

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 14 April 2005

The **SPEAKER (Hon. R.B. Such)** took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Mrs HALL (Morialta): I move:

That this house acknowledges the importance of International Women's Day 2005, held on Tuesday 8th March, and notes its significance in—

- (a) recognising the achievements of women and their contribution to the community; and
- (b) furthering the objective of improving the status of women throughout the world.

It gives me great pleasure to move this motion today, acknowledging the importance of International Women's Day and recognising the achievements of women throughout the world and their contribution. The Hon. Joyce Steele, who as we know was the first woman member in this place, once said:

Although I am not a feminist, I am certainly in favour of women taking their proper place in the community based on their ability to do a job.

I believe those words are fitting as we recognise this annual occasion on which women's ongoing contribution to the community is celebrated. International Women's Day is not just a call for equality in society but also a reflection on the notion that women achieve and contribute on their merits. It is also an opportunity to reflect on the challenges still faced in the international and domestic environment.

The first International Women's Day was held on 19 March 1911 in Germany, Austria, Denmark and a number of other European nations. The significance of 19 March was born out of an unfulfilled promise made in 1848 by a Prussian king. Faced with an armed uprising, he promised a range of reforms. The only one to remain unfulfilled was the granting of voting rights to women. So, on the first International Women's Day in 1911, one million leaflets were distributed calling for action on the unfulfilled promise.

The time of that first International Women's Day was one of great turbulence. It was the turn of the 20th century. Women in industrially developing nations were entering the paid work force in a climate of poor working conditions and poor wages. Trade unions developed and industrial disputes began to occur. The day accordingly took on a tradition of protest and activism, and we then saw the women's movement which was so active and successful through the 1960s and 1970s, and it is now recognised as and has evolved into a more specific and appropriate vein of celebration for the challenges that still face us all in the 21st century.

In South Australia, of course, we have particular and special cause for celebration on issues regarding the status of women. We were the first state, as we all know, to grant the right to vote in 1894, and we were the first in the western democracy to give women the right to stand for parliament. It is pretty interesting to look at the web site to see the material that has been prepared on International Women's Day, because in many countries throughout the world International Women's Day is celebrated as a national holiday. Considering that we created history in South Australia in terms of women's franchise etc., perhaps it is unusual that this house has never considered the possibility

of marking the day in such a similar way. I have to say from a personal perspective that I think it would be far more appropriate than celebrating a horse race and having a long weekend on the Adelaide Cup weekend. However, I go to matters of more importance.

Some question the need for International Women's Day when one takes into account the progress we have made. Some, in fact, have the cheek to argue that women have gained the right to vote over 100 years and the progress we have made is surely proof enough that we have achieved what we want to achieve. However, it would be folly to have that view: there is still so much work to be done. On International Women's Day this year, Linda Matthews, our Equal Opportunity Commissioner, presented a range of points that demonstrate the need for an ongoing commitment to women's issues.

The Hon. G.M. Gunn: What about men's issues?

Mrs HALL: I will come to the men. Primarily, she asked: what do women across the world want in 2005? That is, of course, the crucial question, because for women around the globe there is a multitude of issues that are very much part of life, and they vary dramatically. But, as Linda said:

In some countries the debate is on work life balance. In other parts of the world women are still fighting for the right to vote.

She makes the pertinent point that we cannot lump all women together and assume they are concerned about the same thing, because they just are not.

I say to the member for Stuart, because I know he is always carrying on about the rights of men, that he ought to read some of the words of Linda Matthews, because she says at the end of this article (and the member for Stuart might take it up as a challenge) to those who constantly talk about the plans that are needed for men:

To those who ask why there is not an international day for men, don't ask me. I'm very happy for the blokes to organise their own. And hear, hear!

The remaining challenges that women face in Australia are very diverse. Domestic violence continues to act as a scourge in our community. Figures appearing in the statistical profile of women in South Australia paint a very disturbing picture, and I doubt that there would be one member in this chamber who would not share the serious concerns.

Women are the victims of 88 per cent of all sexual assault offences recorded by police; 80 per cent of all indecent assault offences; 78.5 per cent of unlawful sexual intercourse offences; 88 per cent of physical assault offences; and 97 per cent of sexual assaults perpetrated on family members. More than 85 per cent of sexual harassment complaints and inquiries to the South Australian Equal Opportunity Commission are lodged by women.

Then there are the tragedies affecting our indigenous community. They continue to suffer the most horrendous treatment at the hands of men (often close family relatives), and it is an issue that warrants a vastly improved response from the governance of our country. In many cases, the leadership of Aboriginal communities has a family violence strategy in place, but, clearly, they need support to get better results. We seem to be stuck in the unfortunate rut of fearing accusations of racial insensitivity should we take action against the unspeakable treatment inflicted upon some young and older indigenous women. Members of this house would no doubt be aware of grave issues of substance abuse, violence, rape and incest among sections of our indigenous communities. Empowerment and well-resourced support for

the strong and dedicated women elders must surely be part of the long-term solutions involving violence within some indigenous communities.

We cannot and must not allow this to continue under the pretence that it is all part of some cultural disposition. The fact is that this environment is simply unacceptable for any female child and teenager or adult woman; and, equally, it is unacceptable for the men living in our country in 2005. It is a betrayal of so much that Australians hold dear. From that issue, I would like to touch on another challenge about which I cannot believe we are still talking in 2005, namely, women operating in the professional world.

It must pain those very active feminists of the 1960s and 1970s who achieved so much in impressive gains for women across our community to see that these problems still exist, but they know and we understand that the glass ceiling still remains. Again, the statistics tell the story. Only 27 per cent of managers and administrators of private companies are women. Women make up only 53 per cent of professionals in private companies. They hold but 10 per cent of executive management positions in Australia's top 200, and only 47 per cent of Australian companies have at least one woman in an executive management position.

Women hold a meagre 5 per cent of line positions; they hold an even slimmer 3.2 per cent of the highest executive management titles, and over half of Australian companies have no women executive managers at all. I think that it would be a brave person in the year 2005 who would say that women cannot win these positions on merit, because the figures that I have just recorded are all the more disappointing when one considers that 55 per cent of all graduates are women. Therefore, the talent, knowledge, experience and qualifications are all there. However, as yet, they have not been enough to break through the barriers and glass ceiling that are still permitted to operate in our community.

Indeed, in some respects, it is a poor reflection on our society that, in 2005, we are still aiming to address women's issues in the professional environment. I sincerely hope that, one day, we will get through a whole session of parliament without having to use such appalling and disgraceful statistics as they affect women.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mrs HALL: The Attorney ought to look at the statistical profile of women in South Australia and see how much more needs to be done.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta will ignore interjections; and, if he wants to contribute to the debate, the Attorney ought to do so.

Mrs HALL: Yes; make a contribution. I think that these figures illustrate the need for continued efforts and they defeat the argument from any of those brave males who say that we no longer need an International Women's Day. If they want to organise their international men's day, go right ahead and do it. Stop talking about it. Many issues remain. I have mentioned a couple, but one issue, I suspect, will be the subject of national debate, namely, the need for balance between work and family.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney will be warned in a minute.

Mrs HALL: I am sure that we have all read the many statements of the commonwealth Sex Discrimination Commissioner, Pru Goward, when she launched the inquiry into Men, Women, Work and Family. On a number of

occasions, Pru has suggested that we need to move beyond the perception that balancing work and family is largely a woman's concern. Studies of the University of New South Wales' Social Policy Research Centre have found that women did much more domestic work than men, and this intensified once the children started arriving.

I hope that this inquiry will, among other objectives, seek to extend the dialogue beyond household chores and examine job flexibility, seeking reasons and solutions as to why so few men take up the offer to work part time. Nationally, we know that the scene for women is far more challenging in many ways than for those of us in Australia. I refer in passing to many women in the Muslim world and some of the challenges they face, which are so different and contrast in such a dramatic way to what is predominantly a Christian Australia. They sure pale into comparison.

I cannot believe that, in this day and age, in some nations we still permit stoning to death for adultery. In some nations, if a female is raped we need four male witnesses to the rape, otherwise the female is considered guilty or engaging in illegal fornication. There are still the issues of female genital mutilation and arranged marriages, clothing requirements that need to be adhered to in public and the horrendous issue of trafficking in women and children and sex slavery. I mention these few international issues and I urge members to read an article published in *The Australian* on 8 March headed 'The sisters they ignore'. It talks about the challenges facing the western feminists of today and some of the issues we ought to get involved in. It makes some interesting comparisons about many of the achievements and gains made in previous decades.

I recall speaking on this subject some five or six years ago and on that occasion I quoted Rebecca West who had said in 1913, 'I only know that people call me a feminist whenever I express sentiments that differentiate me from a door mat.' Many women will still cop and enjoy being called a feminist if it means extolling a similar view. While sitting on the left of the Speaker's chair can be a horrible experience for a member of parliament, what often gives me strength is looking up to the portrait of the Hon. Joyce Steele and thinking of the work that women such as she have done to enable the pioneering spirit of so many of our early feminists and activists in our state to bring us as far as we have come.

Time expired.

Ms THOMPSON secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENERGY MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): I move:

That this house supports the initiative of the University of South Australia, the South Australia government, Business SA and Energy SA on the introduction of the graduate certificate program in energy management.

The establishment of an energy management program at graduate certificate level will have a beneficial impact on the current problems facing our energy supply. I will start by highlighting some of the issues South Australia faces in relation to energy.

The privatisation of ETSA by the previous liberal government has brought much hardship for South Australians by dramatically increasing the cost of power. In 2003 consumers faced a 30 per cent increase in their electricity bill—an average of \$218 a year as a direct result of privatisation. This increase in the cost of power has hurt low income

earners the hardest. In 2003 nearly 20 per cent of people seeking assistance from welfare agencies did so primarily because of high electricity bills, and over 80 per cent of all welfare clients had their financial problems compounded by these high power bills. The effect that high electricity prices can have on low income earners has been identified as fuel poverty in the UK. The use of the term 'fuel poverty' correctly identifies the negative effect that costly power has on the health and quality of life of low income earners. South Australia also has also the most peaky demand profile of any Australian state. The need to supply large quantities of electricity for very short periods of time, largely to meet summer air-conditioning requirements, is leading to an unsustainable investment in peaking generation that will lead that increasingly higher energy costs for South Australian consumers.

For example, one third of the state's existing generating capacity operates for 5 per cent of the year or less. Demand side management is a rational means by which we can alleviate the current problems facing our power supply. Demand side management is the planning and implementation of strategies designed to encourage consumers to improve energy efficiency, reduce energy costs, change the time of usage or promote the use of a different energy source. Thus demand side measures comprise actions taken by the power industry players, business and the community to alter or reduce the level or pattern of energy consumption in response to supply costs and environmental drivers or other policies.

A major part of demand side management is the implementation of energy efficient measures, which can deliver substantial cost savings to business and the community through the reduced use of energy. Demand side management is therefore a preferable alternative to the supply led approach, which is recognised as inefficient, costly to consumers and damaging to the environment. The supply side approach is the building of further generating capacity.

The South Australian government's energy efficiency program for low income householders is a tangible example of a successful energy efficiency measure that has been undertaken in the residential sector. The proposed energy management program is the corollary to that being done in the residential sector, particularly for low income earners. It will be conducted at the University of South Australia, picking up on a number of the lessons learned in the energy efficiency program for low income households. The potential savings that could derive from implementing demand side management policies are estimated to be extremely high. Based on a range of overseas and national studies, the potential for cost effective energy efficiency in South Australia has been estimated to be 20 per cent over a 20 year period. If South Australia achieves this cost effective potential, the estimated annual cost saving could be around \$425 million a year for South Australian business. A 20 per cent cost saving potential can be regarded as highly conservative. For example, the UK government in its 2002 energy review identified the cost effective potential for energy efficiency at around 30 per cent, with potential financial benefits to consumers of around £12 billion.

Thus, the potential for an even greater saving than the 20 per cent forecast is a real possibility, especially given that South Australia has implemented fewer energy efficient measures than any other comparable states in other nations. The creation of an energy management program will greatly facilitate the state in achieving this energy efficiency

potential. Other benefits that arise from the implementation of demand side efficiency measures include job creation—and this came as a bit of surprise to me when I was searching this particular program. The benefits of energy efficient measures are not only limited to cost savings, but implementing energy efficient measures also has a positive impact on job creation. This is because compared with the supply of energy, energy efficiency has been shown to be a new generator of employment. Therefore the implementation of energy efficiency measures can result in the desirable outcome of increased employment and decreased production costs—very rarely ever achieved in tandem. This is because a saving on energy costs gained from the employment of an effective energy manager, often exceed the cost of hiring the energy manager. Consequently, research suggests that if South Australia achieves a 20 per cent energy efficiency level, between 850 and 2 700 net jobs could be created. From an environmental perspective, energy efficient measures are a cost effective mechanism to deliver significant greenhouse reductions, and the management of peak demand can also be reduced on generating plants with high emissions.

If South Australia is to meet its greenhouse targets, then energy efficient measures will need to take a key role alongside the deployment of renewable energy projects. The environmental gains achieved from the utilisation of energy efficient practices are overwhelmingly high. For example, it is believed that energy efficient savings have the potential to reduce the state greenhouse gas emissions by over 1.5 million tonnes per annum, or around 5 per cent of 1999 emissions. The benefits that can be achieved through harnessing demand side management measures illustrate why this house should give its full support to the implementation of the energy program to be introduced shortly by the University of South Australia.

I will now briefly discuss the various elements of the program's content. In the last state budget, the Minister for Energy was allocated \$450 000 to develop an industry sector demand side management project over three years. This was set to commence with an allocation of \$50 000 in 2004-2005. A meeting to design the program was originally held with the Engineering Employers Association and Business SA in September 2004. The actual meeting produced a number of very favourable outcomes, which were deemed to be consistent with the national framework for energy efficiency. This then led Energy SA to convene a meeting with Business SA and the University of SA to investigate whether funds could be used to develop a new study program in energy management, which could act as a formal training opportunity for demand management. The University of South Australia suggested the development of a graduate certificate program that could fit into the overall Masters in Technology Management program, which is already offered in South Australia and offshore.

All organisations agreed to work together, and I think that this a great collaborative effort, and bears testimony to what can be achieved in bringing both business, education, and government together to forge alliances and develop new programs, and this works very much off what has been achieved in Austin, Texas, with their triumvirate approach. All organisations agreed to work together to define what the curriculum should be and to undertake the market research that would be necessary to justify the development of a new study program. This was done on the basis that if there were to be sufficient demand for the program Energy SA would provide the funds for each development, University of South

Australia would develop the program and Business SA would recommend the program to its members. In order to determine the demand for the program, University of South Australia's Sustainable Energy Centre, in collaboration with Energy SA and Business SA, launched a detailed survey in December 2004. Without getting into too much detail, the level of response was sufficient for further work to proceed on the development of the program.

The positive results also indicated that there was sufficient demand for the program, with estimated levels of attendance rising from 15 in 2005 to 25 in 2007. The outcome of this process has been the Graduate Certificate in Energy Management, which is designed to prepare practitioners with the core principles and practices of contemporary energy management. For individuals who currently act as energy managers in industry, or for those who aspire to become energy managers in the future. This is a whole new domain of management and I am fairly proud of the fact that South Australia is at the fore in Australia in introducing young people to what will be over coming decades a vital part of management.

The Graduate Certificate in Engineering (Energy Management) comprises four core courses with a total of 18 units. I am not going to go through the content of the 18 units. Suffice to say that on completing the course we will have created what we could quite correctly define as energy managers, who will be given the skills to implement optimal demand side measures within their businesses, enabling an increase in the efficiency of South Australia's energy supply. The advantages gained from employing energy managers is evident from the research which reveals that companies that have previously not applied energy efficiency strategies can save 10 per cent in the first year of implementation of a sound energy management plan. I believe that 10 per cent is a very significant cost saving in the running of industries, particularly those in the auto and advanced manufacturing sectors, because of their high electricity usage.

Ultimately, it may lead to giving this state a fairly sustainable, competitive cost advantage. Therefore, the energy managers that this program will create will have an important role within their business by managing the company's current energy needs and its future energy strategy in an environment where supply and price fluctuations can have a significant impact on business performance.

I conclude by congratulating the South Australian government and, in particular, the Minister for Energy for supporting and promoting this innovative and progressive program. The facilitation of a graduate certificate program will bring about wide benefits for the state by promoting demand side measures that will ensure greater energy efficiency and cheaper energy costs into the future. As I said, I believe it will give this state the basis for carving out a sustained competitive advantage nationally and internationally.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): It is interesting to hear the comments of the member for Napier in moving a motion that this house should support the initiative of the University of South Australia, the government, Business SA and Energy SA on the introduction of a graduate certificate in energy management. I say to the member that the first thing is to have sufficient energy to manage. The honourable member, in the course of making his remarks, made some interesting comments in relation to the decision to privatise the electricity undertakings in this state. The honourable member is very

fortunate to sit in a parliament where the government of South Australia has sufficient resources and funds to carry out the basic necessities that the people need and deserve. When the Liberal Party came to government, following the disastrous Bannon years, that was not the situation.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Don't forget the Arnold years.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: We can add those too. I do not actually blame Lynn Arnold for that demise. He was the one who had to carry the can. In relation to the situation we had at that time, you had a massive government overdraft. The economy had been run down. We had the collapse of the State Bank. We owned a white elephant of the building at 333 Collins Street and other white elephants overseas that were of no value to the people of South Australia, and, therefore, we had to take some steps to reduce the overdraft and get the economy going. If the honourable member thinks it was an easy decision to be involved in the privatisation of our electrical undertakings, I have another opinion. I represent an electorate that had a power station and a coal mine. The great problem we faced was whether we were going to leave the state in debt to the tune of nearly \$10 000 million or whether we were going to take some positive steps.

There was one other problem. The public infrastructure in the electricity industry had been drastically run down. Governments had used ETSA as a milking cow to drag out of it huge quantities of money that should have been reinvested in the infrastructure. Just look at the condition of the railway line between Leigh Creek and Port Augusta. The old power station in Port Augusta had been mothballed and we were told nothing could happen to it. Look what has happened today—\$160 million has been invested in that power station and now it is going to come on as a baseload power station. The money that was invested at that power station has done great things for the people of Port Augusta; it employed people, but that is not the end of it. Look what happened at Hallett. A peaking plant at a cost of some \$60 million to \$70 million was built there. It was built adjacent to the gas pipeline so that it could utilise both diesel and gas: when we have periods of peak demand, it could be brought online because, at the end of the day, the people of South Australia do not like paying high prices for electricity. One thing they absolutely do not like, though, is when they do not have any electricity. We have a situation in Queensland where you get brownouts. We have not had brownouts. Some of my constituents last night were off the power because of the dust associated with some rain—it should not be, but it happened.

What has happened in New South Wales? Two new power houses are being built. The government is not building them: private enterprise is building them. We know that former treasurer Egan bent over backwards to try to privatise and his attitude was that it was better to have good hospitals, schools and roads for the people than owned power stations. He was right. It is a nonsense for anyone to say that, because we have privatised power, it is more expensive. It would not make any difference. If anyone goes around telling people that they are going to get cheap power, they are pulling people's legs. They are misleading them because, at the end of the day, it is an expensive operation.

What we need in this state is a number of things. The member is right that we want more investment. We want to be able to give industry and commerce the cheapest power possible, and we want to have a reliable power source. One of the things that I have taken a great interest in since I have been involved in that area is to get to know the people managing these institutions. They are efficient and motivated,

and they have the interests of the people of South Australia at heart. If anyone has looked at the Leigh Creek coalfield, they would have seen that, as far as coal to burn ratio is concerned, it is as efficient a mine than any other anywhere in Australia.

So, those people are doing the right thing. But to indicate that it was an irresponsible act, because we would not have a AAA rating today if we still owned the electricity undertaking, and this government would not have the money to throw around it is currently throwing around, and we would not have Pelican Point. I raise the point of where the money was going to come from for Pelican Point, the Hallett Station, the upgrading of the Port Augusta power station and those other minor electricity undertakings—I think there is one at Port Lincoln and one other elsewhere—that have been built round the state. Where was the money going to come from? It was absolutely essential then—as it is today—that there was an ongoing investment in the infrastructure, because the demand for electricity has rapidly increased, and the infrastructure has not kept up to date. So, at the end of the day, some of us agreed that, although we had some reservations about it, there was no alternative. If we had not made those decisions, we would not have a AAA rating.

One other thing the Labor Party vigorously opposed was the introduction of the goods and services tax. This tax has given state governments a nest egg they have never had before and were never likely to have. You had only to listen to Peter Beattie on the radio this morning. He is born again! He has put his finger up to the wind, and he has suddenly realised that people are saying, 'Listen, you're getting this nest egg, and if you're not going to back off on some of these annoying taxes, the chilly winds of the ballot box will descend upon you.' He is a smart enough politician to know that that is what is going to happen.

So, it was because of a combination of those things in South Australia that the previous Liberal government did not take the popular decision. Everyone knew there was going to be some flack flying—me most of all, because I faced the meetings attended by those who were working there. But, at the end of the day, we had to do what was right, not what was popular. We are not elected to this place to be popular. We had that with Mr John Bannon, and look where he led us. If we are not careful, the same sort of action is going to take place with this current government. Populace politics is not good politics. At the end of the day, the people end up carrying a tremendous burden.

So, I say to the member for Napier: his intention of getting good, sound management is commendable, and I support it. Unfortunately, the other comments he has made are well off the beam. The Labor Party never faces reality. The Hon. Mr Cameron often says, 'Who were the members in the caucus who wanted to support it, because they knew it was right?' I think our current Treasurer was a supporter of that decision, even though he would not own up to it today.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: What am I supporting?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I will say one thing to the current Treasurer: if we had not sold ETSA, you would not have a AAA rating today.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: I think I will rest my case.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

MEN'S HEALTH TASK FORCE

Mr CAICA (Colton): I move:

That this house congratulates the state government on the announcement of a men's health task force and, in particular, notes that the task force will assist health services to develop a greater focus on men's health and help men access health services earlier.

I will declare an interest—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAICA: Not a conflict of interest, but I will declare an interest: first, that I am a man and, secondly, like everyone else, I need all the help I can get to maintain good health. I was extremely pleased for that reason, as well as for other reasons, of course, to hear that the South Australian government is undertaking action on men's health. I am particularly pleased that the task force will be led by a member of the senior executive, Mr Jim Birch, whom, as everyone knows, is the Chief Executive of the Department of Health. To assist him on this task force there is a membership of men of excellent calibre from across the health system. I am extremely confident that together they will ensure that the health system will improve its responsiveness to men's health issues.

There are a few health issues that are specific to men, such as testicular and prostate cancer, to name two. However, many of the health problems men experience are the same as those experienced by women, such as heart disease, depression, obesity, alcohol and other drug use, other types of cancer, diabetes, and so on. This does not mean that, in the context of those health problems, it is the same. Understanding gender differences in health is critical. The men's task force is about helping health services understand and respond to the specific needs of men so that we can best assist men to take on responsibility for their own health. Without being flippant, I encourage all men and women of this chamber to take responsibility for their own health. I could think of nothing worse, for example, than my friend and colleague the member for Stuart falling over and my having the requirement to give him CPR or mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. Under the circumstances, I would do it. However, I would be racing across quickly to make sure that it was the heart massage I was able to provide first. I encourage everyone to take responsibility for their own health. Looking after your own health is often as simple as ensuring that you do not put off going to see the doctor, which is something so many men—and, I assume, women—do on occasions.

Members interjecting:

Mr CAICA: If I take my wife as an example, she attends the doctor a lot more often than do I. It is about being responsible for taking action when we notice early warning signs about our health. A majority of the men in this chamber might have a little spot here or there they have not decided to have checked, for whatever reason, probably because they are too busy. You should never be too busy to go to the doctor. I encourage people to take that responsibility—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr CAICA: I like to go fishing, and I used to go fishing very often. That is probably why I have some of these little spots on my body that I should have checked out.

