal Party put together as its policy going into the last election. It was a \$50 million plan (which sounds entirely fantastic and monstrous) over a 10 year period which would involve developing infrastructure within the lands and supporting the people on the lands by improving their employment opportunities via developing their skills, providing training for their kids and offering a better education system. It involved improving their living standards by ensuring that the roadways were as decent as one could possibly expect in the 21st century in the metropolitan area, let alone on the lands.

It also involved looking at their water, sewerage and power. I am very pleased about the fact that I managed to obtain sufficient funding from ATSIIC and the state government at the time to build the central power station south of Umuwa. It traverses distribution lines of power some 170 kilometres and supplies six to eight villages with power. In the first instance it created not only a better lifestyle for the people but also a healthier environment, considering that we had diesel generators on most of the areas on the lands that would need to be replaced in years to come as well.

There is also the issue of water, which I hope this government is looking at as well. The amount of potable water on the lands is very questionable. A huge amount of work has to be done to ensure that water is available for people as the population grows. Although the population was static for some years, it has continued to grow over the last few years. All these things are exceedingly important. The Labor government cannot sit back and continue to say that

these problems have been there for years and nothing has been done about them. Many things were on the way and many more things could have been done. It is now in their hands to do it. If they cannot build the assessment facility for their program within the next year or two, then they need to ask where they do stand on this important issue.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Noting the time, I will be as brief as possible, but I do not want to miss the opportunity to make a few comments about the clause in this bill that would allow access to the lands by representatives of news media outlets. I had the opportunity to visit the lands a couple of years ago with the member for Stuart, who has a good first-hand knowledge of the lands and many of the people who reside therein. I heard his contribution earlier in which he mentioned that a group of us visited the lands and that some of us who had not been there before were horrified by what we saw. I was; I was both deeply moved and incredibly horrified, and as a member of this parliament I felt a certain amount of guilt and shame at what is occurring and will continue to occur on those lands.

I believe that the only way in which the public of South Australia and, indeed, Australia will bring enough political pressure to bear to bring about the sort of changes which are absolutely necessary to ensure that not only the Aboriginal people living on these lands but across this country are able to have any future at all (and a future to which they can aspire and to which they can look forward) is if they gain knowledge about what is happening on the lands through our media outlets.

There would be barely a person living in this state who would not be moved and upset if they visited the lands and saw the conditions under which the inhabitants live. There will always be arguments about what we should or should not do to help the Aboriginal people of the Anangu Pitjantjatjara lands to preserve their culture. I with my own eyes and in my own heart do not believe that much of their culture is left. I do not believe there is any hope of survival of what would have been the culture that those people would have had in previous years. Speaking to some of the inhabitants and elders, I put that question to them: how long do we have left before any vestiges of their culture are lost in the sands of history in that area? I was not surprised by the answers I got that we have very few years.

There are very few people left on those lands who have an understanding of the original culture and lifestyle of those people. The young people, for a whole range of reasons, have turned their back on their own culture. The collision between their culture and western culture has meant that there is no going back, and I do not think that young people in those lands, given a free choice, would want to go back anyway. We will continue to throw many millions of dollars into that area and not benefit the people they are directed at, unless the public of South Australia know what is going on in those lands, and that will only happen if we give unfettered access to the news media. I will conclude my remarks and commend the bill as presented to the house.

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Snelling): Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): In closing the debate I thank all members who have contributed to the discussion in this place. I thank members on my side for supporting the amendments I am moving. I also acknowledge that the member for Newland is

supporting at least one of the amendments in relation to the movement of members of the news media on to the AP lands. Given the time, I will not go into any long discussion on the merits of matters that have been discussed as they have been canvassed well by members on both sides, but I will briefly put on the record the government's views on the two amendments.

In relation to the matters that the Hon. Nick Xenophon from another place raised and moved in another place, namely, clauses 7 and 9, and the issue of regulated substance misuse offences and the mandatory referral to assessment services, the government is not opposed to this policy. It is, however, opposed to the amendment for two reasons, the first being a practical one. The facility on the land that would be used for such a purpose has not yet been built, although I understand that capital has been approved and a recurrent budget has also been approved. It is the government's intention to construct such a facility, and I understand we are in consultation with the owners of the land about where and how it should operate. It is a practical thing. You cannot have a measure in the legislation if you cannot implement it.

The second point is more substantial and philosophical. The measures in the bill as the government moved it have been discussed with the traditional owners, who have approved the measures we are putting. The proposition the Hon. Nick Xenophon included was not discussed with the AP people and may not necessarily have their approval. The government is in the process of consulting with the people about a review of the legislation, and we will be putting to them this particular proposition. I hope it will eventually be agreed to and legislation will come forward at a future time to pick up this important measure.

In relation to the other matter raised by the Hon. Nick Xenophon about the news media entering the lands, I indicate the government's absolute opposition to this proposition. It is very bad policy. I am very surprised that the Hon. Nick Xenophon promoted this policy and proposed this legislation. It would seem that he has not thought about this deeply and certainly has not consulted with the Aboriginal people on this measure. Putting aside issues about whether it is appropriate to take away from the AP people their rights to exclude media outlets from their land, and taking away all issues to do with Aboriginal people, the Hon. Nick Xenophon with this measure is creating a precedent that the media can enter onto freeholded land when they choose, to do what they want, as long as they can justify it as public policy. That means that any farmer's land in South Australia could be open and exposed to the same sort of treatment.