Mrs Geraghty: When are you making the appointment?

Mr CAICA: I will make the appointment as soon as I leave this chamber. In fact, as you are the whip, I will tell you that I will have to use some of my chamber duty time to make that appointment almost immediately. I reinforce that point. We know that men do not always seek the health care they

need. This means that, too often, men wait until it is too late and there is no choice but then to seek out that health care. Emergencies can be avoided if we take responsibility for managing our own health.

We all give our cars a service at least annually, if not more often, yet we seem quite happy to neglect our health, to indulge too much in fatty foods, to drink excess alcohol, to neglect warning signs of depression, and we claim to be too busy to exercise—again, I fall into that category. We manage our relationship problems through more eating and drinking and, in worse cases, dangerous driving and other acts of violence. I look forward to hearing from the task force in future to learn about new developments and directions in men's health, and I congratulate the government for instigating the task force.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY secured the adjournment of the debate.

WORLD WAR II, 60TH ANNIVERSARY

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I move:

That this house, in commemorating the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II and the end of the genocide of the Holocaust and the liberation of the death camps in Europe, declares its condemnation of anti-Semitism and all other forms of racism and—

- (a) notes and endorses the resolutions on anti-Semitism presented in the commonwealth House of Representatives on 16 February 2004 and in the Senate on 22 March 2004, and similar resolutions made in the state parliaments of Victoria and New South Wales, particularly noting the long history of anti-Semitism and its evil potential to influence people to express hatred and carry out violence against the Jewish people;
- (b) recognises South Australia's history as a free colony established as a society with religious liberty which includes: a capital renowned as a city of churches, the home of Australia's first Islamic mosque in Marree and the arrival of the first Jewish settlers in South Australia in the state's first year of settlement some 168 years ago;
- (c) recognises South Australia's long commitment to multicultural and multi-faith harmony with about 100 different religious faiths and the cultural heritage from some 160 different nations, all its citizens;
- (d) reaffirms its opposition to all forms of racial and ethnic hatred, persecution and discrimination on ethnic or religious grounds, whenever and wherever it occurs;
- (e) expresses its unequivocal condemnation of violence directed against individuals and religious and cultural institutions;
- (f) resolves to condemn all manifestations of racism and religious vilification in South Australia as a threat to the freedoms that all citizens in this state should enjoy equally in a democratic society, and commits the parliament to take all possible actions to combat this threat to our peaceful and diverse society;
- (g) resolves to encourage South Australian community group leaders to use their influence to oppose and counter racism and religious vilification, and to promote all possible efforts to foster tolerance, respect and community harmony; and
- (h) recognises the social, cultural and economic benefits to all South Australians provided by this state's multicultural and multi-faith society.

This motion is important. In just a few weeks' time there will be ceremonies commemorating the end of World War II in Europe, the defeat of the Nazis and the axis powers and, indeed, the suicide of Hitler and the liberation of the death camps in both Germany and the other formerly occupied nations. When it became apparent to the world that six million Jews and others were killed in the worst acts of genocide against humanity in the long and sorry history of this planet, one would have thought that anti-Semitism would

be gone forever. Unfortunately, it continues to raise its head in both Europe and Australia.

I am mindful of the fact that I first met Norman Schueler, the President of the Jewish Community in South Australia, about 10 years ago when Jewish graves at West Terrace Cemetery were being desecrated. This was a deliberate act of anti-Semitism targeted against Jewish people and their families' remains. We have seen evil organisations such as National Action perpetuating anti-Semitism and other forms of racism. Both my electorate office and my house have been daubed with slogans by National Action such as 'Asian lover' or 'Jew lover' and so on. This is a sickness in our community that cannot be tolerated.

Mr Goldsworthy: Your house?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Yes, my house. The member for Norwood came around and saw what happened to my house. It also happened to her office. We must, as people of goodwill be committed to tolerance, to fighting racism wherever it occurs. We need to be vigilant against it whenever it raises its head. We must also be mindful that there are also groups in South Australia and across the country that continue to deny the existence of the history of the Holocaust. They say that it has somehow been made up. There is a fraudulent academic in South Australia who perpetuates Holocaust denial and continues to put out anti-Semitic material.

This motion on the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II in Europe and the end of the genocide of the Holocaust is a way of declaring our condemnation of anti-Semitism and all other forms of racism. We also recognise that South Australia was established as a free colony, a colony which would celebrate religious liberty, which would be a refuge for those who had faced religious intolerance in other nations. Not only are we renowned as a city of churches but also as the home of Australia's first Islamic mosque in Marree and, of course, for the arrival of the first Jewish settlers in South Australia in the state's first year of settlement some 168 years ago. Jewish people have made an outstanding contribution to the development of this state and our nation. I think it is timely, given this 60th anniversary, for us to make a stand as members of parliament and as leaders in our community. We must take every opportunity not only to encourage but also to support and underpin South Australia's long commitment to multicultural and multi-faith harmony.

At the weekend I attended a ceremony as part of our 3 Million Trees campaign which saw a leading world figure in the Hindu faith planting a tree here in the Adelaide parklands as part of a sacred forest and a symbol of our commitment to multiculturalism and to recognising, as Mahatma Gandhi did, the essential truths that are found in all faiths.

Of course, it also makes me mindful of my first visit to Israel in 1999 with my daughter. The Adelaide Jewish community kindly arranged for us to be taken to the Dead Sea, to Arava in the Negev Desert. We were driven past great historic Jewish sites such as Masada to a fish farm to see 20 000 barramundi and red fish growing fast and furious in tanks filled by warm, geothermal water drawn from deep below the Negev. The salty, brackish water was topped up by scarce rain carefully collected from the surface run-off. We met with the project director, who showed us an extraordinary farm in the desert on the border with Jordan as a joint peace project. The farm is under shadecloth. We saw Western Australian wildflowers, jaffa oranges, sweet tomatoes,

succulent capsicums and even roses grown in carefully monitored experiments designed to determine which species would flourish in an ecologically and economically sustainable way. I think all of us could be inspired by the work of the Israeli people in terms of bringing the desert to bloom. My host from the Jewish National Fund had worked in Arava for decades. She was truly a daughter of Ben-Gurion's dream. She was forging close links with Australia, and her team was working with former foe Jordan in a cross-border farming project for peace. We found her energy and optimism to be infectious.

I want to tell a brief story about my visit with my daughter to the Holocaust Museum in Jerusalem. A small, intense woman with bright eyes who was a guide at the Holocaust Museum wanted to tell us her story. She was an Auschwitz survivor. Her father, mother and small sister were sent to the gas chambers. She and her younger sister were sent on one line and her mum, her dad and her tiny sister to another line and to their deaths in a scene reminiscent of the film *Sophie's Choice*. She told us about the chimneys and the smell, and she said a guard had pointed to the smoke coming out of the chimneys and taunted her with, 'There is your family.' She and her sister were sent to a labour camp, pointlessly shifting stones in a quarry. Every day she was humiliated, abused, beaten and starved. I asked her whether any Nazi had shown her mercy and she said the only kind words spoken to her during this entire, terrible ordeal were from the woman who tattooed the number of her wrist, and she said, 'I will do it in a way that you can still play the piano.' With her faith, and her sister's support, she was able to survive while so many of those with her perished. This woman lives in New York and each year spends several months in Jerusalem working as a guide in the museum because she believes, as we believe, that it is important for the world not to forget what happened.

Just before we arrived there, an elderly German visitor had told her to stop telling her story because her story was too hard to listen to, and he was told that it was even harder to live through. Stunningly, when I asked her name, she said her name was Eva Braun and, sensing my shock, she said that is why she, unlike the other guides, did not wear a name tag revealing her surname. Back home in America she works as a volunteer in a hospital in the tough Queens area of New York, caring for disadvantaged people who are dying in a hospice. I certainly was profoundly moved by meeting her, and she had a real impact on both my daughter and me, particularly when she showed her children's drawings from the death camps.

So, at this time when we remember the terrible events that occurred under Nazi Germany, the time when we remember the holocaust, let us make a commitment to fight racism wherever it occurs. Let us not tolerate anti-semitism, let us not tolerate any forms of racism, and let us make our stand at this time on the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II that we will never allow what happened more than 60 years ago to ever occur again.

We can be very proud in this state that the concept of multiculturalism, as it is now accepted by both major parties in a bipartisan way and, indeed, by most mainstream parties, that is now embraced across Australia started here in South Australia. It started here in places such as Norwood, where people could see that out of different cultures, religions and languages and by drawing from those heritages we could be a stronger place, a stronger community, a stronger state and a stronger nation. People could see that there is strength in diversity, and out of that diversity there is a sense of a

community coming together to share cultures and religions. I look forward to spending time with the Jewish community in the next week or two at the celebration of Passover. I thought that it was important for us, as a parliament, to make a stand against anti-semitism, because it still exists. There are people putting out tracts and sending out pamphlets that still perpetuate falsehoods and untruths against the Jewish people, and still deny the reality of the Holocaust. I commend this resolution to the house.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I, too, like nearly every member in this house, support the Premier's resolution in respect of the conclusion of the Second World War and the very horrible atrocities that were perpetrated in the name of Nazism. However, I think that it would be remiss if this house was not also reminded that words are fine and often hollow because we celebrate 60 years of the end of the Second World War. We do not celebrate 60 years of peace. Since the end of the Second World War we have had Vietnam, Korea, Malaysia, East Timor and Iraq, and that is just our country—insurrections all around the world.

When we sit here and commemorate these things, it is fine; and we are not in this motion saying anything about the great atrocities perpetrated by the Japanese people in the Second World War. Just maybe we are happy with knocking anti-semitism and Nazis because the Jewish community is an important community around the world, and are people who look like us and are like us. But when it comes to the Japanese—a different culture, a culture that is much more hard for us to understand and a culture with whom we are a major trading partner—we do not see these sorts of resolutions coming in here.

I would say: where is the resolution about Rwanda? Where is the resolution about Hutus and Tutsis, when every parliament in the world turned its head away while more than 300 000 people were butchered? The United Nations knew and we did nothing. Where are the resolutions about Pol Pot, and who in this chamber, apart from me (and I am sure there are some others), has been to Phnom Penh, visited the killing fields and seen the pagoda filled with heads and skulls of total barbaric butchery that made the Nazis look humane by comparison.

Ms Ciccarello interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: You can whoosh and whoosh all you like. I am not condoning Nazism in any form at all, but read some of the ways Cambodians were put to death—how they were butchered, mutilated and tortured. Nazism did that, too. Nazism did some shocking things; but the way in which some of the Cambodians were killed was, if anything, even more horrific. I am not condoning the one: I am saying that, in many ways, the other was even worse. What was done in Rwanda was butchery and savagery in the worst order. The United Nations knew, the world's civilised powers knew and every one of them chose to turn their head.

And this place—and I was in this place—knew nothing about it, either through ignorance or not wanting to know, and we all sat in silence. I support this Premier's motion, but I do so with the cautionary note that it is easy to remember our conflicts and our atrocities and to stick up for people just like us who have been wronged. But the Premier says in this motion that we stick up for multiculturalism and multifaith. Well, is it not about time that multiculturalism and multifaith meant paying attention to our nearest neighbours and seeing some of the dreadful things that go on there on a daily basis,

because they are racist and because people are of a different faith.

There is almost, at present, in the south of Thailand a civil war (certainly, a state of unrest), because 90 per cent of the Thai people are Buddhist and 10 per cent are Muslim, and that is causing conflict in that country. Look at that—now gone, thank God—Mahathir Mohamad who would continually lecture this nation and these parliaments on our attitudes to multifaith and multiculturalism. You could go to Malaysia and Penang and read daily in the newspapers every correct word on the treatment of women and minority groups, but you just had to go in the streets and look to know that illegal workers were allowed to seep in from Indonesia.

They prop up the economy for virtually nothing. They are a slave class of worker, and the minute they complain the police swoop and export them back. We had a former prime minister of Malaysia prepared to lecture us with our faults (and every member in this chamber knows that we have them) and with our failings and tell us just how good he was when, if one looked at what was happening in Malaysia, one could see that Malaysia was probably one of the more racist societies in South-East Asia. Certainly, it does not practise the multifaith or multiracism that it preaches other than by word.

If you want to know what someone is like you just do not look at their words, you look at their actions. By their actions you shall know them. We should spend more time in this chamber looking to our north, to our neighbours, and the inhumanity perpetrated against man in those places. I commend this motion to the house. I strongly abhor what happened in the name of Nazi Germany, but if this motion means anything (other than a Premier coming in here and sounding grand), if the Premier is sincere in this, then every person in this house should make a commitment, and it is a commitment to do better in the future.

The tragedy of this motion is that the motion is here. We should all have learnt this lesson 60 years ago. Every civilised human being 60 years ago should have taken this lesson and taken it to heart. We should have learnt the lesson of the witch hunts in Salem 200 years ago. But, in the last few weeks, we have seen witch hunts in Adelaide, the scale of which I am ashamed. In the last 60 years we have seen continued barbarity and continued oppression and discrimination of people on the grounds of race and ethnic origin, and all sorts of things.

If we believe in this motion (and I think we should) it is not simply enough to sit here and pass it and say, 'Didn't we do a good thing—won't the Jewish community like this.' We should pass this motion and say, 'Now let's do a good thing so that we help the Cambodians, and the Laotians'. The situation in Myanmar is absolutely dreadful, as are situations in India. Let us get out there and make sure that, as people who believe in freedom and equality, this never happens again. Let us not sit here, pass a motion and tell each other what a good job we did. Let us at least honour the Premier by doing something about this motion in our hearts and lives and in this parliament rather than by just simply passing the motion. I commend it to the house.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I totally support this motion the Premier has brought before the house and congratulate him for it as it is an opportunity for us to look at all forms of racism, ethnic hatred and persecution. We should take it further and should be leading by example in this house. I was interested in the comments of the member for Unley in

talking about other countries, but what is happening in South Australia at the Baxter Detention Centre concerns me. People are speaking out about it, but the great majority of South Australians do not understand and accept what is happening there, when we as a state should be screaming out about what is happening in Baxter.

The Cornelia Rau story certainly shocked many people and there has been much discussion about her story. Anybody who saw the *4 Corners* program would have been horrified at what they saw. It seems that a lot of the shock and horror was because she was an Australian citizen and was detained there, but they were not shocked and horrified by the fact that what goes on there is happening every day to other inmates at Baxter Detention Centre. That concerns me. We have shown concern for an Australian citizen, but there are people there being treated the same way—people with similar mental health issues—and are just being ignored by everyone. No-one is taking any notice or screaming out about what is going on and this breaks my heart.

I am not a visitor to Baxter Detention Centre because I do not want to raise false hopes by going there, but I know many people who visit from my communities of Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and Woomera and from many other communities. People are hearing the stories coming out from Baxter, but they are not listening to what is being said and it breaks my heart that this is going on.

We should be screaming out to the federal government and saying that this policy is not acceptable and what is happening there is not acceptable. The Premier talked of our proud history in South Australia of multiculturalism and tolerance, but it is not happening. Baxter exists in this state and we are letting it happen. I feel sickened by what is going on there. I always wondered how Nazi Germany happened and how a nation could condone what happened. I could not understand how people could sit back and let it happen. I knew they feared for their lives and so on, but I could not understand how people sat back, let it happen and participated in it. But in recent years, with what has been happening in the detention system in Australia, it has made me realise that it is very easy for that sort of thing to happen in any country.

I am not saying that we are on a par with what happened in Nazi Germany, but people in this state and country have been brainwashed into believing that it is okay. People have hated the inmates and the refugees who have gone there. They have put around awful stories about these people, when the great majority of them are ordinary people who have done all they can for their families and what they believed was best for their families. They have tried to come to a new country. We do not see too many terrorists in Baxter Detention Centre: I am sure there are a few people there who are unsafe, but the great majority of people there are ordinary human beings.

If we in Australia were suffering the same sorts of conditions they left, it would be people like us who would do the same thing. We would try to get out of our countries and do all we could to save our children and go to another country. It breaks my heart to see that we condone what is going on, that we vilify those people and continue to vilify them. Even though there has been a shift in public perception about who is in there and what is happening, we still have a long way to go before we can hold our heads high in South Australia and say that we have done something about what is happening there.

I support the Premier's motion as it is very important, but this house should be leading by example and telling the people the South Australia that, if we want to continue our

proud history, we have to do something about what is happening there.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I, too, rise to support the Premier's motion. It is a very important matter. I will not spend a lot of time covering the eight different aspects of the motion, but I take on face value the Premier's motives for bringing this matter into the parliament, in an earnest, honest and in some ways a statesmanlike fashion and speak in support of it. We can look back at the events of modern history, particularly in relation to the German people, and we find that Germany immediately after World War I had some issues with the way that war finished, and found itself in a somewhat dire situation. Its economy was in an absolute shocking state of depression. When I was a young boy my mother had a German cleaning lady and she was a young teenager who had lived through the Second World War years and the years leading up to the war.

She told my mother that the inflation rate in Germany at the time was so great that a wheelbarrow load of coins was not enough to buy a box of matches to light the candles and fires in their home. The situation was very grim for those people. So, it was not tremendously difficult, in some ways, for a person to come along and promote themselves and supposedly show them a way out of their problems. We know who that person was: Adolf Hitler has certainly gone down in history as one of the chieftains of terror in the world. He increased his power through a reign of terror. He was a murderer, he undertook any and every activity to promote himself, but during that time shielding it with conspiracies and lies, and hiding the truth of the matter to the average German people. I am in no way speaking in support of what happened. I absolutely abhor that part of the German nation's history, but I wanted to talk briefly about this lady's recounting; a first-hand experience of a German girl living in those times. The people were impoverished, they were starving to death, and a person came along and promised them a better way, so they followed him. He instituted a reign of terror, but these people were in peril, and he led them down a path of poison. The regime that he oversaw—as I said, he was a chieftain of terror—was one that is an absolute blight on the history of humanity.

So, I commend the Premier for bringing this matter to the house. The foundation of our western civilisation is based on Judao-Christian philosophy, and this parliament is conducted along those lines. The principles that come from those faiths, and from that cultural background, have underpinned our democratic society extremely well, and will obviously do that into the future. In celebrating the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II, I recall with real pleasure, witnessing first hand, and being part of the celebration of, the 50th anniversary of the end of the war in the Pacific—VP day. We had VE day, which this motion relates to, but in 1996, nine years ago, from memory, we celebrated VP day, and we had a marvelous—

The Hon. M.D. Rann: It was 1995; Australia Remembers.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: 1995, okay. We commemorated the end of the war in the Pacific because, as we know, the war in Europe finished in 1945 and the war in the Pacific finished in 1946.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: In August 1945.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Okay, the Premier understands the dates better than I do. I apologise to the house for that. I was working in my previous career as a bank manager,

managing a branch here in King William Street, and I went outside when the parade was going down the street, and all the ticker tape was flowing out of the building. It is a day that I will remember for the rest of my life. It was something that really lifted the spirits of the people in the CBD and, as the Premier said, the whole nation supported it and enjoyed those celebrations. We believe as a human race that we learn from our mistakes and that we learn from history. In some ways I do not think that we do. The member for Unley spoke about learning lessons from mistakes and horrors of the past, but it staggers me that, as human beings, with our supposedly advanced sense of our relationship with one another, and all those things that make up our way of human life—I do not know if we learn from our mistakes because we witnessed, (again, the Premier might know the dates) when the Soviets pulled out of Yugoslavia, the atrocities of the Serbs against the Bosnians and vice versa, and the destruction of Herzegovina, and the similarities between how they treated one another. They basically captured men and put them into concentration camps, and the UN stood by and did nothing. The UN soldiers went in there and said, 'We can't do anything until we get attacked.' So, they had to trundle along the road and observe the atrocities that were taking place. How long ago is that? Is it 15 years ago or 10 years ago? We are talking about the horrors in modern history of 60 years ago but as a decent democratic country we witnessed a similar, not to the same magnitude, style of atrocity in that part of Eastern Europe only a decade and a half ago. Unfortunately, as human beings, I do not know if we learn lessons. If a decent law-abiding society disintegrates, we revert back to quite a subhuman level of activity.

Time expired.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I rise to indicate that the opposition unanimously supports this motion and commends the Premier for bringing it forward. I think that it is a balanced and well-presented motion that encapsulates what I am sure is the view of all South Australians. In particular, we commend the motion for its fairness noting that it reminds South Australians of the terrible tragedy of the Holocaust but, of course, of times preceding the Holocaust during which the Jewish people suffered enormously in Europe and in other countries around the world—for centuries, in fact—and, in some respects, they continue to suffer. They really are a signal not only of Jewish suffering, but also an example of suffering that extends to other ethnic groups, religious minorities and other persecuted peoples over the centuries. We note the motion includes recognition of South Australia's history as a free colony established to escape from such persecution. It also notes that we were the home of Australia's first Islamic mosque, at Marree and, in so doing, the motion recognises the very diverse and multi-cultural nature of South Australia's society.

We have a certain balance and fairness in the way we look at disagreements that exist and have occurred over time around the world, and I think we bring a certain freshness to these ancient struggles that from time to time result in violence and chaos around the world. It is interesting that, given the events of the last week with the passing of Pope John Paul II, himself a Pole, that country suffered a 20 per cent loss of its population in the period from 1939 to 1945. It is a frightening thought that a country could have 20 per cent fewer people in its six years after such a tragic war. Of course, many of those who died were Polish Jews.

I think that the motion reminds us of how important it is for government to be balanced, fair, open and accepting of all peoples. It reminds us how important it is for leaders and parliaments not to favour any particular ethnic group over another, to be careful when it picks up any particular issue and that it does so with balance and fairness, and in a way that gives all sides of the debate a fair go. There are issues where it is very tempting sometimes for members and leaders to take one point of view and to curry favour with a particular group in the community when we must always be reminded that we lead for all South Australians and that we need to see all points of view. As someone who, in my former life, commanded our peacekeepers in Egypt in the Sinai with a multinational force and observers, I had an opportunity to travel extensively around the Middle East to meet with and discuss many of these issues with Jews, Muslims, Egyptians, Jordanians, Lebanese, Israelis and Palestinians. One comes away with a recognition that these matters referred to in the motion are human problems with human solutions and that one needs to be able to put oneself in the shoes of each of the parties and see the world as they see it before you can broker any sort of reasonably balanced view of what has happened and what needs to happen.

The Premier is right to remind the house that South Australians universally condemn all manifestations of racism and religious vilification in South Australia. We see these things as a threat to our citizenship and democracy. The motion is right to call on all South Australians and community group leaders to use their influence to oppose and counter any form of racism or religious vilification. In doing that, we need to be cautious about being too prescriptive. We can try to pass laws that mandate certain courses of action when many of these values we seek to uphold depend upon a degree of goodwill from all and cannot be codified, mandated and legislated. So, it is a matter of balance.

The motion concludes by recognising the social, cultural and economic benefits to all South Australians provided by this state's multicultural and multi-faith society. I think that is the key to the motion—the diversity, not only of ethnic and religious groups within our community and our immigrant base, but also the diversity of thought and views in South Australia, which I think is a strength on which we can build. It is a strength on which we can build the economy, the fabric of our society and the future for young South Australians. The opposition, having discussed this, universally agrees with it, and we think it is an appropriate motion for the Premier to bring forward. We assure the house that all of us on this side are as one, as members of parliament, in supporting the motion. We hope to see its swift passage this morning.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I want to make a few brief comments about this motion. I commend and support the Premier for his motion to commemorate the 60th anniversary of the end of World War II and the end of genocide and the holocaust. Of course, all of us should deplore any form of racism and anti-Semitism, as well as violence perpetrated on people who are of different faiths. We are very familiar with the death camps; most of us have seen evidence of Auschwitz, Buchenwald and the many other death camps, where millions of people of the Jewish faith were put to death—innocent men, women and, particularly, very young children—and we certainly hope that this will never happen again.

Last year, I was in the Balkans. It is unfortunate that history does repeat itself. Along with the Attorney-General,

I visited Srebrenitsa, where, in just three days, some 8 000 men and boys were killed and mutilated. Just seeing the memorial is something that just beggared belief, knowing of the violence that had been perpetrated.

The member for Waite has mentioned the death of Pope John Paul II and the fact that the Pope was a Pole. The Pope was the first person in history to apologise to the Jews for what they have suffered over several thousand of years. Much of that would have stemmed from the Pope's experience as a child, where many of his school friends were Jewish. He lost many of his personal friends, so he saw the terrible consequences of racism and anti-Semitism. We are fortunate that in South Australia we have a multicultural society. However, we should not be lulled into a false sense of security and think that racism cannot very easily rear its ugly head. Even in Australia, we do not have to look very far back in time, with Pauline Hanson and One Nation and the attitudes that were raised with many people. We certainly do not want to see that happen again. I commend the Premier for having brought this motion, with its many clauses, to the house. We look forward to being able to continue in a free and just society.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): I, too, rise to support this motion and to commend the Premier and the government on bringing to the attention of the house such an important motion and to remind us of the genocide of the holocaust and the liberation of the death camps in Europe. I, along with everyone else in this chamber, declare that we should fight anti-Semitism and other forms of racism.

I was brought up in the 1960s and the 1970s. This reminds me of two songs, one of which was by Donovan called *The Universal Soldier*, which was about the universal soldier fighting hatred and war. It also says that the universal soldier in all of us is a Catholic, a Hindu, a Baptist, an atheist and a Jew. There is the potential in all of us to have that anti-humanity. The other song was by The Uglies, and I think the words of the song are very profound. It goes something like this:

I'm a man at the prime of my life;
I've got a house, a car and a beautiful wife;
There's no chip on my shoulder;
I've no axe to grind, and no possible reason to wake up my mind;
And the days break and the nights fall and drift into time;
Somewhere there is hunger;
Somewhere there is war;
But I can do nothing;
So, I'll just ignore.

The reality is that 60 years have passed, and we must not allow this to drift into time, and we must not ignore the cruelty around us that still exists in many places in the world. We see it daily in places such as Africa and Cambodia, where the cruelty of humanity against innocents continues. Some people want to rewrite history and say that six or seven million Jews were not victims of the holocaust. The reality is that they were, and we must not allow that to drift into time. That is why I commend the Premier for this motion.

When I attended the Papal mass, I sat next to Norman Scheuler. One of the things he said that really touched him was that, when Pope John Paul II came to South Australia, he made sure that he met with the Jewish community. Pope John Paul II referred to the Jews as his older brothers and sisters. As a Christian, that is the reality. It is sad that throughout history, in particular, at the time of the holocaust, we have forgotten that fact.

The evils of totalitarianism, whether they originated from the Right, under Fascism and Nazism, or from the Left, under Communism, whether it be in Russia or China, the atrocities that have been committed under totalitarian regimes, where the individual's humanity is smothered in the interest of the state must be opposed in all theatres of conflict throughout the world.

This sort of evil has no place in the 21st century. If there is a heaven, the likes of Mother Teresa, Mahatma Gandhi and other leaders of various faiths will be together. Equally, if there is a hell, I am sure that Hitler and Stalin are there together, because the systematic atrocities that were committed by Stalin under communism and by fundamentalist atheists amongst their own people as well as those from the Baltics should have an equal place in history. No people have suffered this systematic genocide and been part of the so-called 'Final Solution' as have the Jews.

I believe that we should commemorate the 60th anniversary because it is important that we put history into its proper context. We must learn from history. Sadly, as my colleague the member for Kavel says, we have not learnt from history. Some historians say that the only lesson we have learnt from history is that we do not learn from history, but that should not stop us trying to learn. The atrocities that have been committed—whether in the killing fields of Cambodia, in Rwanda, or in the Balkans, or whether under Hitler or Stalin—must not be let drift into time. Today, we should give special mention to what the Jews have suffered because no other people were part of the 'Final Solution' as were the Jews under Nazism.

This was a dark age in our history, but sadly it continues in various parts of the world today. A motion such as this reminds us that we have to be vigilant. We live in a multicultural and a multi-faith society where we respect each other's beliefs—and long may that continue. As Christians, we should be able to worship God as Jehovah, Allah or the Lord of Heaven, because in faith we should be one. We should search for that universal truth and be vigilant against the proponents of totalitarianism, which could ultimately smother the human race.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I rise to support the motion and to congratulate the Premier on bringing it before the house. I wholeheartedly support the motion, as I am sure do all members. As the member for Waite said, we are as one when it comes to this motion. The tragedy of the Holocaust and the suffering that people faced under the evil brutality of the Nazi regime extended not only to the Jews, but of course it was the Jews who suffered the brunt of the Holocaust. People with disabilities, the mentally ill, and those more commonly known as gypsies were also rounded up and put into concentration camps.

There was also the appalling treatment of Poles in World War II. In fact, Auschwitz was initially set up to deal not with the Jews but with Polish resisters. The first people to be put into those labour camps were Soviet prisoners of war and Polish resisters. It was not until later that Heinrich Himmler, the leader of the SS, decided to utilise Auschwitz for exterminating Polish and German Jews also. The Jews bore the brunt of the Nazi Holocaust, but we sometimes forget those others who died in concentration camps. Often, those people were brave Germans who decided to stand up against the Nazi regime and try to dissent to Nazi rule. Germans and Austrians and many British POWs were sent to concentration

camps to be executed, as were many German generals who plotted against Hitler in 1944.

However, overwhelmingly, the people who suffered the most in those concentration camps were the people who were simply born Jewish. That is the horror of it. It was not based on a crime or resistance to the regime; often it was just based on who your mother and father were or what your last name was. This was a terrible thing about the Holocaust. The Holocaust serves as a reminder to all faiths throughout the world of the evil of people who believe, for whatever reason, that their ideology is correct and dissent is not allowed. Soviet prisoners of war, who built those concentration camps before they were used to exterminate Jewish families in this ethnic cleansing program throughout the eastern provinces that Germany conquered, were executed immediately after the buildings were erected. Those who were liberated by the Soviet armies were executed, so these people suffered doubly. However, I am not sure that such suffering is unique to those people, but the whole concept of a concentration camp is evil, and I am sure that those who first founded them have a great deal to answer for.

But, of course, this motion goes further than just talking about the holocaust and the liberation of the death camps. It also recognises South Australia's long-term commitment to multiculturalism, and it recognises that South Australia is indeed founded on multiculturalism. We were a free state, a beacon to the rest of the world. You could come here to South Australia to express your views freely, whether you were Islamic, Protestant or Catholic—although Catholics found it a bit tougher in South Australia in the early days. One only has to look at some of the early editions of *The Advertiser* to find advertisements where people were asked to apply for jobs but 'Catholics need not apply'. I am glad to say that those days are over in South Australia.

Indeed, South Australia's multiculturalism sees an Orthodox church and an Islamic mosque within sight of each other in the CBD, which is probably something our founding fathers would not have conceived of in 1836 when South Australia was first settled. We condemn all forms of racial vilification, which is something that I am very proud of personally. I think we should always attack the idea, not the faith or the person. You should not necessarily always attack ideas, because some ideas are good ideas, but unfortunately what happens is the idea does not become the issue: it is the messenger of the idea that becomes the issue. In South Australia we do our best to try to move away from that sort of rhetoric.

I think both sides of politics in South Australia are extremely tolerant and sensitive to ethnic diversity. Indeed, the Liberal Party has pre-selected candidates such as Julian Stefani in the upper house and the member for Hartley. I think it is a tribute to the Liberal Party that they have pre-selected people who are ethnically diverse. Steve Condous was the first person of Greek heritage to serve in the South Australian Parliament.

Mrs Hall: Bernice Pfitzner.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Bernice Pfitzner, of course. I am not sure which country her family came from.

Mrs Hall interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: She was ethnically Chinese. The member for Morialta reminds me that she was the first. Indeed, on our side of the house, a very proud moment for me was seeing Carmel Zollo, the first Italian-born minister sworn in—in any cabinet in Australia, I think. I am not sure about that, but I am pretty sure she is South Australia's first Italian-

born minister. I am extremely proud of the Hon. Carmel Zollo and her role in promoting the cause of an ethnically diverse South Australia. And, humbly, my own election was the first time a Greek Australian had been elected to the South Australian parliament for the Australian Labor Party.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: And, of course, I acknowledge the work that the Hon. Nick Bolkus did in breaking the path, because I have seen many times in the Australian Labor Party—

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Can you hang on a second? Do you mind, Joe? You have had your chance. Had it not been for the Hon. Senator Nick Bolkus being pre-selected and elected to the senate, without a Bolkus there could not have been a Koutsantonis. Of course, the member for Norwood, who is a very proud representative of her community, was elected as mayor of her community.

Ms Ciccarello: First Italian-born mayor of Norwood.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: She was the first Italian-born mayor of Norwood. As we all know, Norwood was one of the first places Italian migrants settled in South Australia, and she became their representative on the council as their mayor, and then finally the community of Norwood, multicultural as it is, sent an Italian-born representative to the state parliament, which I think is a great indication of how multicultural South Australia is. Indeed, if you look across our councils and across the state, there are a number of Vietnamese, Greek Australian, Italian Australian, Croatian Serbian, and even some Islamic members.

But, of course, we still have a great way to go. My very good friend Eddie Husic, a friend of mine in Young Labor who ran for the seat of Greenway in New South Wales, is an ethnically Bosnian Muslim. He ran into some difficulties when he ran for parliament, and I am not casting aspersions on any members opposite because I know they are all people of good intentions, but I think some of their colleagues interstate played a bit rough and played the man, not the ball. I heard very clever campaigning techniques such as Eddie's opponent, the current member for Greenway, saying, 'If anyone mentions my opponent is a Muslim, I will fire them.' Pamphlets were put up saying that 'My opponent's religion, Muslim, has nothing to do with politics whatsoever.' These are clever techniques to let everyone know your opponent's religious affiliation while trying to claim it is not an issue. It is a technique perfected in the United States by James Carvel, who said, 'I will not be using the fact that my opponent appeared on drug charges in 1972 as an election issue because it has nothing to do with it.' So we have some way to go, and I hope that one day we will elect people based on their character, not based on their religious affiliation or their ethnicity.

Time expired.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I am delighted to contribute to the debate on this motion. Of course, I support the motion. To not support a motion such as this would be akin to saying that you do not support motherhood. The motion is all about motherhood statements. I am fundamentally a cynic, and I am quite happy to admit that, and I must admit I did not hear all of the Premier's contribution so I failed to come to an understanding of what he is trying to achieve by the motion.

That is not to say that the house does not move and support motherhood-type motions all the time. It does,

particularly in private member's time. Having said that, of course in acknowledging the 60th anniversary of the Second World War, certainly, I support the Premier's statements. I would like to make a few comments that are possibly a little different than other members have made. One of the things we often fail to realise as people living in a neighbourly fashion with other tribes is that the fights, battles and wars that we have with our neighbours (and with people who are not even our neighbours or who live on the other side of the world) are caused by racism and religious and cultural differences.

The reality, in my mind, is that that is not the cause of these difficulties: it is the excuse that we use to try to justify the abominable way in which we behave towards one another. One of the things in very recent history which has absolutely fascinated me and which, I must admit, I have failed to understand is the way that the people in the Balkan States treated each other when the rule of law and good orderly society started to fall apart. Those people had lived together for hundreds and thousands of years, but the old tribal rivalries and hatreds—some of them going back many hundreds of years—broke out.

That did not surprise me because that was part of their culture, but the way in which those hatreds manifested was beyond by imagination to understand. We are very lucky in South Australia. I suggest that, pre-settlement, probably the founding fathers of South Australia had more discussion and put more thought into the process of how we would develop as a society. Basically starting from scratch, the founding fathers of South Australia, through the late 1820s when they were discussing setting up a settlement, a colony, in South Australia, went through lots of debate about how to found a perfect society. That is what they wanted to do. I do not think that, by any means, we have achieved a perfect society, but we have achieved, I think, a society that is probably as close to perfection as any to be found in this world. We are very fortunate, and I believe that we owe a lot to our founding fathers for that.

Harking back to the example I just gave about what happened in the Balkans, it is not by pure luck that we enjoy what we enjoy here in South Australia. I am not too sure that by passing a motion such as this will ensure that we continue to enjoy that. I think that what we have to fight to protect in South Australia is our rule of law. If one looks anywhere around the world in any society, it is the rule of law which keeps people living peacefully with their neighbours. The rule of law will survive only when every member of the society is treated fairly and the same as everyone else and when every member of society knows that the systems which dictate the way in which we go about our daily business are open; and that the people managing those systems are accountable. I wish that the Premier had added into the motion those things that say how we can continue to protect the wonderful society that we have here in South Australia.

They are the things which, I think, in all reality, we should be trying to project to people in other places, and suggest that they can learn from the example that we have here in South Australia. In no way would I suggest that we do that in a patronising way, but I think that we can offer South Australia and the society that we have created as an example to other peoples. There is nothing in the Premier's motion with which any member would not agree, and that is why I suggest it is a little motherhood. However, I am quite happy to support the motion, and I believe that it will have speedy passage through the house.

Motion carried.

KYOTO PROTOCOL

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Caica:

That this house calls on the federal government to ratify the Kyoto Protocol which comes into effect on 16 February 2005.

(Continued from 7 April. Page 223.)

Mrs HALL (Morialta): I rise today to speak on the member for Colton's motion calling on the federal government to ratify the Kyoto Protocol. The member for Colton has made a number of erroneous suggestions during his remarks, particularly regarding the federal government's strategy to combat climate change as being unclear. Let me assure members that the federal government's policy is very clear and explicit. It will not ratify the Kyoto Protocol because, as it is written, it will threaten Australia's economic prosperity without delivering any tangible benefits. However, the Howard government has committed to reaching the targets set by the protocol. The Kyoto Protocol, as we know, is an amendment to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. It seeks to reduce the level of greenhouse gases by 5.2 per cent of 1990 levels and therefore assist in the reduction of global warming.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mrs HALL: Listen, Tom. There is significant evidence to suggest that the protocol will not in any meaningful way reach the targets it has set. In fact, the respected Academy of Sciences has said that the Russian government's decision to approve the Kyoto Protocol was 'purely political' and that it had 'no scientific justification'. In addition, *Nature* magazine in October 2003 predicted that the benefit of the protocol would perhaps be only between .02°C and .28°C. It is fair to say that the science behind this proposal has its critics, and some of the conclusions drawn from that science are positively bizarre.

Between 1940 and 1970, global temperatures went down, even though carbon dioxide levels increased. If you study this over a longer period of time, there is evidence in the ice age temperature variation studies that CO₂ increases occurred after warming. My point here is not to try to dispute the fact that climate change is occurring—we know it is—but to highlight the fact that there is considerable well informed debate and doubt over what is the cause of the problem. CO₂ reductions are important, necessary and admirable for a number of reasons, but not necessarily because they will reduce global warming.

However, even the impact of that warming is questioned by some. Professor of Environmental Science at the University of Virginia, Patrick Michaels, has said that the most noticeable changes of temperature occur in extremely cold climates such as Siberia. He says that neither plants nor animals can feel the difference between minus 40° and minus 38°. By contrast, in more humid climates there is almost no noticeable temperature variation. It is a fact that the scientific models used to demonstrate the changes in global temperatures are incomplete and therefore intrinsically inaccurate. They do not include information regarding sun spot activity, volcanic activity, solar influences and the acknowledged weakness of cloud physics in climate models.

Beyond the issue of whether the science of under-pinning the treaty is sound, the Kyoto Protocol is fundamentally flawed as a binding document. First, developing countries are not bound by the protocol. Countries like China, which is the

second largest emitter of greenhouse gases, is not bound. India is also exempt. It should be noted by the member for Colton that the Chinese economy is expected to quadruple by 2020. There are several economic models which show that the Kyoto Protocol is more expensive than the global warming it seeks to avoid, yet the alleged benefits are quite small.

The Australian Greenhouse Office released its modelling and shows that there would be a reduction in growth of about only 1 per cent, not the genuine reversal of the current trend. The Kyoto Protocol provides false hope to people who are serious about doing something to reduce greenhouse gases and who are concerned about climate change.

The member for Colton and the Labor Party fail to recognise, in typical fashion, the practicality of implementing this. It is simply unacceptable to proceed with greenhouse gas reductions because it is politically correct if it means a massive loss of investment and jobs in this country—or perhaps the Labor Party did not notice what happened in Tasmania at the last election. What it similarly fails to understand is that the federal government is proceeding with initiatives to reduce these emissions in a way that does not negatively impact on the economy. The Howard government has provided over \$1 billion for incentives for greenhouse gas emission reductions for industries and communities. Australia has been cutting 60 million tonnes of greenhouse gases on average on an annual basis around the first phase of the Kyoto Protocol. It has done this in a time of unprecedented prosperity in this country's history. Employment and investment have dramatically increased under the Howard government, particularly employment, which is at record highs.

The member for Colton states that it is his belief that 16 February, the day the protocol was intended to be implemented, was a day of shame. It is typical of the Labor Party to look at protecting Australia's interests and seeing decisions based on fact and not on emotions as somehow shameful. The member's repeated assertion that the federal government is doing nothing about greenhouse emissions is patently false and he must be a firm believer in the principle that, if you repeat a claim often enough, it will eventually become fact. It has committed to the target set and has looked at various methods, some of which were mentioned in the member for Colton's speech, for reducing emissions.

To this I say that we now need to admit that the Kyoto Protocol does not fit with so much of what the member for Colton had to say. It does not reduce greenhouse emissions anywhere near the 15 per cent he talked about when he used the example of what was happening in England. Australia has shown the way with respect to how to reduce emission and continue economic growth. Governments have to establish a goal and set about implementing it, incorporating transition and stages as part of the solution. I also point out that the member's faith in Kyoto is misguided, as it will not reduce greenhouse emissions for Australia because Australia was one of two countries allowed to increase its emissions up to 8 per cent—yet another example of the absurdity of the agreement and the fact that it does not fundamentally address the issue of climate change, greenhouse gas emissions or, for that matter, sustainability.

The member for Colton says that Australia is the worst country per capita for fossil fuel pollution. In reality, apart from setting an example to others, Australia's contribution to greenhouse gas emissions is essentially small on a world scale. Even the Kyoto Protocol acknowledges this because it allows for new increases in emissions. Additionally, we are

a net exporter of energy, so we are very different from some countries which are inefficient energy users. In concluding my remarks, the ALP has to get its story straight about energy. On the one hand, the Labor Party says it is absolutely supportive of this agreement, and it abhors greenhouse gas emissions. Fair enough, but does it seriously, honestly expect a \$800 billion economy to be powered by wind farms and the sun? I oppose the motion.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): I think that the member for Morialta will soon have a coastal electorate by the way she is going in not supporting the Kyoto Protocol. Let us look at this in a world perspective. There are two countries in the world that have refused to sign this agreement: the United States of America and the commonwealth of Australia.

Mrs Hall interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: If the member for Morialta thinks that I am anti-American, I think she is in for a rude awakening when it comes to my views on American foreign policy. However, on American environmental policy I agree with Al Gore, John Kerry, Evan Bayh, Hilary Clinton, and Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, that we should sign the Kyoto Protocol. Vladimir Putin, the President of Russia, has signed the Kyoto Protocol. If there is one country in the world—

Mrs Hall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta is defying the chair.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS:—that could not afford to sign this treaty, it is Russia, because its major source of power is coal and uranium—nuclear power. It has made a bold decision in the interests of future generations and its children to sign a protocol—the member for Morialta is right, it does not go the whole way to solving greenhouse gas emissions, and it does not solve our environmental problems—but it says that the environment is an important challenge that we have to face, and we have to start looking for alternatives. The member for Morialta says in her argument, ‘We are doing all this stuff anyway. Why do we have to sign an international agreement that compels us to do things?’ Australian businesses are missing out on credits, incentives and trade benefits that Kyoto provides to other countries. We now have the best wind technologies in Asia. South Australia is the leader in wind generated technology. We have the expertise, we know how to export this expertise, and we should be selling it to the world. There are always people out there talking about environmental hysteresis, saying that the greenhouse gas effect is not really that bad, ‘Global warming—is it really due to carbon emissions, or is it just some cyclical change that we are going through that happens every 1 000 years, before we had recorded temperatures. Is the hole in the ozone layer really a big problem?’ I would ask people to go to Europe and to see what has happened to places like Holland. At the moment, because of the melting ice packs, Holland is finding that if it does not spend billions and billions of dollars in infrastructure on sea walls to keep the ocean at bay, it would lose half its country.

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for MacKillop laughs because he is ignorant of what is going on outside of South Australia.

Mr Williams: It has reclaimed land for hundreds of years.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: They started reclaiming the land in 1939, for what the member for MacKillop knows, and then

they lost it all in 1953 in a major storm surge, and rather than reclaim it again, they built storm surge barges. But, of course, the member for MacKillop being the expert on everything other than anything factual, would not know that. It was not done over hundreds of years at all. That is all at risk now because of global warming. I am not saying that the Kyoto Protocol solves all these problems. In fact, I have my suspicions about it as well. One of the problems that I have with it, is that there is only one form of energy, other than solar and wind, that emits no carbon.

Mrs Hall interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I do not, because the fact remains that building nuclear power stations uses a great deal of energy that counters the benefits that you might get, and there is also the long term waste to deal with. No-one wants to deal with nuclear waste. The only people who like nuclear waste are members opposite who want it all brought to South Australia. They want to put up something—like the Statue of Liberty but in reverse—‘Bring us your waste. Bring us your open exposed barrels and we will take them for a small fee.’

Mrs Hall interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The glow in the dark state. My view on Kyoto is that it is a step in the right direction. Given the mistakes that we have made over the last 200 years with the industrial revolution, and even the last 30 years, even though it is not the perfect direction to be taking, it is something which we can aspire to. As we move towards Kyoto, we will realise its shortcomings and improve on them for the next time. We need leadership. We need the greatest democracies in the world to say, ‘We need to do something with environmental damage.’ That means that the United States has to lead the way. Right now the United States is the biggest consumer of unrenewable energy in the world—more so than China.

Mrs Hall interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The member for Morialta says, ‘What about in 2020?’ She is right; China will exceed the United States, and what happens then to the greenhouse effect? What happens then to global warming? What happens when we have unsustainable growth? What do we do then? What do we say to future generations when they say to us, ‘What did you do in 2005 when scientists were telling you that there were problems?’ What are we going to say to people living at Henley Beach and West Beach when the shore is lapping up at their front doorsteps? What will we say to them then? It takes more than wearing a green shirt to be green, the member for Morialta. I think we need to take a step in the right direction. I hope that the members opposite will see the light one day and move forward on environmental sustainability, because all they want to do is take a step back into the past. The most humiliating thing about this is places like Canada, Mexico, all of Europe and most of Asia are signing up to this, except Australia and the United States; that is what is embarrassing about it. If the truth be known, they want to withdraw out of the United Nations as well. They do not like signing international treaties. They do not like international responsibility—they do not believe in it. They do not believe in any sort of collective responsibility for our planet. They just do not like it. I think this is not a Left ideology.

Mrs Hall: Oh, really!

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: It is not; this is about saving humanity.

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: They’re not too fond of scrutiny about refugee policy either.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: No; well, neither are we. I think we would definitely adopt the Kyoto Protocol. I am proud of the Premier for making an election promise to the state and trying to achieve Kyoto protocols by 2010 or 2015, whatever the deadline is.