I find it extraordinary that the great defender of the rights of private landholders in this place, the member for Stuart, came in and supported the Hon. Nick Xenophon. He is arguing for a legal trespass on freeholded title by members of media outlets. That is clearly wrong in policy terms. Nobody who has freehold land should be exposed to that kind of treatment by the media at its will. If you do not want media coming on to your property you should be able to say so. If you do not want any unauthorised entry on to your property you should have the right to exclude those people, and other members of this place have put that very well indeed. It is an offence to the traditional owners of the land to have media outlet representatives coming on to their lands, as the member for Giles said, at inappropriate times when business is being performed, and entering parts of the land where there are important sites. Then there is the whole general issue about public safety of people entering the lands without telling

anyone what they are doing. But I guess if they were to do that, as the member for Newland said, in some cases it probably would not be a great loss.

In light of the time, I commend the amendments to the house. This is a very important bill which is trying to do a serious thing about drug abuse on the Pitjantjatjara lands. We should not get confused with other issues. We should just get to the facts of this bill and pass it speedily through parliament tonight.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I oppose clause 5. The arguments have already been put. It is totally wrong for this measure to be introduced, and I would hope the house will support me in that.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I indicate that the opposition supports clause 5 as it is in the bill presented by the upper house, and I understand that the upper house feels very strongly about this.

Clause negatived.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I move:

Page 3, lines 17 to 40 and page 4 lines 1 to 21—

Delete all words in these lines

This amendment removes the words that were put in place by the upper house in relation to mandatory referral. As I have already said, we are not opposed to this in principle but we want to negotiate and discuss this properly with the traditional owners so that when it does come back here we know we have the consent of the community upon whom this measure will be imposed.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I indicate that the opposition opposes the government's amendments and supports the bill as is. The reason is that the mandatory reporting of child abuse is in place. You do not need to leave young people in a situation where the abuse can be continued. But, more importantly, we will not be sending them away if the government gets off its backside and spends the \$3.275 million that has been allocated for a substance misuse facility. This needs to be done, and I know it has strong support both in this place and in the upper house. The facility obviously has been consulted on, because it has 2004-05 on it, and 2005-06. So it has been discussed and talked about. Let us just get on with it.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I point out to the house that the facility has been discussed with the traditional owners but not the legislative framework that has been placed in this bill. The money has been committed, as I have already said, and we are waiting until we can get an agreement with the community about where it will be placed. It is not the government that is stopping this from happening. I am not trying to blame anyone. We have to go through the proper process of consultation with the community, and sometimes that takes time. I hope the committee understands that we are working on this as swiftly as we can.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Can the minister advise whether that will be along the same lines as provided in the act in relation to mandatory referral, or will it be a voluntary system?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: What I am saying is that there are two issues. The first issue is the facility itself and, secondly, it is how the facility is used. As I understand it, we have an agreement with the traditional owners that there will be a

facility. We are now working with them about where it will be situated, and that is taking some time. A lot of consultation, discussion and so on needs to take place. The second issue is how that facility is used, and we want to work with them to work out what the rules will be for using that facility. What the Hon. Nick Xenophon is suggesting in his amendments is a good idea, and I think that would be the view of the government. As the member for Newland put it, rather than a group of 'whities' sitting here on North Terrace imposing that concept on them, we want to work through it with them so that we can get their agreement and consent so that it is not seen as something that is imposed from outside the community. The sensitivities in this are very important, and we want to do it appropriately. So, while I recognise the merit of the proposition, we do not accept it at this stage. I indicate that we want to work with the community to get to an agreement about how this should be done.

Mr HANNA: I note that the government has already consulted with the community up there about the building of a substance misuse facility, and that is good news. In respect of the legislative framework and the notion that petrol sniffers might be taken there, whether or not they want to go, I agree that that is a serious issue. However, I bear in mind two things. First, the current practice and, secondly, what I have heard from people up there. The way in which things are done at the moment is that the police turn a blind eye to petrol sniffing, because it is just so rampant—every police officer could probably spend 24 hours a day trying to track down petrol sniffing to stamp it out, and that will not happen and it does not happen now. Secondly, frequently petrol sniffing happens at night, and it is very difficult to catch people in the act. So, even if there is a telephone call and the police are one or two hours away, when they arrive it is obviously very dark. Trying to catch people who then tear off somewhere, either on foot or in a vehicle, is not easy. Thirdly, at the moment, even if the police do catch people, putting people in cells is something that no-one wants, and it is not exactly the best treatment.

In terms of what I have heard from people up there, having briefly visited the lands, first, there is a very strong feeling that something needs to be done and that some treatment needs to be provided to people and, secondly, there is also a strong feeling that locking people in a gaol cell is not the answer. So, the logic is very clear to me that something needs to be done. That means forcing people to have some sort of treatment, and a prison cell is not the appropriate place to do it. The minister argues that this should not be done without the entire consultation process and that is certainly a respectable argument: I do not dismiss it lightly. My conscience is clear in supporting it, based on my conversations with people on the lands.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I oppose clause 9. This is consequential on the amendment that has already been passed, amendment no. 2.

Clause negatived.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I thank the house for supporting the government's amendments. It establishes the proper balance that was originally

intended by the government. I take this opportunity of thanking all the advisers for their assistance, as well as Parliamentary Counsel.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I want to make one comment, and I am afraid it is in contradiction to the minister's last comments. I think it is quite obvious that the opposition was not supporting two of those amendments, and that has been made quite clear. If the minister is thanking us for support for that, I want to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: I thought you said 'the contributors'.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: No, the advisers.

The Hon. D.C. KOTZ: The minister needs to be very specific: advisers or contributors. We are the contributors in this parliament. I think I have made the point.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Let me make it plain: I was not thanking the Liberal Party.

Bill read a third time.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.58 p.m. the house adjourned until Monday 28 February at 2 p.m.