Mrs Hall: Don't you know your policy?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I am not as smart as the member for Morialta. I am not the genius that she is.

Mr Williams interjecting:

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: And there's the member for MacKillop who thinks that Holland was reclaiming the land 200 years ago: you genius; you're a joke. Anyway, Mr Speaker, I support the Kyoto Protocol. I support the member for Colton's motion; he should be congratulated on it. He has a seaside electorate. They are the ones who will bear the brunt of the ignorance of members opposite because of greenhouse gases and global warming.

Ms Rankine: And their federal colleagues.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: And their federal colleagues. We need to do something about it, and I think we are going in the right direction.

Motion carried.

OLYMPIC DAM PROJECT EXPANSION

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Williams:

That this house acknowledges the recent expansion announcements of Western Mining Corporation and congratulates the former Tonkin Liberal government, supported by the former Labor Legislative Councillor, the Hon. Norm Foster MLC, for their strong support for the Olympic Dam project and the long term economic benefit to this state despite intense rejection at the time by the Labor Party opposition, which was coordinated by a senior adviser who is now the current Premier.

which Mr Snelling has moved to amend by deleting all words after 'congratulates' and insert:

the Rann Labor government for its strong support and active efforts to work with Western Mining Company to expand the Olympic Dam Mine.

(Continued from 7 April. Page 2229.)

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I wish to support the motion of the member for MacKillop in this house.

Mr Koutsantonis: Are you supporting the amendment?

Mr BRINDAL: No; I am told I am not; and being a person of vastly independent mind—

Mr Koutsantonis: So much for the independence of the Liberal Party.

Mr BRINDAL: The member for West Torrens would do well to note the Liberal Party is a very broad church.

Mr Koutsantonis: They don't want you in there anymore.

Mr BRINDAL: No; we are independent to do what we like. Unfortunately, because, unlike the member for West Torrens, I cannot be an expert on everything sometimes in the party I have to rely on people that I trust. I just asked two people that I trust what I am doing in this, and I was given an answer.

Mr Koutsantonis: So did Dean Brown.

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

Mr BRINDAL: The reason I support this is that I listened with interest to the last debate and, while I can support the sentiments of many speakers, I think that we are falling into a trap in this parliament of firstly pre-empting, and I do not think that anyone in this parliament would be very happy that the Prime Minister seems to think that he can get up and tell

this parliament how it should act and what it should do. The Australia according to John Howard should be an Australia of the brave new world. But I am sorry, I think he is one of the great post-war prime ministers. However, I do not think he is right on the issue of the difference between the commonwealth and the states. This has served this nation well for over a century. Our forefathers created a good model, and I do not care who the Prime Minister is. I do not think he has the right to come in and say, 'The founding fathers didn't know what they were doing. The Australian people are totally wrong. I won't put it to a referendum. I will not abolish the states by referendum; I will simply strangle them to death and demand what's happening.' In that light, I think this chamber is falling into a mistake. If we cannot usurp the authority of the federal parliament—if they cannot usurp our authority, neither should we be usurping theirs. The foreign affairs treaties power are the sovereign rights of the commonwealth of Australia; not ours.

Mr Koutsantonis: This is Olympic Dam, mate.

Mr BRINDAL: That is why I will come to Olympic Dam. Olympic Dam is something that we can be concerned with. The whole issue of the Kyoto Protocol comes down to a sustainable world for the future, and it is not just about signing an agreement so that we can all feel good and pat ourselves on the back. It is actually about doing something. I put to members opposite that many of the countries that have willingly—in fact, some of the countries—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I know. This is why this motion from the member for MacKillop is relevant, because many of the countries which signed the Kyoto Protocol rushed along to sign it. The first to put their signatures there will be the last to do anything. They will say, 'We ratified the protocol. Well; what have you done?' For decades and decades it will be nothing. In contrast, the member for MacKillop brings before the house this motion, and what a good motion it is. When the Tonkin Labor government, in spite of the best efforts of the Hon. Mike Rann—

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I rise on a point of order, sir. The member for Unley has grossly insulted the Australian Labor Party by calling us part of the Tonkin government. We were not.

The SPEAKER: That is not a point of order.

Mr BRINDAL: That was a slip in my convoluted thinking even to suggest that a man like David Tonkin could be associated with the ALP. I am glad that the member for West Torrens corrected me, because it is an insult to David Tonkin's memory. I apologise to the house for making that slip. It is a very important motion. When the Tonkin Labor government had the courage—

Mr Koutsantonis: On a point of order, sir—

Mr BRINDAL: Sorry, the Tonkin Liberal government. The member has been told that it is not a point of order, so he should sit down.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member for Unley continues to insult the Australian Labor Party.

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not a point of order. The member for West Torrens should not take frivolous points of order.

Mr BRINDAL: I hope Hansard will correct that, because it is not nice to associate David Tonkin with that lot. When the Tonkin Liberal government had the courage to take this initiative, it was opposed by the Australian Labor Party, particularly by the now Premier of this state, ignoring the

matter of the royalties that would flow to this state—we could afford to lose them. It is a copper mine with a strong uranium ore body in it, gold being another by-product. Incidentally, all members of this house will know that the entire operation at Roxby Downs is more than paid for simply from the gold extracted, and that the copper and uranium are in many ways bonus products. But on a matter of political principle, it was opposed. Good on them, because uranium was then a dirty word; it was then a polluting factor in the environment. It was something the world feared.

This is where the two motions come together, and this is where the member for MacKillop and the Tonkin Liberal government are to be supported and lauded simply because, with the advent of the Kyoto protocol, we are much more aware that uranium as a possible energy source for the future cannot be ignored. It is the by-products of dissipating heat, in the same way that heat is dissipated from a coal power station. It does not produce carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide or other particulate matter which goes to the ozone layer and which acts as an envelope—

Mrs Geraghty: What do you get?

Mr BRINDAL: Largely, you get energy, and you get very little pollution with that energy. What is more, if you rationally examine this, as horrific as Chernobyl was, if you look at some of the other accidents and deaths in conventional power stations, if you add it all up, you will see how safe nuclear power is on a statistical basis. Look at the number of deaths in coal mines. Members of the Australian Labor Party should know that some of the hardest fought rights were for miners. They died in droves of all sorts of diseases, because they were treated virtually like cattle in order to extract ore for rich barons. That being the case, if you add up the possible benefits of the nuclear power industry to a future world, they might be what saves this world, not destroys it. Whilst members opposite bleat about the Kyoto protocol, and they bleat about this uranium industry, will one member of the Labor Party get up and tell me what the solution is? If we cannot have coal power fired stations—

Mr Koutsantonis: Nuclear fusion.

Mr BRINDAL: I thought that was a nuclear reaction—
Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for West Torrens.

Mr BRINDAL:—which requires reagents. The point is this: we are in a world where none of us wants to forgo our power, comforts and those things that come with being a First World country. However, those things come at an environmental and energy cost which is crippling high. If this world and our civilisation is to survive into the future, we have to find alternative sources of energy which do not cause the inestimable damage currently being caused to our environments by the more primitive methods of burning coal and fossil fuels. No-one would disagree with that fact. Nuclear power may represent that alternative, and Roxby Downs might well be something which contributes not to the destruction of the environment but to its salvation. Are there still problems with the nuclear industry? Probably, there are. Can we make it safer? Yes, we must. However, at the end of the day, there were people who sat in chambers like this and executed people for saying that the world was flat. There were people who thought that the invention of the motor car would be the destruction of civilisation and those who protested against railways. With every step forward, they have tried to hold us back.

Ms Ciccarello interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Norwood is a great champion of transport.

Time expired.

Mr MEIER secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 2 p.m.]

PLUMBING INDUSTRY

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS** (8 November 2004).

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: To the best of my recollection the date the CEO of SA Water was asked to meet with the Plumbing Industry Association to address their concerns was on or about 18 October 2004.

I made public that I had asked the CEO to do so on ABC radio on 19 October 2004.

ADELAIDE SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

A petition signed by 211 members of the South Australian community requesting the house to urge the state and federal governments to adequately fund the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra at its existing size and activity level, was presented by Mr Hamilton-Smith.

Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Transport (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—

Transport and Urban Planning, Department of—Report 2003-04—Addendum

By the Minister for Education and Children's Services (Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith)—

Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia—Report 2004

Teachers Registration Board—Report 2004.

QUESTION TIME

FAMILY AND YOUTH SERVICES

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): My question is for the minister for disability services. Will the minister advise the house whether all members of the Special Investigations Unit into complaints against FAYS staff are fully and correctly authorised to perform their duties?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): Can I ask the honourable member to repeat her question, but this time at andante rather than allegro.

Mrs REDMOND: I will do it largo, if the minister would prefer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Can the member for Heysen repeat the question.

Mrs REDMOND: My question is for the minister for disability services: will the minister advise the house whether all members of the Special Investigations Unit into complaints against FAYS staff are fully and correctly authorised to perform their duties?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am advised that they are properly authorised to perform their duties.

PUBLIC DENTAL SERVICE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Health. What is the government doing to reduce the average waiting time for public dental treatment in South Australia?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): The government has done a lot. I am pleased to be able to inform the house that public dental waiting lists and waiting times are plummeting under this government. The wait for public dental treatment has now fallen by 22 months since mid-2002 from 49 to 28 months. That is a drop of 45 per cent. Over the same period, the number of people on the public dental waiting list has fallen by 43 000, a drop of 42 per cent. These falls can be directly linked to extra funding from the state government. In the last two years we have injected an extra \$15.5 million into public dental programs, and this money is starting to reap dividends. We have slashed almost two years from the waiting time for dental work compared with the situation that we inherited from the previous government.

This new money is both employing additional public dental staff and being used to contract private dental care. This means that even more dental services can be provided to people sooner. All up, this year, the state government will spend almost \$44 million on public dental care, including \$13 million on the School Dental Service, \$10 million on the Adelaide Dental Hospital and \$21 million on the Community Dental Service. The money is being spent right around the state, including in country areas. Improving the availability of dental care is a Labor priority, and we are certainly delivering that to the people of South Australia.

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mitchell may not have to wait long for treatment, if he keeps interjecting.

SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. Does the minister concede that, due to internal delays with authorisations, members of the Special Investigations Unit were not authorised for certain investigative actions that they performed?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I thank the honourable member for her question, and no.

SCHOOLS, WHYALLA

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Will the relocation of Whyalla Stuart Primary and Junior Primary Schools to Stuart High School improve education outcomes for students in Whyalla?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Giles for her question. She has been keenly involved in educational change and progress in Whyalla, and I am delighted once again to support the initiatives put together by the community, the parents and the schools. We are very pleased to support their proposal to relocate Whyalla Stuart primary and junior primary schools to the Stuart High School site. This was not a program that was taken up with great speed but was one that was consulted widely with staff, community groups and individuals as a way of bringing together three schools to produce better outcomes for children.

The government is pleased to support this initiative with an allocation of \$1 million, because it recognises that those transitional periods for children during the course of their schooling are the periods during which they often struggle to accept the changes in a new school, and the outcomes can be improved by co-location where there is familiarity with the new school sites. It is helped, of course, when there are family groupings across various age groups. We know that the outcomes in Stuart High School are extremely good and, by improving the facilities and learning opportunities in the areas of visual arts, aquaculture, sport and IT, there will be greater opportunities for young people and the opportunity for primary school children to use some of the facilities that otherwise would be dedicated only to senior children.

The co-location on the site will produce a seamless transition. One of the reasons that the extra funding has been put into this project is to upgrade the facilities, refurbish some of the new classrooms, improve the administration block, improve the technology suites and improve the outdoor play areas because, clearly, outdoor areas suitable for older children need to be modified to be suitable for smaller and younger children. We are absolutely committed to supporting the schools' initiative and helping it produce better outcomes for young people. In fact, this co-location of schools will produce advantages for young people and those transitional areas will be better dealt with.

In response to some of the comments from across the room, I think the opposition is skating on dangerous territory when it criticises the government for electricity prices and school closures. What an extraordinary bleating! Let us just remember those opposite closed 64 schools, and we have opened one.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister can resume her seat. She is debating the question.

ALLEGATIONS, INVESTIGATION

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond): My question is to the Premier. Is it the government's intention to pay the legal costs of the action being taken by the minister who is the subject of allegations of paedophilia?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): No legal costs will be paid by the government against any allegation involving serving members of parliament or former members of parliament. A request has been put to the government—I would say unofficially—regarding legal costs as they relate to serving members of the South Australia Police on which the government has yet to make a determination. We will make a determination on that issue for serving police officers only, not for current or former members of parliament.

In my opinion, one would hope that the conclusion of those police investigations into these allegations will put to rest once and for all the most unseemly smear campaign ever conducted by an elected member of parliament, his support staff and volunteers ever in the state's history. But one should not automatically assume that police investigations will simply be about the veracity of the allegations, and I am talking only in terms of my personal view because these are operational matters. I would assume that the actions of those involved in the campaign to distribute, promulgate and advance these allegations would also be the subject of police inquiries.

Issues, such as witness tampering and, perhaps, issues of criminal defamation and false allegations are all issues of a criminal nature, but we do not know, and maybe it will not

come to that. Until those investigations are concluded, as I said, we will not make a decision about serving members. Did I note that the member for Schubert had a chuckle?

Mr Venning: No.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, members opposite are a little quiet now, because this has—

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

Mr HANNA: I rise on a point of order, sir. I think that the Deputy Premier has answered the question to the fullest extent he could.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier is getting close to the end.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, I am. I am answering a very serious question about a serious matter from a member of parliament who, I would think, should be taking some form of legal counsel himself.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: As a supplementary question, may I ask to whomever it is representing the Attorney-General today—and we have not had ministers, may I observe, or the Premier indicating who will represent them in their absence—whether the government is aware that the lawyers acting for the said minister the subject of the allegations are also acting in the class action for the wards of the state who claim damages in consequence of their being victims of abuse when they were wards of the state?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do not understand the question, but I would ask that you, sir, as the Speaker of the House, consider that these are matters pertaining to a current police investigation. Matters that appeared in *The Advertiser* today by Nigel Hunt would lead me to think that discussion concerning those matters may, indeed, have some form of impact on police investigations. I would like to take some counsel from the Police Commissioner. Indeed, I would ask you, sir, as Speaker, to advise—

The Hon. I.P. Lewis: It would be a good idea if you did.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond is out of order.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:—whether I am in a position to comment publicly prior to the conclusion of those police investigations.

The SPEAKER: Members know that their actions in here should not prejudice any matters that are before the court or are likely to be before the court in any way which would deny people their rights or prejudice an outcome of proper justice.

SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS UNIT

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. In relation to the Special Investigations Unit, will the minister advise whether he has sought or obtained legal advice regarding the admissibility of any evidence obtained by investigators engaged by the unit in the period between when they commenced investigations and when they finally received authorisation to act? Department documents obtained by the opposition indicate that two investigators were engaged by the Special Investigations Unit to conduct investigations prior to May 2004. On 21 June 2004, the Crown Solicitor's Office provided a legal opinion on the establishment of the unit, in which it advised:

For the SIU to conduct investigations into suspected child abuse it will be an essential prerequisite for its officers to be given delegated authority. . . Without this power they would have very limited authority to question members of the public in relation to allegations of abuse against children and certainly would have no power to insist on people answering questions or to provide written or oral information about a child.

That opinion went on to suggest that the draft delegations, not yet issued, were not satisfactory and that either special laws needed to be passed or new delegations had to be prepared. The delegations ultimately were not issued until 21 August 2004.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): My answers to the earlier questions rather clarify the position. All the relevant authorisations for the purpose of the conduct of the prosecution, which is really at the heart of this matter, have been in place. What would have illuminated this house was for the member for Heysen to tell us that the material she is talking about is material at issue in a current criminal proceeding in our courts at the moment. A former foster carer is presently before the courts and is seeking to challenge the way in which the Special Investigations Unit has gone about its function. I have had numerous pieces of correspondence going backwards and forwards between the solicitors for this individual and my ministerial office and department seeking to demand information, put propositions to me and no doubt erect numerous legal defences to their effective prosecution within the courts of a very serious crime.

The advice I have received is that all the relevant authorisations were in place for the purposes of ensuring that the prosecution that is presently before the courts is to be successful, but that matter will be tested by the courts in due course and I do not want to venture into that debate. It is disappointing—and I have made this point on previous occasions—when we hear the legal arguments presently before the courts essentially being echoed in this place, despite the fact that I have said on numerous occasions that our advice is that the relevant authorisations were in place to allow the Special Investigations Unit to carry out its functions. This has led to a police prosecution and now somebody is before the courts charged with the most serious crimes imaginable.

EMPLOYMENT FORECAST

The Hon. P.L. WHITE (Taylor): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. With reference to Drake's quarterly employment forecast released today, what are the estimates for jobs growth?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I thank the member for Taylor for her question. South Australians can look forward to 8 686 new jobs being created over the next three months or a 1.5 per cent increase in net employment. This is according to the Drake International quarterly employment forecast released today, as the member for Taylor said, for April to June 2005. The Drake forecast surveyed 3 299 businesses from 12 industry sectors and found that new full-time positions looked set to appear in the banking and finance and the construction and engineering sectors. Hospitality and tourism is expected to create additional casual work. In real terms, after allowing for resignations and retirements, Drake says that this will translate into 4 498 new full-time jobs and 2 303 new casual jobs for South Australians.

On balance, 22.4 per cent of South Australian firms surveyed said that they intended to recruit over the next three months. This is an increase in 21.5 per cent recorded last quarter, and above the national average of 19.6 per cent. It suggests that job opportunities are spread across a large number of our South Australian employers. Drake describes the job outlook as extremely positive. The forecast more than doubles the 3 322 positions predicted last quarter. Nationally Drake predicts an average of 1.23 per cent increase in net employment compared with the 1.5 per cent increase predicted for South Australia. Whilst we do not want to rely on survey predictions, they are helpful to us in working out where we are going in the labour market, and this, accompanied by the ABS trend figures, shows that there has been an increase of 2 000 full-time jobs in South Australia in the last month, and 20 200 new full-time jobs during the past year—which I think members will agree is very good news for us. Last month's ABS figures showed that South Australia received 9.1 per cent of the nation's new jobs and this is obviously well above the state's working age population share which is 7.7 per cent.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond): I have a supplementary question: does the government know what skills are likely to be required in the main in those increased jobs of which the minister has just given us detail and whether they are available within the unemployed, and, if they are not, what is the government doing about it?

The Hon. S.W. KEY: I would like to thank the member for Hammond for the question. There is quite a number of programs that I have reported in this house that we have put in place to make sure that the supply and demand in the job market match up better than they have in the past. The SA Works program, as well as the Regions at Work program—and if you remember, member for Hammond, the Regions at Work program is looking at trying to make sure that we not only have people in the region working together but we also look at people seeking work, wanting to be part of the labour market, and also the skills that are required by industry and the three levels of government and the community sector in that region.

So, we have put quite an extensive program in place on a regional level, as well as on a more macro level. We have a work force development strategy where we are working with nine skills industry forums to make sure that we are very clear about not only what strategy we need but also what targets we need to achieve with young people, and also with people in the community who wish to change their vocations. I would be more than happy, if the honourable member is interested, to provide a briefing for his electorate, or for the whole of South Australia.

BUS DRIVERS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Transport guarantee now the jobs of 139 existing bus drivers following the minister's meeting with Mr Alex Gallagher, last Wednesday 6 April? Last Wednesday the minister said that he would meet with Mr Gallagher to see what could be done to protect the jobs of bus drivers affected by the government awarding contracts to different service providers.

The SPEAKER: The question is hypothetical to some degree, but the minister can respond.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): Can I explain to the member for Mawson that the reason that I

cannot guarantee jobs is because the government does not employ those people. This outsourcing deal was one that you thought of a long time ago, but the simple truth is this: we are not the employer.

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: You say you can guarantee the jobs; you cannot do it. You cannot do it because the employer is fully entitled to exercise the lawful rights of employers throughout Australia. I point out that your fellow in Canberra has been working very hard to ensure that those lawful rights are reduced year by year—and they are the real lawful rights of employees. We take our commitments genuinely. I have met, not on one occasion but on two occasions, with the secretary of the union, and I have had our people meet with him too, in order to provide the information that might assist in ensuring the maximum number of people possible are transferred with a contract. We are doing everything we can. That is because I am genuine about it—two meetings, last week, with the secretary of the union. I do not know how often the honourable member met with the secretary of a union when he was minister. I suggest it was probably close to never, because we know that the rhetoric in this place from the opposition is completely different to its behaviour in government. We know who outsourced the water contract and shed thousands and thousands of jobs through outsourcing it. We know who privatised ETSA.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister is now debating the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I just make the point, sir, that empty rhetoric in opposition is no match for action in government.

EQUITY START HOME LOAN

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): My question is to the Minister for Housing. What has the initial response been to the Equity Start Home Loan product announced in the Housing Plan for South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Housing): The initial response to the new HomeStart loan product, Equity Start, has been very heartening. Equity Start will aim to create new home ownership opportunities for people in public and community housing. The product is aimed at encouraging about 1 000 social housing tenants into home ownership for the first time. This is very important at a time in our history when we are seeing reports of dramatically falling rates of home affordability and, after decades of cuts to the basic social supports, we are seeing an increasing level of targeting of public housing. For a decade of economic rationalism, we have seen many social supports stripped away. The Labor government here understands that home ownership is central to people's sense of having some security in the community. I will be launching Equity Start formally later this month, but we have been taking expressions of interest since the announcement of the Housing Plan in early March.

Following early advice, I am delighted that as many as 3 600 people have registered their interest in this initiative, and I have asked HomeStart to contact the applicants next week to inform them of the eligibility criteria. This will be followed up with information packs being posted to all those who have been registered. The aim of this project is to do two things. One is to allow social housing tenants the opportunity of making their own home theirs in a real sense through ownership, but also by putting together a pool of money that

will drive innovation in the affordable housing sector. We believe that with the initial good reception that this initiative has received, we can drive innovation. We have put \$15 million into this off the budget, together with the \$93-odd million that we hope to create from the Equity Start project and the \$15 million to accelerate urban renewal projects. This provides a fantastic new opportunity to drive affordable housing initiatives throughout South Australia.

BUS DRIVERS

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Why is the minister training and offering employment incentives to create additional new bus drivers at a cost of up to \$7 000 when 139 fully qualified and experienced bus drivers are yet to find employment due to the government awarding the contract to Torrens Transit and Southlink?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): First of all, I thank the member for his question. I will need some further information from him, and I would also need to check the claims that he is making. If he is talking about the current drivers that previously were part of the public sector, there is a different profile to the programs that we are supporting through South Australian works for long-distance drivers and also drivers in remote areas. If the member is happy to provide me with more details, I will make sure that I can answer that question for him.

WAR MEMORIAL

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is to the Minister for Administrative Services. How is the government ensuring that the World War II memorial is ready for the Anzac Day ceremonies?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): I thank the member for Norwood for her question and her strong interest in this area. The government is committed to the recognition of South Australians who fought for their country. To provide necessary restoration work to the War Memorial, the government accessed the specialist services of Art-Lab Australia to repatinate the bronze memorial tablets. Two highly trained conservators were engaged to do the work on condition that it would be completed before Anzac Day. The project involved highlighting the names on the memorial of all those who gave their lives defending Australia. Micro-crystalline wax was then applied to the bronze memorial to protect and sustain the surface.

I am advised that the result is considered to be outstanding and a testament to the skills and knowledge that are available in Australia. I understand that the Executive Director of the Returned and Servicemen's League of South Australia has highly praised this work. This very significant project has been completed to an exacting time line to enable us to recognise these very special South Australians on Anzac Day.

DRUG DRIVING, TESTING

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): Will the Minister for Police advise the house when the government intends to introduce its proposed legislation to provide for random drug driving testing, given that yesterday the government used its numbers to close down debate on the member for Schubert's

drug driving bill, which was intended to help save lives on South Australia's roads?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): The bill to which the member for Mawson has referred, and which my revered colleague the member for Taylor first dealt with, is out for consultation. The real problem the members for Mawson and Schubert have is not that they do not like the bill that is out for consultation (I am sure they do not disagree with consultation) but that they are not the government. The member for Mawson has to come to terms with the fact that he is not a member of the government. We are the government; we draft the legislation, and we put it out for consultation. I have been the Minister for Transport now for two weeks; they were the government for 8½ years. Drugs have not crept into the community in the last three years. We have put the bill out for consultation.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The real aggravation they have is that they not are the government, and it is my firm ambition that that situation remains for as long as humanly possible.

Mr BROKENSHERE: I have a supplementary question. Will the minister introduce the government's proposed legislation immediately for debate and introduction and, with total bipartisan support, get it through the parliament in two weeks in order to save lives?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will go more slowly: the bill is out for consultation.

Mr Brokenshire: Bring it in now. Come on, get serious!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson started off very well. I do not know what went wrong, but he is now reverting back to his bad ways.

BUS DRIVERS

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is to the Minister for Transport.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Transport is out of order.

Mr HANNA: When the Rann Labor government was putting together the tender documents for bus services, why did it not insist on a clause that would have ensured continuation of employment for those bus drivers already engaged with bus service providers?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Why didn't you think of it?

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Mawson. He is defying the chair. I point out that the warnings issued to two members this morning are still in force. The Minister for Transport.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): It is a better question than any the member for Mawson has thought of. Obviously, I was not the minister at that time—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, I have been the Minister for Transport for two weeks. Generally, the process is considerably longer. I am sure it was handled very well, but I will have to find that out. At least the member for Mitchell asks a question for which I have to find a substantial answer. No wonder you thought it was a good question. Perhaps you should take him on as a consultant, and he could do that market research for you. I will bring back the answer.

GRANTS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Why did the minister ignore well-established protocols by allowing one of the Premier's staff, the Labor candidate for Stuart, to announce a \$28 000 grant to the Port Augusta Football Association when it has always been the convention that the local member announces such grants?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing): These announcements that have been made in the past few days are good news for the whole of the community. I ensured—and I hope the member will verify this—that the member for Stuart was informed of the grants that were made available to his electorate. To the best of my memory, last week he asked me about grants for his electorate, and I ensured that he was informed of that information before any public announcement was made.

HOMELESSNESS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is to the Minister for Housing. How are South Australians contributing to the awareness of homelessness in our community?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! When the house comes to order I will call the Minister for Housing.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Housing): Yesterday, I had great pleasure in launching a national magazine called *Exclusion/Inclusion*. This is an edition of the Council on Homeless Persons *Parity* magazine, which is an outstanding publication. It contains contributions from a number of leaders in the homelessness sector across Australia. A close look was taken at our social inclusion initiative in this issue, and it is heartening to see that South Australians were at the centre of those contributions.

South Australians made valuable contributions to this magazine, and there was a real focus on and excitement about the particular leadership role that South Australia is taking in the homelessness sector. I was pleased to see contributions from the Chair of our Social Inclusion Board, Monsignor David Cappo; Michelle Slatter, a leading academic from Flinders University who has worked extensively with AHURI; Janet Atkins, policy officer at our peak housing organisation, Shelter SA; David Waterford of the Social Inclusion Unit; and Andrew Beer from AHURI.

The contributors to the *Parity* magazine acknowledged that South Australia is the first state to have set up a social inclusion unit. We are also highly regarded for the way in which we have set ambitious targets to achieve a reduction in homelessness. We are investing \$20 million over five years to back up this commitment. The state housing plan is also making an important contribution to reducing homelessness in our state. This plan is about more than just providing shelter for somebody; it is about the crucial provision of support services to assist people to sustain themselves in a tenancy and to make sure that they do not become at risk of homelessness and are able to make a success of themselves within their community. This magazine indicates that South Australia is at the forefront of thinking about homelessness in this country, and there is every prospect of our achieving our ambitious targets.

SCHOOLS, STUDENT ASSAULTS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What is the government doing to assist with the financial reimbursement and education needs of a 13-year-old student who was assaulted by another student at Windsor Gardens School in June 2004, and what is the government doing to protect other children from such incidents on school grounds?

I was advised that in June last year a 13 year old student at the school was assaulted by another student, who has since been convicted of assault occasioning actual bodily harm with a penalty including 30 hours' community service and a 12 month restraining order. Further, the victim received a broken nose, cracked eye socket and fractured cheek bone. She spent three hours in surgery and three days in hospital, had six months of therapy with a psychiatrist and missed months of school. The family has advised me that the education department, only in the last few days in responding to a request for financial assistance, said, 'This is not the department's problem' and, 'Get a solicitor.'

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Bragg for her question. As ever, I would not take her version of the events as reflecting what was said and, if she has any evidence about the conversations, I would be very pleased to look at those conversations and examine what was said, and by whom.

However, in the matter that is being discussed, certainly I understand that the people involved are seeking legal advice. There have been considerable discussions about what might occur and therefore it would not be appropriate for me to discuss those matters in this place. However, I will say that, if this is the student about whom I do know and I have had briefings on a related matter, there have been several issues in the young person's life and there has been a considerable amount of assistance in terms of equipment, special calculators and computer equipment in order to support that young person's study. But, veering towards a discussion of legal action would not be proper in this place.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a supplementary question. What action is the government taking to protect other children from these incidents on school grounds?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I thank the member for Bragg for her question. She would realise that, where there was a criminal offence, as in this case, it is clearly against the law and there are actions that are taken under those circumstances. The reality is that we have implemented a very extensive system of anti-bullying. We have set up a curriculum that has gone through all our schools. We are working assiduously to prevent bullying. We have protective mechanisms in place, training, programs and curriculum development. We have made extensive progress from the position we inherited from the last government.

Clearly, bullying is a matter that we feel strongly about. Bullying in the schoolyard is very much akin to bullying in the workplace and domestic violence, and the outcomes of failing to deal with these episodes early in a person's offending history are very significant. We have taken action because we realise that these young people, both victims and perpetrators, are at risk of further issues in their lives and intervention is necessary, and we are taking it.

ZOOM! FILM AWARDS

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is to the Minister for Youth. How are the achievements of young filmmakers being recognised in South Australia?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Youth): I thank the member for Reynell for her question. On Saturday night I will be attending the annual Zoom! young filmmakers' awards at the Mercury Cinema. The Zoom! awards are a great celebration of short filmmaking and create an exciting, competitive environment to challenge and reward upcoming generations of South Australian filmmakers. Fostering creativity is part of the South Australian Strategic Plan, and growth and expansion of South Australia's film, television and audio-visual sectors plays an important part in achieving this objective.

Human rights for young people is the theme of a new category that has been introduced this year. The Zoom! youth rights award will have a prize of \$5 000 for the best film, documentary or animation on a human rights theme, and is open to emerging filmmakers under the age of 25 years. Human rights is one of the great and important subjects of our time. Young people take on these issues, and how human rights will apply to their lives I am sure will make a compelling and powerful story.

We already have a fine tradition in South Australia in filmmaking but the government believes it is really important to ensure that there are younger people entering this field. I hope that this new prize, which is through the Office for Youth, will be an investment in making sure that we have the interest, thought and production on this very important theme.

TEACHER SELECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Again, my question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Will the right be restored for school communities to select their own teachers? I note that an article in the *Independent Weekly* reported that the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of Education, Mr Steve Marshall, is 'charged with implementing the state government's education reform agenda', which may eventually see public school communities choosing their own teachers. The Australian Education Union (AEU), as part of its current enterprise bargain negotiations, has rejected the government's proposed model of merit selection for all staff. On its web site, the union has also told its members:

The government has indicated that they have a strong preference for local selection of all school and pre-school staff on merit, but have indicated a preparedness to examine modifications to school choice processes.

Mrs GERAGHTY: I rise on a point of order, sir. Before you call the minister, on two occasions today the explanation to a question has gone either into debate or been almost a grievance, and I ask that you examine that matter.

The SPEAKER: I remind members that explanations are that: they should not be debate. The minister for education.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Bragg for her question, because she will, of course, know that this government does support excellence in teachers. We support the professionalism of those teachers within the public education system. Unlike some of the comments that we hear from across the room, we always recognise that the quality of our education system depends on the quality and professionalism of our teachers. Having said that, enterprise

bargaining is not a matter that is conducted on the floor of this chamber.

Ms CHAPMAN: As a supplementary question: is it the government's proposal to restore the rights for schools to select their own teachers? It is nothing to do with the EB.

The SPEAKER: The minister does not wish to answer.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): The minister has already correctly informed the member for Bragg that negotiations on enterprise bargaining do not occur in this chamber.

Ms Chapman: She just said that.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I should not have to repeat it as a result of another question. I am the minister responsible for negotiations with respect to enterprise bargaining. I do not need to remind either the honourable member or the member for Mawson how negotiations for enterprise bargaining occur.

DISABILITY SERVICES, PORT AUGUSTA

Mr SNELLING (Playford): My question is to the Minister for Disability. How is the government improving services and support to people with a disability and their families in the Port Augusta region?

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Disability): In fact, Mr Jarvis was with me when I launched the Port Augusta Regional Disability Plan. He was the beneficiary of much community gratitude when he stood next to me as I announced a new Port Augusta Regional Disability Plan, which maps out a three-year plan for a stronger grass roots approach for people helping someone with a disability. This plan came about as a result of extensive community engagement, many workshops and 40 groups within the Port Augusta region. The plan will include a range of initiatives to ensure that people and their carers are given increased access to health support and educational and recreational services to improve their quality of life.

The regional plan includes the development of respite options (including day options and emergency respite), a range of sport and recreation options (including a transport and pedestrian access group), a training and health support planning group will look at staffing issues and another group will look at developing communication tools about services, including developing a web site. This collective commitment by the local community and the government services within it to improve the state and scope of services for people with a disability in this region is a fantastic example of cooperation and planning.

There are some desperate circumstances in our regional and remote communities, especially amongst the Aboriginal communities. Acquired brain injury and intellectual disability are the predominant disabilities in this region, with more than a quarter of people with a disability having acquired brain injury. That is why I was pleased to see the real cooperation with indigenous elders regarding the particular and urgent needs of indigenous communities. This, together with the additional resources we provided to Miriam High when I was in Port Augusta a few weeks ago, was well received by the community and demonstrates the South Australian Labor government's commitment to the regions and to the Port Augusta area.

MIGRANTS, SKILLED

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. What action has the minister taken to ensure that regional employers continue to have access to skilled migrants, given that the state government, rather than individual employers, has chosen to sponsor skilled migrants itself? The opposition has been informed that, since the state government began to sponsor migrants to South Australia, regional employers are unable to attract skilled migrants to fill positions where unemployment rates are very low. Employers have said that this was not an issue when individual regional employers sponsored the migrants, ensuring that those workers stayed in regional areas for at least three years.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister Assisting the Premier in Economic Development): As minister—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, there is a very important reason for my answering this question. I have responsibility for population policy in the migration program, as Minister Assisting the Premier in Economic Development.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: We just have to assume that every time somebody stands the member for Bragg has an opinion on something. It is a good question: I do not know the answer to that. I will inquire and come back to the member privately, if you would like, directly with an answer.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am sure that we can be confident that the member for MacKillop will distribute the answer to his colleagues. I will find out the answer because I would find it difficult to accept a proposition where our migrant program, a significant policy and involving a significant financial contribution by the state, is in any way being undermined. I am not saying that what the honourable member is saying is not correct, but it is difficult to see it occurring. I will check it out and come back to the house.

STATE WARDS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. Will the minister advise what assistance will be provided to a young person under the care of the state when she turns 18 years? I have received advice that a young woman under the minister's care and currently aged 17 years is facing eviction, without support or assistance, when she turns 18 later this year. This young lady is currently undertaking year 12 studies, which she wishes to finish, but she has been advised that upon turning 18 years she will no longer be accommodated under her current arrangements and nor will the Department for Families and Communities assist her to obtain Housing Trust accommodation.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I thank the honourable member for her question and I am very alarmed to hear that report. If she has been told that, it is erroneous advice. We take seriously our responsibilities to assist young adults in planning the next phase of their life—their transition from care into independent living arrangements. We engage with the Housing Trust on that very issue.

Through the excellent initiative of the Minister for Youth, the Dame Roma Mitchell Trust Fund, provides resources to assist former guardianship children to access relevant ser-

vices. This can include the purchasing of equipment and furniture to assist them to move into independent living arrangements and all agencies within the Department of Families and Communities should be working closely together to ensure that our guardianship children receive these things.

I have made very clear in my department that these children need to be treated as we would treat our own children. For all intents and purposes we are their parents: we should behave like good parents and make sure they get adequate transition and support. I am alarmed to hear what she says. I will ask her for more details about his particular case and we will make sure that that situation is reversed. I do not want this young person worrying about this while they are considering their matriculation exams.

YOUTH ACCOMMODATION

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Firstly, I would like to thank the Minister for Families and Communities for his very positive response to that question. I have another question for the minister: is the minister able to provide a breakdown of the cost of providing children with hotel or motel accommodation under supervision, as compared with the cost of maintaining children in government owned homes? I have been advised that three houses formerly owned by SOS Children's Village, but taken over by the department last year, have remained vacant, but over many months numbers of children under the minister's care have been accommodated in motel rooms.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I cannot quite follow that question but I understand that the suggestion is that somehow it is more expensive to have these homes that we have available than it is to provide them with accommodation in motel rooms, and that is true; it is a much more expensive model. But the care that is provided in hotel rooms is not optimal, and they are not always available at short notice. It is not an environment where anyone should be kept, preferably not at all, but certainly not for any length of time. It is not an environment where somebody can become settled and established in a home environment. The member for Heysen talks about two separate sets of housing. We have the SOS village, which we were forced to take over because the previous non-government organisation decided that it did not want to continue that role. So, we are managing that set of cottages for the benefit of the children who were placed there with the old SOS village. Our prime concern was to make sure that we did not disrupt their home life.

As for the balance of the homes that exist within that cottage, I would expect that use is being made of those homes when, and if, it is appropriate to take that opportunity up. We will always seek to use a home environment where we possibly can rather than an institutional environment—whether it be a motel or some other facility. So, I will check the precise details that the member for Heysen raises, but certainly it is a much more preferable option, than the set of arrangements that we have put in place, and there should be a reduction in the amount of time that we spend with young people in motels.

SCHOOLS, ABSENTEEISM

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Following my question on 5 April 2005, can the minister confirm whether

absenteeism rates for South Australia's state schools have worsened in the last 12 months, and whether the DECS report based on 2004 will be tabled?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for his question. As I said previously, I have not yet received the data finalised from last year. He is quite right. I think he has had representations from teachers in schools who have quite rightly pointed out that the blow torch is upon them about absenteeism and attendance. Schools have been sending out notices to parents saying that in the future we expect to know when absenteeism is authorised or unauthorised. One of the issues about school attendance is that previously the data was soft in that we knew if there was non-attendance, but we were never certain how many of those non-attenders had a valid reason not to be present. We want the data to be correct, and the first step was to make sure that parents realise how important it is to send their children to school every day; and most significantly how important it is to get them there on time so that they are not late or in trouble; and, in particular, to recognise that every day adds up and that there are cumulative losses to their educational outcomes. Those children who are poor attenders and late attenders tend to be under-achievers and tend to eventually be drop-outs. We want every child to have a chance. We want every child to do well. We have made a clear direction; we have changed policy from the previous government. Absenteeism is a major focus for action. We have action zones and funded programs, and every school knows that we are watching, counting and measuring. In the time we have been in government, the number of authorised absences has risen in the number of—

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order. The question was very simple: will the minister release the table? I am sick of listening to a lecture on government policy in answer to a statistical question.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The minister was starting to debate the issue.

Mr SCALZI: I have a supplementary question. I am pleased that the minister has set the blowtorch, but when are we going to see the light of the report?

The SPEAKER: Because the member commented, I will rule that out of order.

POWERLINES, EYRE PENINSULA

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Infrastructure advise the house whether the government has taken any action to have a second regulated powerline built to back up the existing inadequate, nearly 40 year old, 132 kilovolt line from Port Augusta that services the whole Eyre Peninsula region, including Port Lincoln?

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): The member for Mawson says it is a good question. Has the government taken any action to put in a back up line? I have some breaking news for the member for Flinders. Her government privatised the industry. It is owned by the private sector. The government no longer owns the transmission system or the distribution system, therefore, we do not build extensions to it. I agree that it was a terrible idea to privatise transmission and distribution, but that is what the opposition did. That is why we do not build transmission or distribution systems.

For the benefit of the member for Flinders, what happens in terms of the transmission line is that the company to which her government sold the transmission system now goes to the ACCC, a body we do not control, and the ACCC decides how much investment that transmission company had. I know that is a very quick and short lesson, but I am sure now that the member for Flinders understands that the government does not own and it does not even control the investment decisions, nor does it regulate the investment decisions, as a result of the disastrous decision of the former Liberal government.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister is debating the question.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kavel is out of order.

Ms Rankine: You supported the sale.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wright is out of order. I call the member for Unley.

TWIN LAKES PROJECT

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): My question is to the Premier or possibly, in his absence, the Minister for the River Murray. What is the government of South Australia doing to support or not support the twin lakes project, which was developed by Root and Brown but which is actually supported now in a slightly amended form by the Murray-Darling Association, and which came to have, as one of its strongest advocates, Don Blackmore, since it will save virtually all the environmental water needed for the river? Is the government prepared to advance this cause with Canberra?

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD (Minister for the River Murray): I thank the member for Unley for his question. The project he refers to is not actually a project as yet: it is a concept, which has been promoted by Mr Tony Read. What the project will provide, if the concept is worked up, is an inner lake and an outer lake down at Lake Alexandrina, the intention of which is to provide more tidal flows to keep the mouth open and to reduce evaporation from the lakes area. On the surface, it seems like an admirable project and, as a consequence, some work is being undertaken by the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council to do some modelling to see whether or not the concept actually has merit and whether or not it can proceed to become a project that will be considered. However, it is in the very early stages.

The initial concept put forward has been shown to have some serious deficiencies, which have been identified by the modelling that has been done by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, for the work is being undertaken by both the proponent of the concept and also the Murray-Darling Basin Commission. The important thing to realise, though, is there are a lot of people with a lot of ideas out there, and Tony Read is one of them. It is important to note that the commission, as well as the state of South Australia, take seriously all projects or ideas that appear to have merit, and the South Australian government will support them. However, at this stage, it is just a concept, and that concept is being investigated.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

TRAVELLERS' AID SOCIETY

Mrs HALL (Morialta): This afternoon I want to raise the issue of the Travellers' Aid Society. I believe the Minister for Transport owes this house an apology regarding the Travellers' Aid Society. In question time on Tuesday, the minister provided information about an issue I had raised the previous day about the future of the Travellers' Aid Society. In his customary arrogant, albeit theatrical, fashion, the minister attempted to demean my concerns regarding the forced relocation of the society. He suggested that I check the accuracy of explanations to my questions in the future. I have done just that. I am very happy to inform the house of the reasons for my concern then and now about the treatment of a community body that has served this state for over a century.

The Travellers' Aid Society is a non-profit organisation which is based at the Adelaide Railway Station, which has served this community since 1887. Dedicated volunteers give assistance to travellers, many of whom are disadvantaged, such as victims of domestic violence fleeing to safety, the homeless who have been bashed and robbed, people needing to travel to a court appearance, or parents who require help in collecting children for holiday access. Until now, the society has operated out of rent free premises in the railway station. I emphasise that it has been rent free in recognition of their non-profit status and the generous help they offer the community.

I was recently advised by a concerned constituent that the society had been removed from its premises in order to allow TransAdelaide to take over the office for its own purposes. I was further advised that no alternative accommodation had been arranged. Indeed, a note on the door of the society's former premises still advises that it will not be open as of 24 March and that the society was hopeful of opening a new office in due course. They are hardly the words of an organisation that has been looked after by TransAdelaide and this government. As I have explained, I raised these concerns in the house, only to be ridiculed by the minister the following day, who apparently had, as promised, and in his own words, 'checked the veracity of my unsourced advice'.

The minister claimed that TransAdelaide, in conjunction with DAIS, had assisted the Travellers' Aid Society in finding new accommodation and was helping to carry out a refurbishment. Importantly, the minister claimed that advice was given to the Travellers' Aid Society in November 2004 that operations in the existing premises were to cease on 31 March. What he did not inform the house is as follows. My discussions with the Travellers' Aid Society, since his revelations, have shown the society received no written notice until 8 February this year when, in a letter to the Treasurer of the society (and note it was not the President or the Secretary), TransAdelaide advised that there 'may be potential' for them to take up new premises in the railway station, and I ask members to note the word 'potential'. The assistance that the minister speaks so proudly of was an offer contingent on an agreement to commit to an annual lease at a starting rental rate of \$7 650 a year. Incidentally, a subsequent request to the DAIS minister for rental assistance (as recommended by TransAdelaide in its letter) was rejected—and this to a not-for-profit organisation that has operated rent free in that

office since 1966, while it goes about assisting the needy in our community.

It is absolutely outrageous for the Minister for Transport to come into this place and preach to members in his usual theatrical manner when real issues are raised with regard to this government's treatment of a community organisation. I urge the Minister for Transport to review what he has told this house and to in future hold his tongue and stop omitting to tell the truth to this chamber about such an important issue. For a government that professes to be honest and transparent, what he did in answering the question yesterday was utterly appalling, and he should apologise.

Time expired.

CRABBING

Mr CAICA (Colton): One of the joys of life is to sit down after a day's fishing and, after all the jobs have been completed (the cleaning of the gear and the filleting of the fish), to eat the catch and wash it down with one or two great South Australian wines or, in the case of crabs, to have a cold beer. South Australia—and, in particular, Adelaide—is one of the greatest places in the world to live. I know that members would agree that it must rank with the very best places on this planet in which to live. We have fresh produce available to us, we have access to very good health care and education, we live in a clean environment—indeed, the people of Adelaide and the people of South Australia must be the envy of other peoples around the world because of what we have.

On the Easter weekend I was able with my son, Simon, to wander down to Henley jetty around midnight and catch enough sand crabs and a few blueys to have a beautiful feed the next day. On Easter Monday I was able to go down towards Grange and catch a few beautiful mullet. I know that some of my colleagues do not think that mullet are good-tasting, but I am sure that if I cooked it for them they would enjoy that particular fish. If I did not have to be here today, later on this evening or tonight I would be able to do exactly the same thing along our local coastline. We are fortunate to live in Adelaide, and it is critical that we make sure that we preserve for the future all those things that make South Australia and Adelaide a great place to live. It is our responsibility to ensure that future generations are able to enjoy all the benefits and more that we who live here today have available to us.

I hear members saying, 'Why doesn't Caica get to the point?' Well, I will do that now. Over the past 12 months I have approached minister McEwen on a few occasions to express my concern about a commercial crabber who is operating off the metropolitan coastline, sometimes significantly less than a kilometre out from the shoreline. I have also spoken to officers of the department of fisheries who have, in turn, spoken to this particular commercial crabber. The deal that is supposed to exist with this crabber is what I understand to be a gentleman's agreement under which this person, who operates out of Outer Harbour and Port Adelaide, is not to set pots off the metropolitan coastline of Adelaide. He has consistently broken this gentleman's agreement, despite being advised by departmental officers that the agreement be observed.

Only yesterday when I took our dog for a walk on the beach early in the morning, I observed the crabber again operating off the coastline. I rang the department and was informed that they had received complaints from many

recreational crabbers as well as local residents and that this had been happening again for several days. Indeed, I understand that he had set his crab pots only several hundred metres off West Lakes from the high water mark.

The minister has been reasonable with respect to this matter. He has tried through his departmental officers to speak to this crabber about the gentleman's agreement that exists, but it is clear to me that this person is no gentleman and that he is incapable of keeping his side of the agreement, despite the warnings that have been issued by the department. As I said, I spoke to departmental officers again yesterday morning and I will speak to the minister again.

If this crabber continues to flout the gentleman's handshake agreement, I believe it is time for the minister to give serious consideration to issuing a notice under section 43 of the Fisheries Act, which would temporarily prohibit certain fishing activities within that area of which I speak: that is, the metropolitan coastline. There are plenty of crabs out there at the moment, and this commercial crabber does not need to set pots adjacent to the Henley and Grange jetties and the coastline where recreational crabbers are able to enjoy the pleasure of catching a feed of crabs.

So, I believe that it is certainly time now for the minister to give serious consideration to issuing that notice. As I said, this crabber is no gentleman and this notice ought to be issued. Indeed, by doing so, we can ensure that he goes to areas where he can still catch crabs but we allow recreational crabbers to enjoy that particular seafood and also ensure that this produce remains into the future for future recreational crabbers to enjoy.

TEACHERS' REGISTRATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): Today the annual report of the Teachers Registration Board of South Australia for the year ending 30 June 2004 was tabled in this house. I place on the record my congratulations to Ms Carmel Kerin, who has been reappointed as the chair of that board, and I congratulate the board for the excellent work it does. The introduction last year of new teachers' standards legislation in this house was the culmination of recommendations it had made in 2003. I have said before that I am disappointed that it took so long for the government to act on this, and I remain so. One of the initiatives which has ultimately got under way in the last few weeks is the assessment and checking of all teachers in relation to police records for the purposes of affecting, if appropriate, the continued registration that they currently enjoy and which, as the house probably knows, is necessary for them to be able to teach.

Today's report reveals another disturbing statistic, and that is an increased level of inquiries resulting in the cancellation of registration, this time of six teachers. Last year it was five teachers but one of those related to a credit card fraud. But now the number of cancellations of registration has increased to six, and they are directly related to teachers who were guilty of disgraceful or improper conduct. In summary, they were: two involving males with criminal convictions for sexual offences relating to children; a male teacher convicted of six counts of indecent assault, one count of unlawful sexual intercourse and one count of inciting a child (an 8 year old female student at his school) to commit an indecent act; a male teacher with criminal convictions for four counts of unlawful sexual intercourse with a 15 year old male student; a male teacher who was found guilty of improper and disgraceful conduct involving an 11 year old student (this was

conduct which occurred outside of a direct student-teacher relationship but breached a relationship of trust); and another teacher who was found guilty of improper and disgraceful conduct involving the supervision of three male students (again a direct breach of the relationship of trust). There were other inquiries relevant to disgraceful and improper conduct but, due to either lack of services or insufficient evidence, they were adjourned sine die.

This is a disturbing result that has been tabled today and reminds us in this house, and particularly the ministers responsible, on a daily basis of the importance of protecting our children who are in the daily institutional care of the minister while they are at school. Also, equally disturbing, we received a report from the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology which tells us that, as of 2004, we have 8 700 students who are under the age of 18 years enrolled in TAFE courses. This is the public education system set up for the purposes of training and vocation. It is therefore very important to again protect students within this institution. The minister has assured me, and I accept this and I indeed see such an indication in the report, that there was some review undertaken last year to deal with the protection of children in TAFE premises.

But what is concerning is that there is no intention that any of that will be operational until the end of 2005—that is, police checks for all relevant departmental employees and volunteers; a more planned approach to the mandated notification training; and a DFEEST child protection policy. That is disturbing. We have 8 700 children in the system who have no protection at all in relation to these important measures.

The Teachers Registration Board does not have jurisdiction to deal with complaints in relation to these institutions, and it is important that the government get on and attend to this. What I do note is that, in this instance, the minister, I am pleased to hear, is also proposing to include volunteers. There is no provision still, and nothing has been tabled in this house by the Minister for Families and Communities on the promise (which he has given to this house twice this year) that he is advancing child protection legislation to deal with persons other than teachers in that professional jurisdiction. Obviously, many other people in the school and TAFE environments have a direct relationship with children. They are in possession of a very substantial responsibility, and it is time that the minister came into this house and tabled that legislation.

CHILD CARE

Ms RANKINE (Wright): When I spoke last week about the child-care crisis in Australia, I highlighted the problems associated with private centres. In order to show why it is essential to have a thriving not-for-profit childcare sector where centres are run on a break-even basis by local government, church groups, tertiary institutions and community groups, I posed this simple question: if you had a choice between a not-for-profit centre, which spent all its finances on providing the most educationally sound and stimulating experience for your children, and a private childcare centre that had limits on equipment, resources and staff to meet profit targets, where would you choose to place your child?

The point I made last week is that private does not equate to better. Daniel Donahoo from the policy think tank OzProspect validated my view by saying that higher prices do not translate to better quality. He says that, to keep costs

down, private providers need unqualified staff and will just meet child/staff ratios. How does this compare with the not-for-profit sector? In their report, 'The Plight of Child Care', Rosalie Rogers and Pauline Birch show a stark contrast. The report is unequivocal about the not-for-profit centres. Their report states:

. . . the ones visited have been of a much higher standard and quality than any private centre.

They report that each centre had a good budget for staff, food, equipment and administrative support, and note the critical role of staff—staff who turn up for work early and who collect resources and activities out of hours, most of whom are longstanding employees and who develop friendships with families at the centres. It is this relationship development that is crucial in ensuring a quality educative experience for children in these centres. In private centres, where casualisation is rampant, this relationship is far more fragile.

Another distinguishing feature is the involvement of parents. Within the not-for-profit services there is active parental involvement in all aspects of the care and education of their children, including finances; not so in a private centre, where parents will have little or no say and are simply passive consumers. Further, community childcare centres make a crucial contribution to developing social capital. The National Association of Community Based Children's Services made the point in its policy paper, 'Community Ownership in the 21st Century', which states:

Community-owned services empower families through genuine partnerships to advocate on behalf of their children and their children's services [and develop]. . . the deeper features of social capital.

It also shows that the community services are far more inclusive because they 'work to respond to the needs of everyone, including hard-to-service groups, such as refugees, people on low incomes and geographically isolated families'. Most members in this house would have community-based childcare centres in their electorate that meet at least one of these criteria. In my own electorate I have the Homestead Childcare Centre and the Salisbury Campus Childcare Centre, which caters for children with disabilities and which is a very fine example of a centre that caters for a diverse population and people from low income.

It has also been very empowering. This centre faced a real battle to stay open. The parents were empowered by their involvement and, through the good sense, cooperation and compassion of Gordon Pickard, that centre remains open. To put it simply and bluntly, the not-for-profit sector provides benchmarking for quality of service, staffing and pricing; allows parents active involvement in decision making; develops social capital; is inclusive of marginalised groups; and gives real choice. But, with the trend to large private operators, soon there will be no choice. A columnist in a Canadian newspaper wrote:

We don't want to end like Australia where the government decided to invest public dollars—

The SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member's time has expired. For the benefit of members, the chair allows members to finish the sentence, but they should not go on.

Ms RANKINE: Sir, I beg your indulgence because the clock was not turned on and a guesstimate was made for the time. I would like to finish the quote.

The SPEAKER: The chair will allow the member for Wright to conclude her remarks.

Ms RANKINE: Thank you, sir. The columnist wrote:

We don't want to end like Australia where the government decided to invest public dollars in both commercial and not-for-profit child care systems, only to see huge child care companies take over. The money Australians spend on child care gets spent on their children only after these companies have skimmed off their profits and satisfied investors. We can do better.

Clearly we can and should be doing better for our children.

FREEHOLD LEASES

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I wish to raise two issues: first, the need for the Minister for Environment and Conservation to allow those pastoralists who have perpetual leases to freehold them. There is no reason whatsoever for our having this outmoded tunnel vision attitude that these people should not be able to get a better, more secure and reasonable title. The NRM and other legislation is there to ensure proper management. The reasons outlined to the select committee of why it should not take place were, to put it mildly, lacking any credibility or commonsense, and even the minister indicated that you could not support or justify them. I know exactly what has gone on in the past where they got around ministers Wotton and Evans and circumvented the then government's policy and they have successfully been able to do it again. They have had their chance. In future, no matter what they think, they will not stop this process. They might as well get on with it now: it is fair, reasonable and in the public interest.

I am very annoyed that good, hard-working people who want to secure their investment and make improvements (particularly in the tourism and other areas) are being deprived of the opportunity. There is not one reason why they should not be able to get a better title to their land. To say that it is not as well managed as pastoral leases is not correct and the people who made that recommendation in my view are trying to justify the unjustifiable.

The other matter I refer to is the ongoing problems with the corellas in my electorate, which are continuing to cause havoc.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: We will fix those corellas.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Unfortunately there are too many and, as the leader pointed out today, in the past they have been crunching up the boosters on television antennas, ripping up cricket pitches, interfering with ovals and tennis courts, stripping trees and making it almost impossible in some of the caravan parks for people to properly utilise them. In general they are in plague proportions. An urgent need exists to drastically reduce the numbers. I understand clearly that it is not an easy exercise and everyone needs to work together. I assure the minister that he will have my support whatever—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That is right. The minister will have my support whatever action he needs to take, but doing nothing is not an option. I went to the new playground at the Melrose School at the bottom of the creek at Mount Remarkable—a beautiful spot. What the corellas were doing there was no-one's business. You could shoot boxes of cartridges away and still would not resolve the problem.

The other matter I will briefly mention today is that one thing that the Standing Orders Committee needs to look at very carefully is a statement made on Wednesday 13 October 2004, when there was some discussion about the word 'hypocrite', and what happened last night. The now Minister of Transport on 13 October, in his usual quite enthusiastic manner of addressing the house, talked about the opposition

being 'a bunch of sanctimonious hypocrites.' I do not know what he would say about them when he was being critical.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: I withdraw belatedly.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Unfortunately that will not help the member for Schubert. The member for Schubert thought that he was on sound ground when he said, 'You are a lot of hypocrites.' Unfortunately, he got an early minute to think through the situation. I understand the difficulty that the Deputy Speaker had in this matter, but I think it is a matter that the Standing Orders Committee ought to have a look at because it is a term that is used pretty widely in the community, and it is one of the less objectionable terms used.

Time expired.

KURDISH COMMUNITY

Mr SNELLING (Playford): I was rising to talk about the Kurdish community but I will briefly respond to the comments of the member for Stuart. The naming of the member for Schubert arose because he defied the chair. The chair directed him to withdraw and he refused to. So, whether the word 'hypocrite' is parliamentary or otherwise is irrelevant. The member for Schubert, as he well knew at that time, was defying the chair, and that was the reason that he was named. I am sure that when the member for Stuart was speaker, he would have been a lot less indulgent than the chair was yesterday.

I wish to talk about the local Kurdish community. On 19 March I had the great pleasure of representing the Minister for Multicultural Affairs at the celebration of Newroz, the Kurdish new year festival. At the outset, let me congratulate Mrs Vaheda Mansoury, who is a South Australian of Kurdish background from Iran. She lives in my electorate and she was recently appointed to the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the aspirations of the Kurdish people. The displacement and suffering of the Kurdish people constitutes one of the world's longest and gravest shames. For far too long the Kurdish people have struggled for their basic human rights, and the tragic battle faced by Kurdish generations unfortunately continues. The living traditions of the Kurdish people are among the oldest surviving cultures in our world today despite systematic and atrocious attempts to destroy their existence.

In Turkey, for example, the Kurdish culture and identity has been banned for decades. In Turkish-occupied Kurdistan, resistance action from the civilian population has been responded to with unimaginable violence, including torture, harassment, village burning and forced deportation. In Iranian-occupied Kurdistan, Kurds face similar hardship in their fight for human rights and freedom. The festival, Newroz, is a unique and sacred time for Kurds, and marks the birth of Spring in the homeland. Newroz is a festive celebration of life and new beginnings. The Kurdish new year represents optimism and how, in turbulent and challenging times, we must remain focused on our goals and objectives, and our dreams and passions.

The Kurdish community is among the fastest growing communities in South Australia. As I move around my electorate visiting new constituents as they come on to the roll, often I find that they are Kurds, who have made South Australia their home, become Australian citizens and, as a result, have come on to the electoral roll. In the five years between the 1996 census and the 2001 census, the number of Kurds in South Australia has quadrupled, and it has continued

to grow since then. I think that this increase and presence is warmly welcomed. The Kurdish community is an integral and valued constituent of multicultural life in South Australia, and I think South Australia is honoured to share Kurdish new year, Newroz, with its respected Kurdish Australian friends.

In conclusion, I acknowledge the fact that a Kurd has been elected President of Iraq, and I think that that gives one great optimism for the future of Iraq and, perhaps, for a new era for the Kurdish people, and respect for their cultures and traditions.

REGIONAL SITTING

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

That the house at its rising adjourn until 2 p.m. on Tuesday 3 May at the Sir Robert Helpmann Theatre Mount Gambier and that the house also sit at Mount Gambier on Wednesday 4 May and Thursday 5 May.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I certainly hear the motion, and I am well aware of the motion, but I am very disappointed that reports of this first came to us via the media. That is the first I heard about the fact that this parliament was going to sit at Mount Gambier. I have no problem with it sitting at Mount Gambier, but I would have loved to have some opportunity to have a say as to where we sat. I, personally, feel that there was a strong argument to go to a place like my own electorate—to Kadina or Wallaroo, or we could have gone a little further north to Port Pirie, perhaps. Perhaps we could have gone down south to Victor Harbor, and there are various other options that could have been. Did we consider any of them? No.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Yes; we did.

Mr MEIER: I am sorry; the first I heard about it was when I read it in *The Advertiser*; in fact, to tell you the truth, I did not read it in the first instance. My wife said, 'I see that you are going to Mount Gambier.' I said, 'I am certainly not.' She said, 'Yes, you are. The newspaper says you are going to be sitting in Mount Gambier.' I said, 'When is that?' I do not think that is the right way for members of parliament to be treated. I do not think it is the way a democracy should work, and I am extremely disappointed that that is the way that we, as members, certainly on this side of the house, first found out that we were going to Mount Gambier.

I can see the commonsense in endeavouring to take the parliament out, but why are we not taking the parliament out? Why are we simply taking out the House of Assembly? Is there something now that has divided the two houses? I was also given to understand that the one house is integral to the other; in fact, I think we have considered some motions over the last year or two as to whether there should be changes to another place, and none of them have come to fruition. It seems that everyone in this place says that they believe there should be an upper house as well as a lower house. How come we are taking only half the parliament? I believe that the people of Mount Gambier are not going to be too happy that they will get only half a show. That is another thing that this house, and another place, should have considered. Is it only going to be one house or is it going to be the other house too? None of those things have been considered in that respect.

Furthermore, the expense involved is an issue. I have heard no figures, so I do not know what the expense is; obviously, there have to be some expenses. We have heard the Treasurer crying poor in today's paper. He indicated that he is very upset that the federal Treasurer has said that he wants to hold the states to what they committed themselves to some years ago and that they would cut certain taxes when the GST came in. It appears that South Australia has not adhered to that. I was very pleased to note that the state Treasurer said that we will go down that track. Last night, I said that over the last five years we have inherited something like \$5 billion. In other words—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. We are a little off the subject, aren't we? The member is talking about tax cuts, and the subject is about the parliamentary sittings in Mount Gambier on 3 May.

The SPEAKER: I ask the member for Goyder to focus on the motion.

Mr MEIER: I do not want to side track the motion, but I was indicating the financial side of it. The Treasurer cries poor, yet he has many hundreds of millions of dollars of extra money available. Why is the Treasurer crying poor, when he has enough money to take the parliament to Mount Gambier and to set up Mount Gambier when that sort of money could have been spent on what would be an obvious case, the Mount Gambier Hospital? I believe the community has been fundraising for the hydrotherapy pool down there, and I am sure that tens of thousands of dollars for the parliament to sit in Mount Gambier could well have gone towards fulfilling the need in that area—or for more surgery. If my memory serves me correctly, the hospital suffered a 36 per cent cut in surgery last year. The money that is being spent to take us down there could have been put towards that.

It is not only the Mount Gambier Hospital but also hospitals in my electorate that are in need. For example, the Wallaroo hospital has had many cuts in services. I think we have all heard that the Ardrossan Hospital is in dire straits at present. I have made pleas in this house for some \$200 000. I realise this will not necessarily cost \$200 000. But, even if it costs \$50 000, we could—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Goyder is taking an extraordinary amount of leeway in debating whether or not we sit in Mount Gambier. We have just heard about several different hospitals. Can we pull him up before he runs through every country hospital in South Australia?

The SPEAKER: Order! The member has some latitude, but he should be focusing on the motion.

Mr MEIER: I think I have made the point that it will cost a significant amount of money and that it could have been better spent. The other point I want to make is that I am very fearful that the government will use the stage in the Sir Robert Helpmann Theatre, I think it is, as a real stage, and the members will be on the stage. We have seen too often that it does not matter what questions we as the opposition ask, under most circumstances we do not get an answer. In fact, invariably a truthful and helpful answer will not be given. If the people of Mount Gambier are going to be there on the floor and we are on the stage and that occurs, I think it will be the last time I will be in favour of going from this establishment.

One of the things I have disliked intensively over the years is that we do not get the truth. We ask questions, and they are completely changed around. The minister has that right. As you, sir, and, certainly, your predecessors, have said on many

occasions, 'I cannot force the minister to answer the question.' If that is going to happen in Mount Gambier—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Mr Speaker, this is drawing a long bow. The member is not in the general vicinity of the debate.

The SPEAKER: I think the member for Goyder has concluded his remarks.

Mr MEIER: I will conclude my remarks then, sir. I am pleased that the leader of government business has taken points of order. I think he recognised that I want to see this parliament held in an honourable and respectful manner so that the people of Mount Gambier will see that the house does get things done and that questions will not simply be thrown to one side and answers not given. With those comments, I conclude my remarks.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I want to respond briefly to the comments—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. As a clarification, if the minister, as the mover, speaks, does he close the debate?

The SPEAKER: I do not want to deny anyone the right to speak. If the minister speaks, he will close the debate.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): One of my fondest memories as a child was going on holidays to Mount Gambier. It is a fantastic spot and it has a great community. I have no problem with me as a member of parliament going to Mount Gambier. In fact, I was a member of the shadow cabinet that went to Mount Gambier a couple of months ago and spoke to the community. What I do have a problem with is the fact that about \$300 000—I hope we are eventually told the final figure—would be far better spent in the community. That is the feedback that we are getting from the community: the community would rather have that money spent on them, not on our coming down there with this bit of a roadshow. It will be quite good for the Rotary clubs and the children of Mount Gambier to have a look at the parliament in session, but I guarantee that, if you ask the community, they would rather have this \$300 000 in the pockets of their community organisations, their hospitals and schools.

If we are forced to go down there, we do not have to buy carpet or have special seats. I will be more than happy to use the government car that I have and not travel down there at extra expense, because I want the Mount Gambier community to benefit from this trip in every way possible, and the best way for them to benefit is through our not going at all and spending this \$300 000 on the community.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I will not have a bob each way; I unequivocally oppose the adjournment of the house to Mount Gambier. I think it is a shocking waste of taxpayers' money and totally unnecessary.

Mrs Geraghty: Say that in Mount Gambier.

Mr BRINDAL: I will say it in Mount Gambier; I will say it all over the state. I think it is an appalling waste and the most blatant example of pork-barrelling that the whole house should be asked by the executive government to adjourn to Mount Gambier to conduct a sham exercise in order to have the member for Mount Gambier re-elected, because he has sold out to the Labor Party. That is the crux of why this house is being asked to adjourn to Mount Gambier. I think it is a stunt, and I think it is a disgrace. Our forebears built this building so that the parliament of South Australia could sit here. The facilities are here; everything is here.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Well, the fact is that, if it were necessary to adjourn to Mount Gambier so that we could learn more about Mount Gambier, then the members of the house who put that forward as their argument should not be in this house, because with the extensive travel and study allowances that they get if they have not been to Mount Gambier yet then something is wrong. It is for this house to decide where it best should sit to maximise the benefit to the people of South Australia. If any member on the government benches wants to put forward an argument that the parliament's sitting in Mount Gambier will equal in its facilities or its capacity to do its work the facilities that we have here, I would be surprised.

The only argument that I have heard from the government about adjourning the house to Mount Gambier is that the people of Mount Gambier are part of this state and deserve exposure to the parliament. I agree with that argument, but why then is this \$300 000 or more not being spent on webcast facilities in this parliament so that the people of Mount Gambier can see the way we all carry on for not only three days in a set piece musical but every day that we sit in this parliament? That is their right, but it is also the right of the people of Ceduna, Port Augusta, Port Pirie and the Riverland.

An honourable member: And Unley.

Mr BRINDAL: And Unley, because I bet some members opposite have never been to Unley unless it is to have a cafe latte. The adjournment of this house is a fundamental question which has been answered for 150 years: that this house adjourn to this place, not to some other place. I point out that the federal parliament in Canberra, which covers a much bigger jurisdiction than we are ever likely to have, was purpose-built in Canberra away from all the regional centres and never has thought it conducive to its better working to sit anywhere other than in Canberra since it moved there. However, they provide a television coverage so that all of Australia can see what they are doing on a daily basis. We won't do that; we are too mean, but we will put on a circus in Mount Gambier.

Finally, I oppose the adjournment because I believe that the will of this house is sovereign. I want members opposite to contemplate this, at least in the privacy of their caucus: who decided that we were going to Mount Gambier? Yesterday—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: We will, right now, chookie.

Mr BRINDAL: We will, chookie, will we? That's good, saying that we are making an honest decision, since we have all been told for months that we are going, since the carpet has been purchased, since the bookings have been arranged.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You want the taxpayers to meet the cost. You don't want it to come out of your travel allowance.

Mr BRINDAL: It's got nothing to do with my travel allowance; it is all the taxpayer's money.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: You can come with me on Bob's show tonight and argue that.

Mr BRINDAL: No. It's all the taxpayer's money, whatever it comes out of. I do not want it to come out of our travel allowances because I do not want you to hide it. Mark my words: if this house votes for this adjournment, the cost will not come back on the government, it will be on this house. No-one should forget that. Everyone who votes for the adjournment to Mount Gambier votes for the costs incurred—every single one of you.

Yesterday, I heard the Premier say of the Attorney, 'He's introduced some good stuff with a little bit of advice from on

high.' I presume he was not taking the Almighty's name in vain; therefore, he would have been declaring himself to be in a position perhaps somewhat inferior but very similar to the Almighty himself. I put to this house that such is the Premier's actions when it comes to the decision to go to Mount Gambier. We were not consulted, and I bet the caucus were not consulted. The member for Mount Gambier and the Premier probably sat down and had a cup of tea and a couple of Bex, and the member for Mount Gambier said, 'Wasn't part of the deal to go to Mount Gambier, because I need my re-election chances boosted.' This is a cheap stunt, and it is taking money away that should be going to decent causes such as hospitals and roads in Mount Gambier. The Attorney-General says that I don't like it very much for personal reasons. If there is a personal reason I will tell him. If I had wanted to be part of a travelling circus I would have gone to Canberra. I actually like going home to my family at night. Country members might say, 'We don't get that privilege.' No, they do not, because they chose to come here as the situation exists, as we chose not to go to Canberra. We chose a set of conditions and that set of conditions is being ignored.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: You can go on all you like, but outside don't some of you look me in the eye. The Labor Party is great at coming in here and playing the part. I actually know what a few of you think. I know, sir, what a few members over there think because they have discussed it with me. So I take it a little bit amiss when the very people who privately support what I say and will say, 'Good speech' outside, will sit there and crow the party line. This is a farce. It is high farce. It is stupid. It is an insult not only to the people of South Australia but also to the people of Mount Gambier. I oppose the adjournment to Mount Gambier.

Ms BREUER (Giles): As a proud country member of this house, I think I should say something about this. The only thing about the trip to Mount Gambier that disappoints me is the fact that it is to Mount Gambier and not Whyalla or Port Augusta. However, I am promised that in the future we will have that opportunity. I hear many people in this place complain about the number of schools from their electorates that come to Parliament House that they have to show around the place, and it is a bit of an imposition on their time and they get a bit sick of it. In a good year, two schools from my electorate come to Adelaide. That is in a good year. So far, this year, I have not seen one, and I think I have one booking for August. Country schools can no longer afford to come to Adelaide in the way that they used to and visit all the institutions such as Parliament House.

I would love to have more schools come to Parliament House, but I never have that opportunity. The children in Mount Gambier have an excellent opportunity, and I believe that schools from Mount Gambier and the surrounding areas are taking it up. They are getting an opportunity to come and see how parliament works. I am told if it was put onto the internet they could do the same thing. It is like the difference between going to the grand final (when the Crows win) and watching it on television. There is a huge difference. It is like watching parliament in Canberra. Big deal! It is not like being there. This is giving people in the country in Mount Gambier an opportunity to see how parliament works.

The other thing that happens in this place is that I would get 10, maybe 12, visitors a year from my electorate who can come in here and have dinner with me. I do not see many guests from outside. I have a lot of guests for dinner but they

are usually people from Adelaide whom I get to come in and talk to me over dinner. Very few people from my electorate come to Adelaide when parliament is sitting and have the opportunity to come in here. If they do come, they welcome the opportunity and they love to see what goes on here. Sometimes governments have to spend money. Sometimes parliament has to spend money. There is a heck of a lot of money wasted in this place. In this instance I think it is an excellent spending of our money. I think it would benefit greatly country people, and I think they are miserable over there if they try to object to this. I think we should have more taking of the parliament to the people.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): I, too, rise to oppose the suspension of standing orders to facilitate adjourning parliament to Mount Gambier. In my view, after 15 years in this place, this is one of the most scandalous wastes of money that I have witnessed at any one time by a government. This money is being wasted under the guise of taking parliament to a regional area to, in the words of the member for Giles, enable country people to see how parliament works. The fact is that taking this parliament to Mount Gambier will not enable the people of Mount Gambier to see how a parliament works. Parliament currently sits here four days and week, and on Tuesdays and Wednesdays it sits until about 10 p.m. The reality is that the parliament in Mount Gambier will not be sitting on Monday. The intent is, I understand from government members, for it to adjourn at 7.30 p.m. on Tuesday and 7.30 p.m. on Wednesday, and private members' business will occupy a considerable proportion of the time on Wednesday and, indeed, on Thursday. And the private members' business on the *Notice Paper* is specific to Mount Gambier for the purpose of the travelling circus—and that is what this is, a travelling circus.

The business is not the normal type of business that is undertaken by this parliament. So the people of Mount Gambier will not see how the parliament operates because they are getting a travelling circus. They are getting a travelling circus mounted upon a stage in the form of a traditional theatre. Doubtless, we will see a myriad of Dorothy Dix questions from the government about aspects of works that might or might not be done in Mount Gambier. So the people of Mount Gambier will not see the parliament as it is. We all know what this is about. Today it is 11 months and four days from a state election, and that is what this is about. This is about propping up the member for Mount Gambier in case the Labor Party may need him to assist them to govern after the next election. This is about pork-barrelling. This is about trying to prop up the member for Mount Gambier, who is experiencing horrendous bad publicity, and has for an extended period of time, in his local region. That is what this is about. This is a con that is being imposed on the people of Mount Gambier.

If the government was open, honest and accountable about this process, and they are not, of wanting to take the parliament to the people of regional South Australia, they would do as the member for Unley suggested in his address. What would happen is that we would have the technology in this parliament to be able to allow country people—in fact, all South Australians—access to the proceedings of parliament on the internet, live. That is what would be happening. So the constituents of the member for Giles would be able to see the parliament operating as it does. So the people of Mount Gambier, at any time the parliament is operating, would be able to see how it really does operate. The people of Mount

Gambier do not want to see a travelling circus or a charade: they want to see how parliament really operates.

In view of the performance of a number of government members, I can well understand why they are reluctant to spend the money (which will be wasted on this venture) on putting technology into the parliament to take the parliament to the people. That is the only way to take the parliament to the people. I also noted an interjection that occurred when the member for Unley was speaking, when at least one member of the government benches indicated that the member for Unley's concern may be that the payment for the Mount Gambier expenditure will come out of his parliamentary travel allowance.

It is well known in this parliament that, during my 15 years, I have handed back more than \$50 000 in travel allowance. At present I have plenty of surplus travel allowance. That does not fess me in the slightest. I am not at all concerned about that, and I doubt very much whether the member for Unley or any other member of parliament is. We want to ensure that the full costs of this travelling circus are made public, and those full costs do not only include the cost of making available the cost of accommodation. I understand from you, Mr Speaker, that at least 134 motel rooms and other accommodation places in Mount Gambier have been booked.

Mr Speaker, you might like to confirm whether I have remembered that figure correctly—134 motel rooms and units. We want to know the cost of that, as well as the cost of travel for personnel and the cost of phone calls made during the normal course of business of the parliament. They will be at STD rates. All members will be dialling at STD rates to be able to cover the costs of their normal business. We want to know the costs of the staff. Indeed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! This is becoming disorderly.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Attorney-General is out of order.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: It will also include the cost of the Parliamentary Network Support Group, which has had to set up the computer systems. It has had to test them. It has had to make them available to the members of parliament to test them. Costs are involved in that. Importantly, I know that, as a former police minister, extensive security costs are involved for any such operation. Costs will be involved with respect to the South Australia police force.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: All those things need to be made available. I am fully in favour of all travel costs being made available, including travel costs experienced by ministers. It is not for me to reveal those today, for I note that the Hon. Angus Redford in another place has put forward a notice of motion that he will shortly reveal the travel costs of a particular minister—and I would not want to steal his thunder. It is important that all costs be made available, and—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: The Attorney-General wants to keep interjecting. If he wants to know about costs, let him talk to the minister next to him about costs.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney is out of order. The member for Bright will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: I am happy to. This is a roort of the taxpayers' pocket. It is an outrage, and I say that as a member of parliament who has handed back more than

\$50 000 in costs, because I believe that it is necessary to have travel only for particular purposes, and this is not a sensible purpose.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I do not have a problem going to Mount Gambier, and, in fact, I look forward to travelling right through rural and regional South Australia regularly. The Liberal Party is a strong supporter of rural and regional South Australia. It is there all the time as, indeed, it is for the city and metropolitan areas. However, I find it interesting with respect to a change of ruling in terms of the new Speaker. One would have to ask whether that ruling applies also to ministers and the Speaker. As you know, sir, ministers and the Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Absolutely.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: It does?

The SPEAKER: Absolutely.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I am glad to see some justice, for a change.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): We all know why the House of Assembly is proposing to go to Mount Gambier: it is for political reasons. It is not to—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Fancy that!

Mr HANNA: The Attorney-General says, ‘Fancy that’, which is an acknowledgment that the primary motivation is purely political. It is a public relations exercise to convey the message that the Labor government cares about the people of Mount Gambier. It does not care any more or any less by the fact that it is going down there, except that it will be contributing hundreds of thousands of dollars to the local economy. The government would be better off just giving that money to the local health services, the local legal services and the local schools. Any member of this chamber, including the ministers, who want to show that they really care about the people of Mount Gambier can go down there any week of the year.

I have been to Mount Gambier twice in the last year to speak to people who want to speak to me about environmental and other local issues. Any member can do that. I will say another thing. There is some evidence for the fact that it is just a political exercise when one looks at the motions that have been allocated to the government backbenchers to fill up the Thursday morning of debate. Each member will stand up in turn to say that they support the local fire, schools, legal services, etc. Why can we not do that just as well here, and why do we single out one town outside Adelaide for that purpose?

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson will come to order.

Mr HANNA: It is just a public relations exercise. Why did the government not ask the Legislative Council to go down there? It is because it would have voted down the proposal. The Legislative Council would have voted it down because, on a cost-benefit analysis, it would have said, ‘We can demonstrate how much we care for the people of Mount Gambier without going there.’ Having given all their reasons, showing up the true reasons behind the proposal, it will be interesting to see whether members of the opposition vote for it.

I refer to the way it has been managed. I, for one—and I am sure other members—have been left in a difficult position with regard to transport arrangements. I have booked my own aeroplane flight to go down there with a staffer, because in

this place I have a staffer here for three days of the week to assist with parliamentary business. It is essential for a minor party to have that on-the-spot support. I will be paying for him and for me, but at the same time I heard a rumour this week that a charter flight is booked for MPs. I do not know the details and I am not sure whether it will cost more or less than the commercial flight I have booked, but this sort of thing is unclear to members. We should not be put in that situation. I have reservations about going down there, not out of a lack of affection and care for the people of Mount Gambier but simply because I doubt the value of spending literally hundreds of thousands of dollars to demonstrate that affection and care.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): In one way I am looking forward to the parliament being in Mount Gambier. My wife and I live about 30 minutes drive from Mount Gambier, so for three days of the sitting of the house I will be able to enjoy life that city members enjoy every sitting week of the year. I will be able to return and sleep in my own bed, and I look forward to that. That is the only thing I look forward to with regard to the parliament adjourning from here to Mount Gambier. I agree wholeheartedly with what the member for Mitchell said: this is just a piece of political theatre. How apt that the parliament will be sitting on the stage of the Sir Robert Helpmann Theatre, performing for the good folk of Mount Gambier, because that is what we will be doing. It will be a performance and many of my colleagues have outlined the reason.

At least members of the Liberal Party gave notice of motion of issues that are of importance to the people of Mount Gambier. We did it in a timely fashion so that members of the government would have time to prepare themselves to debate the issues that are important to the people of Mount Gambier. The Liberal Party has strong affinity with rural and regional South Australia and we understand the wants, needs and aspirations of those people. Unfortunately, the government does not have those links and part of the deception of this plan to adjourn to Mount Gambier is to try to make out that the government has strong empathy for and sympathy with the aspirations and wants of the people of rural South Australia. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Many of my colleagues have lamented the fact that we will be spending a lot of money. It has been hard to estimate, but I think the member for Bright talked about the myriad costs involved in adjourning from here to Mount Gambier. I know that not only would the people of Mount Gambier be much happier if that money was donated to good works and services in their city, but it would make a significant impact on my electorate next door. We know the problems that have been experienced in the Mount Gambier Health Service for a number of years with its under funding problems, which have caused significant down-grading of services across my electorate. The five hospitals in my electorate are part of the same health service—the South-East Health Service—and are funded out of the same bucket as the Mount Gambier Hospital. If you do not want to give the money to the Mount Gambier Hospital, you can put it into my electorate, because the services in this part of the state and across the board would be much better if the money, instead of being spent taking the parliament to Mount Gambier for a theatrical performance on the stage of the Sir Robert Helpmann Theatre, were given to those agencies delivering the services in Mount Gambier.

Notwithstanding the fact that I will enjoy the few days and the extra nights in my own bed at home, it is a nonsense, a stupid act, for us to go to Mount Gambier, and whoever is responsible for it should take a long, hard look at the way they are governing the state.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): It has been an extraordinary debate. At least I can give credit to the member for Bright, which is rare for me, and the member for Unley in that they at least opposed going to Mount Gambier. Some of the other contributions are that they do not oppose going—they like the idea of going—but somehow we should do it for free. Talk about trying to have two bob each way without even spending two bob! I look forward to their continuing this debate in Mount Gambier and telling the people down there that it is a waste of money and that we should not be there. I do not suspect we will hear that.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, sir, if an amendment to the motion was contemplated, does it have to be done before or after the completion remarks?

The SPEAKER: I believe the opportunity is gone, given that the minister is concluding.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is an extraordinary position to say that they want to go, but they do not want to go. I look forward to seeing who votes which way on it. The opposition has said, and I use the words of the member for Bright, that it is going to be a circus. He has got the analogy right in this regard, we certainly will be carting a lot of unwilling clowns along with us. One of the things that clowns do in a circus is they wear funny adornments, and they run around with big shoes—

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, sir: members are not supposed to criticise other members other than by substantive motion. We are being referred to, or the staff in this place are being referred to as—

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that it is helpful to debate for the minister to go down that path.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The analogy was made with circuses. I am saying that the role of clowns is that they run around and amuse people by trying to hurt each other but instead hurt themselves. I think that the contribution from the member for Bright fits very neatly into that category when he said, unbelievably, that this is the most scandalous waste of money that he has seen in his time in the parliament. It was a far more scandalous waste of money when the Crown Solicitor suggested—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, sir: this is entirely off the subject of the motion before the house. I ask you to bring the minister back to the motion.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister should focus on the motion.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If it sits easily in the mouth to say this is a scandalous waste of money, it is fair for us to make a comparison. I know what he does not want to hear; and the member for Mitchell knows what he does not want to hear.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: you have given the minister your ruling. He is clearly defying the chair.

The SPEAKER: The minister should come back to the motion.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will come back to the scandalous waste of money that was alleged by the member for Bright.

The SPEAKER: Order, the minister will resume his seat! The minister is defying the chair and he will cease to do that. Is he concluding his remarks?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The matter I speak of is on the public record anyway and we all know about it.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He wants to talk about my travel costs. I am quite happy to compare them with lots of people in the previous government anytime. I do not think that I have been overseas.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I spent a lot of money travelling to Port Lincoln, a lot more often than members on that side—those members committed to regional South Australia—but if he wants to distract the debate down there. I think his other contribution was that he was worried about the cost of 0055 numbers from Mount Gambier but I cannot help him with that one. It is absurd to say that this parliament should be confined to Adelaide. It is absurd to say that the only people who deserve (and ‘deserve’ is probably not the right word), the only people who should have these proceedings thrust upon them are the poor long suffering Adelaidians. We want to show this mob to everyone in South Australia. We want to thrust their performance on all South Australians to be fair and equitable. The truth is this: to suggest that only the people of Adelaide are important enough to have a parliament, I think, is an absurd situation. I note that some of the Liberals say, ‘Yes, we should go to the regions, but not this region. We should go to other regions, but not this region.’ We have to go to one first. But for the member for Bright to describe this as pork-barrelling for the member for Mount Gambier because he is in such trouble, I think he had better go and have a look at the election results last time. The bloke who was in trouble gave them an absolute walloping. I think that the member for Mount Gambier is safe as long as he wishes.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Watching the poll.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I have seen a few polls, and it is not the member for Mount Gambier who is in trouble, and I understand why Brave Sir Robert is beating his hasty retreat, because the polls suggest that it is not the member for Mount Gambier who is trouble. Regional South Australians deserve to see the parliament, they deserve to hear the parliament, and they deserve to make a judgement first-hand on these people. I am sure that I know why they do not want to be seen too widely, but you have to start in one region. It is the intention, as I understand it, to continue to do it.

For the member for Goyder, if it was not communicated through the proper channels. I apologise, because the member for Goyder has always, in my time in this house, dealt honourably with me in business and has always been as good as his word. It is regrettable if we have failed to communicate through proper channels, and I apologise to the member for Goyder, who is one of the very few Liberals I will miss when he leaves this place. Congratulations on a good career. But regional South Australians deserve it. I suggest this: do not have two bob on each way. If you really do not want us to go, vote against it to a person, because we will be supporting going to the regions as we believe that the regions deserve to see the parliament.

The house divided on the motion:

The bells having been rung:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. There is a division in process; members have to be counted.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Mr Speaker, I have a question to you before the vote is counted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs GERAGHTY: If a member calls 'No' when you call for the ayes and noes on a position, is it appropriate and proper for those people who said no to then change their vote and move across?

The SPEAKER: No; the person who called 'Divide' must vote against the motion. How members vote is up to them.

AYES (34)

Atkinson, M. J.	Bedford, F. E.
Breuer, L. R.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Caica, P.	Chapman, V. A.
Ciccarello, V.	Conlon, P. F. (teller)
Foley, K. O.	Geraghty, R. K.
Gunn, G. M.	Hall, J. L.
Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.	Kerin, R. G.
Key, S. W.	Koutsantonis, T.
Lomax-Smith, J. D.	Maywald, K. A.
McFetridge, D.	Meier, E. J.
O'Brien, M. F.	Penfold, E. M.
Rankine, J. M.	Rann, M. D.
Rau, J. R.	Scalzi, G.
Snelling, J. J.	Stevens, L.
Thompson, M. G.	Weatherill, J. W.
White, P. L.	Wright, M. J.

NOES (7)

Brindal, M. K.	Goldsworthy, R. M.
Hanna, K. (teller)	Matthew, W. A.
Redmond, I. M.	Venning, I. H.
Williams, M. R.	

Majority of 27 for the ayes.
Motion thus carried.

The SPEAKER: For the benefit of members, I will give some details in relation to Mount Gambier. Additional information has been put in members' pigeon holes which they need to look at, essentially saying that the parliament will pay the travel costs of members to Mount Gambier, including the charter aircraft. Members will be asked to authorise the deduction from their individual travel allowance an amount of \$100 per day for the motel and up to \$80 per day for other expenses. Ministers and the Speaker will be in the same category. That is the agreement that has been reached and the reason it took some time was the Minister for Infrastructure was paired out last night and I have only just been able to catch up with the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker: I am sorry, but I am not going to authorise \$80 for other expenses. I am responsible for my travel, as everybody else in this house is, and I am sorry—

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not a point of order. That is the member's choice.

Mr HANNA: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I have a question following your remarks. The question is what happens if members do not sign that authorisation?

The SPEAKER: That is a matter that will be dealt with if that situation arises. It is hypothetical at this stage. In terms

of the cost, it cannot be precise at this stage, but I have been informed that it is likely to be in the vicinity of \$100 000, which is approximately 12 cents per capita for the state. A sum of \$20 000 is being gifted to the Helpmann Theatre, which would need to be done anyway, because I am told the part of the theatre that we are using does not even have a telephone. We are going to gift to them the IT connection which will enable us not to be required to bring so many staff down. So that will be given to the theatre and the people of Mount Gambier as a gift. It will give high-speed communication to that theatre plus the telephone connection. The carpet, which is a green carpet, costs \$5 000. It can be re-used in regional sittings and it will match the carpet in this house. It is being put in by local tradespeople and the reason it is costing a bit more is that we have to do it on the Sunday morning because the theatre is being used on the Saturday night.

The all-up cost of the carpet is \$5 000. It is reusable. It will be rolled up and brought back. I have decided that there will be no close-circuit TV, which will save \$17 000. The expenditure, as much as possible, will be locally carried out. I can tell members that I attended the Western Australian regional parliament last year in Albany, and the upper house went to Kalgoorlie, and it was well received by the people in that area, especially by the children, who had the opportunity, for the first time in their lives, to attend a parliament. As to cost, members will get a full report when it is completed, but I am advised by the clerks that the likely cost is in the vicinity of \$100 000. The police will carry their own costs, as would be expected, because that is a normal expectation of a government agency.

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW: Mr Speaker, as a point of clarification, if I may: the cost of \$100 000 you have just acknowledged does not include police costs. Sir, does that also include the cost to the Parliamentary Network Support Group for their expenditure, the cost of transporting ministerial staff, extra administration costs which will be incurred because of the greater distance from ministers' offices and metropolitan electorate offices? They are all costs. My question is: is the cost of \$100 000 the cost to the parliament only?

The SPEAKER: The police cover their own costs, because there are security issues. That is why members are grouped in motels and not spread all over the place. In terms of the parliamentary support group, I understand that two of its members have been involved in setting up the connections. Administrative costs are borne, anyway. But there will be a full report, detailing all the costings, after the event.

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

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable messages to be delivered to and received from the Legislative Council by the Clerk by alternative means during the sittings of the house at Mount Gambier from 3 to 5 May.

The SPEAKER: There being an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the house present, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: Does the minister—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of clarification, the way this is worded on the *Notice Paper*, it seeks to suspend standing orders and, concurrently in that suspension, to put a motion. I wish to be quite clear: are we just now suspending standing orders, or are we putting this motion—because I certainly will speak against it.

The SPEAKER: We are suspending standing orders so that we can consider the matter of the delivery of messages. It is a procedural matter. The question before the chair is that the motion be agreed to. Those in favour say aye, against say no. As I hear no negative voice, the motion for suspension is agreed to.

Motion carried.

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

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council drawing attention to the foregoing resolution and requesting it to make reciprocal arrangements.

The SPEAKER: Is that seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I wish to speak against the motion, for the very reason I spoke against the original motion.

Members interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: No, I am not going to repeat the whole speech, unless the government annoys me, and then I will exercise my parliamentary right. I merely want to make the point that, with respect to both these motions for which we have just suspended standing orders, they vary the procedures of the house and involve us doing a whole lot of things that have never been done before and in a way they have never been done for. That shows me that this is not solving problems; it is creating problems. These two matters might be a simple thing, in relation to messages from the Governor and messages from the upper house, but I say to this house: wait until we sit, and then see how many problems emerge both before we sit and when we are sitting, and then remember that you were told.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Just on that, it is absurd that the house should sit there and not be able to receive or transmit messages.

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Unley, instead of being a teacher should have been a lawyer, because they operate by the doctrine of precedent, which translated for him is that nothing should ever be done for the first time. But, unfortunately, some things are done for the first time, and we will manage.

Motion carried.

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

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable messages from the Governor to be received by the Clerk by alternative means during the sittings of the house at Mount Gambier from 3 to 5 May.

The SPEAKER: I have counted the house and, as there is not an absolute majority present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

The SPEAKER: I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

Motion carried.

LAW REFORM (CONTRIBUTORY NEGLIGENCE AND APPORTIONMENT OF LIABILITY) (PROPORTIONATE LIABILITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 2 March. Page 1834.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): On 2 March 2005 the Attorney-General introduced this bill as part of a package of reforms relating to insurance law and associated legislation in response to what has commonly been called the insurance crisis in Australia. Already this house has introduced legislation which has culminated in the Recreational Services (Limitation of Liability) Act 2002, the Statutes Amendment (Structured Settlements) Act 2002, the Wrongs Liability (Damages for Personal Injury) Amendment Act 2002, the Law Reform (Ipp Recommendations) Act 2004, and the Professional Standards Act 2004.

After an initial flurry of legislation, there seemed to be a lull for over a year. In the latter part of last year we looked at some of the important recommendations contained in the Ipp report which was produced by a committee of eminent persons appointed by the commonwealth and state governments in July 2002 to review the law of negligence. Members would be familiar with the period of time when HIH collapsed together with United Medical Protection, Australia's largest provider of medical indemnity insurance. That created a significant problem for many in the community to access affordable insurance. This was a direct response to the withdrawal from the market of a number of public liability insurers and a consequent enormous hike in premiums.

As a new member of parliament, I recall at that time the concerns that were raised. I cite the example of the Burnside War Memorial Hospital—just one of many organisations that were threatened with closure—because it could not access insurance in Australia, let alone affordable insurance anywhere in the world, to enable it to continue to provide its birthing facilities, for which it is famous. It was so difficult for the Burnside hospital that the then chief executive officer had to fly to London to try to access an insurer that would provide public liability and medical professional insurance for the hospital. I cite the example of the Burnside hospital because its premiums increased from less than \$100 000 a year to, from recollection, about \$350 000 a year.

The government, in its flurry to fall into line with insurance liability reform during this period in 2002 (which was designed to remedy the problem of accessing insurance), behaved incredibly inconsistently by holding out its hands eagerly to take in the enormous windfall gained from stamp duty on those increased insurance premiums. The government was ready to put out their hands and take in the millions of dollars extra that they could recover as a result of skyrocketing premiums. On the one hand, the Deputy Premier was telling members in the house about the importance of insurance reform so that South Australia could join with the other states and provide relief for its citizens; yet, on the other hand, the government was greedily seeking the benefits from these increased premiums without providing any relief.

I asked the Deputy Premier to consider at least providing a refund of the extra stamp duty that the Burnside War Memorial Hospital was required to pay on this massive increase in premiums—at that stage, an extra \$20 000 a year, which has increased further since then. I was not asking for the whole of the stamp duty on their insurance premiums to be refunded but the extra stamp duty payable on the increased premiums. When a submission was put to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer of this state, the very person who was bleating about providing support for accessible and affordable insurance through this legislative reform, he said, 'No, that will not happen, that will not be provided and, there will not only be no consideration of any provision of relief, but there will be not even a proportional provision of relief in the light

of this increase. So, the people who have been able to struggle to find extra insurance and are paying a high increase in premium have had a slap in the face by this government in the Treasurer's miserable response to their request for even the extra stamp duty relief. That is the hypocrisy of putting up legislative reform of this type to provide for relief as part of a package, as they have done over the three preceding years, and what this government has done should be on the record.

At present, the position in relation to the amendments that this bill proposes is fairly complicated, but I will try to simplify the principle that applies. Currently, a plaintiff (a person seeking compensation) who has suffered damage which has been caused by the negligence of more than one party (there may be two or three parties that together and individually contributed to the damage) will sue those persons as being jointly and severally liable—that is, equally liable. So all of them are liable for all of the loss. A simple example of that is to assume that the plaintiff suffers damage and sues four parties, A, B, C and D, and the court determines the question of liability and apportions responsibility for that damage according to their conduct or negligence. For example, A is 10 per cent responsible, B is 9 per cent responsible, C is 1 per cent responsible and D is 80 per cent responsible. Under our current provisions, each of A, B, C and D is responsible for paying the whole lot, that is, 100 per cent of the damages of the plaintiff. This is sometimes called solidarity liability, as opposed to proportionate liability.

Of course, under the current law, although the plaintiff might sue all of A, B, C and D, they then proceed to collect, because of the joint and several liability position, from the party that has the most resources—and, you guessed it, most often that is the party that is either solvent (that is, has plenty of funds to be able to pay, which does not happen a lot) or, alternatively, is backed by an insurance company. So the person the plaintiff recovers from, irrespective of whether they are 1 per cent liable or 80 per cent liable, will really depend on who has the money behind them.

Not surprisingly, the people who take out insurance—the businesses responsible for insuring against that risk so as to be able to provide such a benefit to any plaintiff—arguably are the ones who carry the real responsibility for all those who care not as to their conduct or as to whether they have sufficient funds to meet any claim. And the insurers behind those that are responsible have been complaining that this is a system which not only prejudices them but also has the direct effect of upping the premiums. The risk of loss is determined and the premium set based on the fact that they could always be liable for 100 per cent. So, of course the insurance premiums go up, the insurance claims come in, the amount of the claim is high, and both the responsible person who takes out the insurance and the insurance company effectively are penalised.

These matters, amongst other things, were considered by the committee headed by Justice Ipp, and the report was published in September 2002. The committee formed the view that, notwithstanding the prejudice to those taking out insurance and their insurance companies and that on the face of it the proposal had some merit, proportionate liability should not apply in relation to personal injuries. One of the bases for that was that it seemed important that, if someone did sustain a personal injury and suffered a loss as a result, it is more important that the plaintiff in that case ought to be able to recover that loss for personal injury than the inequity of someone on the defendant's side having to pay more than

their share. So, for the greater good, they took the view that, if you sustained personal injury, the question of proportionate liability should not apply. Many will argue against that and say that, whatever the damage, that still should not impose the perpetuation of an unfair system where those in the insurance world carry the extra risk.

We all know that there are many occasions when a respondent in these types of actions are men and women of straw; they have no insurance and no asset, someone is left with significant personal injury, and they suffer that unfairly. A significant balancing act occurred in relation to that. When this bill is enacted, what will happen is that the court will still have to allocate fixed shares of damages awarded to defendants whose negligence or wrongdoing has caused the damage. That has not really changed in any practical term except that it will be clear that that must happen rather than there simply being a determination, which is almost academic when it comes to who pays.

Each defendant will then be liable only for his or her fixed share. In the example used, if defendant C was liable for only 1 per cent of whatever the assessed damages are, then C would have to pay only 1 per cent. The shares will be determined according to what is 'fair and equitable having regard to his or her responsibility for the damage and the responsibility of any other wrongdoers'. The new regime will not apply where wrongdoers act jointly. In such case each defendant will remain responsible for the damage caused by their joint activity in full. The new regime applies to claims in tort and in contract or for breach of statutory duty.

It applies also to cases of misrepresentation either at common law or under the Fair Trading Act. However, a person who perpetrates a fraud will continue to be liable for the whole of the damage done. The other states, consistent with this whole package of legislation over the past few years, have been considering these matters one by one. From memory, I think that we are one of the last states to introduce the Law Reform Ipp Recommendations. I can recall promises from the Deputy Premier that that would be there for consideration in early 2004. We were closer to the end of the year before we actually dealt with the matter.

Nevertheless, even though we have tagged along a bit with respect to some of these reforms, I note that New South Wales passed its Civil Liability Act in 2002; Queensland passed its Civil Liability Act in 2003; Victoria's Wrongs Act (Part 4AA) was introduced in 2003; and Western Australia passed its Civil Liability Act in 2002. Certainly, other states seemed to get their act together a lot earlier than this state. Again, this seems to be consistent with this government. It jumps on the bandwagon of what purports to be a good idea.

In this case it has been a very long time before it has acted on the whole relief package, and we end up lagging behind the rest of Australia rather than seeing the promises of being out in front and providing relief. I should advise the house that there is one significant difference between the states: in Queensland, proportionate liability applies to claims only over \$5 000. The opposition will support the bill. It has been a long time coming. It does concern me greatly that, three years down the track into this government, we have had a sickening take of stamp duty on the insurance premiums where those concerned have had to fight for continued access to them at a very high rate.

This government continues to provide little or no relief in this area. I hope that, as Treasurer, the Deputy Premier will give some appropriate consideration to this in the forthcoming budget. It is a stain, I suggest, on the government, in

terms of attempting to achieve a gross take of tax at the very time it comes into this house and says that it is attempting to provide relief. It is just scraping that money in without any care or real consideration for the people who have been affected by the collapse of HIH and United Medical Protection. It does concern me that there has been no real relief in that regard, and that the government should take advantage of the misery and disadvantage of those suffering in times of such need.

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

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

Motion carried.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I rise to speak on behalf of the Greens. There are two competing principles to consider in relation to this bill which, of course, is part of the so-called law reform package in relation to insurance and which was prompted by the insurance industry a couple of years ago after it had collectively experienced a couple of bad years in terms of profits. The federal Liberal government and all state Labor governments responded cooperatively and introduced a range of changes to the law which benefited insurance companies. That has allowed them to increase their premiums and increase their profits. They have done well out of it. This is probably the least objectionable of the range of reforms which insurance companies sought. I say that because the principle underpinning the bill is that those who are responsible for damage should pay for it rather than being part of a group who share responsibility for the damage of any one or all of them. In other words, liability becomes several instead of collective. There is something that appeals to everyone's sense of fairness about that.

The other side of the coin, however, is that there will be those at fault who cannot pay for the wrong that they do. There will be plaintiffs—people who have been wronged—who come before the courts and will only be able to prove the greatest share of fault against those who are least able to pay. In the past, where there was an insured defendant among those who had some responsibility for the damage done to a plaintiff, the plaintiff essentially would be able to recover from the insurance company.

I can understand the insurance companies grumbling about that, but at least it meant that there was often, in incidents in public places or on commercial properties, at least one defendant who could bear to pay the cost of the plaintiff's damage. Now, if the defendant who was found to be primarily responsible for the financial loss or property damage of the plaintiff is impecunious, then the plaintiff simply misses out. One regrettable aspect of that is that the plaintiff may be put to a great deal of expense in terms of investigation and legal costs to find out just who was responsible for the wrong done to the plaintiff and to find out whether or not that particular defendant is impecunious. It makes litigation much more difficult for people losing economically through property damage or some other kind of financial loss. The risk becomes greater and no doubt lawyers will be cautioning plaintiffs against suing for this type of damage accordingly in future. That is exactly what insurance companies want.

On the face of it, there is something fair about allocating each defendant's share of responsibility for the wrong done to the plaintiff. The devil in this bill is in the detail of who gets to recover from defendants, given that many defendants

at fault will be found to be impecunious. At the end of the day, the answer to this difficulty is resolved by the other members of the House of Assembly, because the government and opposition are supporting it. This is probably the least objectionable of the range of insurance law changes that came out of the insurance industry submissions to Liberal and Labor governments several years ago.

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

ROAD TRAFFIC (EXCESSIVE SPEED) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 8 March. Page 1941.)

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): This bill is obviously another piece of legislation that the government has put into the parliament in an attempt to try to get a message through to the community—the motorists across South Australia—that considerable excessive speed is a major factor in road accidents, particularly fatalities. We all know that it involves speed, seat belts, alcohol, inattention and tiredness. They are the major fundamentals that contribute to road trauma. I understand why the government has introduced this bill. I am led to believe that both Sir Eric Neal's Road Safety Advisory Committee and Dr Jack McLean recommended this initiative.

I want to put on the public record that the Liberal Party will be supporting this bill. However, there was a lot of debate and discussion among my colleagues in the party room about this bill, because a lot of legislation has come through over the last 12 months. It is not this particular minister because, as he said earlier today, he has been in the job for only a couple of minutes, and this bill was tabled by the previous minister for transport. This minister is the third minister for transport in three years. It is a bit like small business, where there have been at least three ministers in three years. My colleagues are saying that they support the bill, because it is a genuine attempt to get a message across that, if you are going to speed excessively and if you are going to drive recklessly or drive in a dangerous manner, you are going to have to realise that the penalties will be quite substantial. The penalties for a first offence are a fine for excessive speed—which is a new offence of driving a vehicle at a speed exceeding the limit by 45 kilometres an hour or more—of not less than \$600 and not more than \$1 000, and disqualification for a minimum of six months; and, for a second and subsequent offence, the penalties are a fine of not less than \$700 and not more than \$1 200, and disqualification for a minimum of two years. That means that, if you are a real hoon, if you are prepared to put at risk the lives of other people—and around you or in the vehicle with you—if you want to be stupid enough to drive 80 or 90 kilometres over a speed limit and tragically kill yourself, that is bad enough but, when you are so stupid that you kill other innocent people on the roads, I would expect that you would lose your licence for more than a minimum of two years once you went through the court system.

There is a small but significant proportion of South Australians who, for some reason, think that they are totally bullet proof and whose driving behaviour is totally unaccept-

able to the rest of South Australia. We saw in the *Sunday Mail* even last weekend a double page where people had written in expressing concern about the significant—and what I hope and pray is a spike—rise in road fatalities. As tragic and bad as it is, one would hope that it will level out during the course of the year, because one of the worst things that can ever happen to a family is to lose a loved one on the road. As one of my constituents who worked in Julia Farr told me, ‘You forget about the people who are not killed but who are effectively a vegetable for the rest of their lives.’ That is tragic for them and their families and, callously, there is an economic cost to this as well.

Fatalities that occur through dangerous and excessive speed cost the South Australian community \$100 million a year. That is an enormous amount of money, a significant cost that occurs because people are prepared to run the risk of killing themselves and others on the road through inappropriate behaviour. I think that the total cost of road fatality and road trauma to the state in a year is something like \$1.18 billion. We have to be serious about doing whatever we can to curb the road toll.

Because of the work load and the fact that this bill will get through in the next 30 minutes or thereabouts, some of my colleagues have asked me to put some points of view on the record in the second reading debate on their behalf. The point that they made is this: there is a lot of emphasis on getting tough on drivers who break the law—and that is fair enough to a great extent and is supported by my colleagues in the Liberal Party—but they are concerned—and I share their view on this—that there does not seem to be a lot of initiative over and above legislation in this house. At present, there is conservatively \$160 million of backlog road maintenance, and I am advised that that figure could be heading towards \$200 million. We do not have sufficient traffic police on our roads, and the police are trying to manage as best they can, and they do a brilliant job of that. Members would have seen the Deputy Commissioner, John White—and a very good Deputy Commissioner at that—doing a country road blitz.

When there was major road trauma on the Fleurieu Peninsula, we had a road blitz. All of a sudden there was a traffic presence out there, and the driving behaviour and patterns absolutely changed, because drivers knew that there was a fair chance that they were going to get caught. There is a lot of media publicity about a blitz: the community is told when the blitz will start and when it will finish. Personally, I struggle a bit with that. I do not think that we should know when there is a blitz on. I think that what we should know is that, wherever you are, 24 hours a day, seven days a week, there is a very good chance, if you are breaking the law, that you will have a police officer put on their flashing lights and pull you over. That is what we really need and want. We are not seeing a growth in traffic police numbers at all.

We have other problems in this state at times, such as Baxter. I understand—and it happened when I was police minister too—that we have to send a lot of police officers to Baxter. It would be nice if the protesters attended Baxter at a time other than at Easter—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Exactly; I agree. That then pulls hundreds of police officers off the roads not only over Easter but also for a period before and after, because they still have to have a life outside policing and take their days off. While we support this legislation, and while we supported other legislation relating to 24 hour, seven day a week random

breath testing, we believe that we need a stronger police presence on our roads and a more concerted effort.

It is interesting to see a lot of this driving behaviour, because it is tragic. I do not want to talk about individual cases, because that would not be fair on those who have lost loved ones, but you see time and time again at 6 o'clock in the morning, at 2 o'clock in the morning, speeds that are clearly excessive where people are wiping out trees and power poles with ease because of the speed they are going at. I personally believe it is because they know that traffic police only do two shifts. They are not like general patrols. General patrols are out there in a limited capacity on their third shift (their night shift) but they are still out there. Traffic patrols, on the other hand, are only out there for two shifts—a day shift and an afternoon shift. These people know that from about 11 o'clock at night until 7 o'clock in the morning there is not much chance you are going to get knocked off for speeding, and I think that is something that has to be addressed. I said in the media on the weekend, if it is not possible at this point in time to put additional police into traffic, maybe, operationally, they have to consider juggling their overall global number of police to get some more police out there at those times.

I know that on the Victor Harbor Road, when they have had the odd night where they use a piece of the road right near the track to our farm, I can see that flashing light going off every few minutes at three or four o'clock in the morning, if they happen to be there, because that is when these people just go berserk. That includes motorbikes as well. If they are going to drive at crazy speeds at that time, I do not mind, especially if they actually contribute to the coffers of government and if that money goes back into the roads, because they deserve to do that to get the message through to them that their lives and that of others are more important. Unfortunately, at the moment, the chances are they can fly up and down those roads and they will not see a police officer.

Of course, a police officer has a marked effect over the speed camera because most of the time people do not know what has happened with the speed camera until a few weeks after when they receive a letter in the mail. When a police officer has a laser gun or mobile radar and they pull you over they deal with it straightaway and it actually gives a better message to the offender than simply copping an expiation notice. We have to understand, as a community, that there is some responsibility to each and every one of us that when you have a vehicle it is potentially lethal and that it is not a right to drive a motor vehicle: it is a privilege. Some of these people actually take it as a right rather than a privilege. It is interesting when you talk about issues around road safety and excessive speed, etc.

The Clipsal 500 is something that I strongly support; in fact, it started under our government. Some discussion in the community lately has been about certain events that occur in the Clipsal 500. It is not actually the V8 Holdens and Fords and whatever racing as such that they are referring to, because that is what motor racing is all about, but it is the individual motorbike doing burnouts in pit straight with smoke flying out while they are on one wheel. It is the utes doing doughnuts in front of the crowd on pit straight. Of course, there is some argument that perhaps young people when they see that think, ‘Well, if they can do it, I can do it.’ That is what they try to do but, of course, they do not have the training, experience, skills and safety features in their utes and motorbikes that those particular people have. There probably needs to be a debate on whether or not those

particular parts of the Clipsal 500 are sending the wrong message to certain sectors of our community.

Education and training are obviously key factors. Proper road maintenance and construction is paramount. Also, we need a situation, as I said earlier, where we see a better police presence because when the police are present the driving pattern changes completely. As soon as the *Victor Harbor Times* or the *Mount Barker Courier*, or whatever paper has reported the end of a blitz, then they revert back to their old driving patterns and behaviours. So, that simply says to me that the most powerful way of stopping road fatality is still that of a police officer in a marked police car. One would have had concern about some other matters in this bill, and they were raised again by my colleagues. I am pleased to see that they are covered; that is, to deal with situations where you are on the lower road limits because of road works or things like that where you may come back to 40 kilometres per hour. There are some provisions there.

It has been considered in this bill so that if there are no workers present you will not cop the full brunt of this legislation like you would if you were doing 160 kilometres per hour in a 110 kilometre per hour zone. Having those few words on the public record, on behalf of the party as a whole, the Liberal Party supports this bill. I hope that the message gets across to people that it is not worth the risk. I do not think we have all the answers yet. In fact, when you listen to talkback radio at the moment, some people are advocating some extremely draconian measures to try to stop the road toll and trauma. I will not debate those now, but I am sure that the overall community debate that the parliament will have to look at in a detailed way will accelerate during this year because there is no topic that is more in the public arena at the moment than the real concern that people have about our road trauma, particularly to do with the loss of our young loved ones. When I refer to young loved ones, I am talking about males up to 25 years of age who believe they are bulletproof. I am not sure what has got into their heads, but it clearly shows that with males up to 25 years of age there are problems. We will work through that. We support the bill and I wish the bill a rapid carriage through the house and some success in curbing the road trauma.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I want to make a brief contribution and raise a couple of issues that I hope the minister might address in his response. The first one is the issue of the expiation of the offence. I notice that the expiation fee remains the same whether it is a first or subsequent offence, and I appreciate the difficulty of differentiating those offences. Obviously, the person who is issuing the offence at the time will not know whether it is a first or subsequent offence, although one would imagine that, in due course, our computer systems might be able to deal with that problem.

The more concerning question I want to raise is that you have the expiation capacity under subsection (1) of new section 45A. Let me make it quite clear to the minister that I am absolutely in favour of this legislation, but I just want to clarify a few things. The disqualification from driving under subsection (3) commences with the words 'where a court convicts a person'. I seem to recall from other provisions in relation to licence disqualifications I have dealt with in the courts from time to time that the effect will be that, where you expiate the offence, the court is not necessarily then found to be convicting a person, therefore there may not be a disqualification applying.

If it is the government's intention (which I would support) to ensure that someone who has this problem and commits the offence and expiates it, they should also be disqualified from driving. I see the minister nodding, so I hope that means that, when he responds to my comments, he will be able to confirm on the record that that is the intention. From my recollection of appearing in court (and it is a few years ago since I dealt with one of these matters), it was clearly the case that there was a difficulty with this issue of whether someone had expiated an offence and, more particularly, relating to what happens subsequently to that event. You can certainly have the disqualification. However, if the court has not disqualified, the effect of that is that the person, if they then drive whilst disqualified, will face a much lesser penalty if they have only had their licence removed by an administrative process than if they have had their licence removed by the court. The reason for that is that, when someone's licence is removed by a court, the magistrate, as a matter of habit, gives an admonishment to them to say, 'You have just had your licence disqualified. Make no mistake, if you now drive whilst you are disqualified from driving, you will go to gaol.' Because they have had that admonition from the court, that is usually the consequence of then driving while disqualified.

My big fear with this (and I recognise that the minister and I are basically on the same track as far as wanting to deal with the issue) is that, if someone can expiate the offence, first of all, they pay a significantly lesser penalty. They may then be able to have their licence disqualified, although that does not appear to be apparent in the wording of the section. But, even if they do have their licence disqualified, they may not face a stricter regime should they drive whilst they are disqualified when they then do the wrong thing again.

The other thing I want to clarify is under subsection (4), where it provides that, in determining whether an offence under this section is a first or a subsequent offence, we can look at previous offences committed under section 46. Section 46 of the Road Traffic Act deals with reckless and dangerous driving. So, the effect of subsection (4) is to say that you could be convicted of a second or subsequent offence under new section 45A, if, for instance, within the last five years, you have had a conviction under section 46 for reckless and dangerous driving, and then get a penalty under section 45A for the excessive speed.

I ask the minister whether or not there is any danger in that—for instance, that someone could have been convicted for reckless and dangerous driving which did not involve excessive speed (I know that normally it will), and they could then face being penalised under this section at a much heavier regime, even though they have not done what the intention of this section is meant to penalise. I will perhaps at some time raise the issue for consideration of how we deal with this question of the people who, in my view, are so antisocial they drive habitually at 45 kilometres above the speed limit. It seems to me that these are the very people who do not care very much whether they have a licence in place. I notice that there is a provision under section 45B which refers to the licence disqualification or suspension which contemplates that the person getting that licence disqualification or suspension notified to them may a person who does not hold a driver's licence. We really need to come to terms with how we are going to address in the longer term this question of people who are so antisocial they are prepared to drive without a licence and who are prepared, in those circumstances, to drive at more than 45 kilometres beyond the limit to then not face very severe consequences if they dare to

drive subsequently. With those comments, I commend the government for the bill and, like the shadow minister, wish the bill speedy passage through the house.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I also indicate that I will be supporting the bill. However, I want to express some concerns and make some comment about how the bill might be implemented, either through regulations or on the ground, and how it will work. My concerns particularly have to do with the issue of mandatory minimum sentencing. I point to the provisions in the bill, particularly sections 45A and 46, that predicate a minimum sentence for the offence. I understand the government's logic behind saying, for example, that there will be a minimum six-month suspension for an offence, or a two-year suspension for a second offence. However, my reservation in how this might be implemented is that we are taking away in this bill any flexibility for a court to consider the circumstances that might be prevailing at the time of the offence. For example, we are assuming that, irrespective of the circumstances, a two-year suspension should apply if someone has a second offence and a six-month suspension.

For instance, if someone is on the road to Coober Pedy, it is a wide open road, there is no other traffic around, the speed limit is, say, 110, and they are travelling at 45 kilometres over the speed limit (155 km/h), that is exactly the same seriousness of offence as someone speeding down a busy city street at peak hour where the speed limit might be 60 km/h and they are doing 105 km/h. I wonder whether those two offences are equally villainous. The bill seems to provide no flexibility in respect of an emergency. If someone is rushing their wife to hospital or going to the scene of a personal emergency, there seems to be no provision for mitigating circumstances. It could be argued that they could contest the matter in court, but if they are found guilty it seems that the minimum sentence will apply.

I wonder about that, because it takes away the role of the court of looking at each case on its merits and making a determination based on the facts. I will not oppose this provision and I will support the bill—as my colleague the member for Mawson has indicated, the Liberal Party is wholly in support of this legislation—but I am cautious about the wisdom of having mandatory minimum sentencing, even though I know that this area of road traffic law is abreast of it. I commend the government broadly for the initiative, but I would like to tell the minister about something that happened to a soldier who was under my command in 1976.

He was a young bloke aged 19 years and his licence had been suspended on demerit points. He was at home one day with his girlfriend and they decided to go down to the corner shop in the car, which he drove even though his licence had been suspended. He was apprehended, and the penalty he was given in a Queensland court was three months in Boggo Road Gaol. This happened in November 1976, and he spent three months over Christmas in Boggo Road, one of the most notorious gaols at that time in this country. I do not know what happened to him while he was inside—I visited him on a couple of occasions as his platoon commander—but when he came out 12 weeks later he was a very distressed young man. Shortly after that, he committed suicide by driving his motorbike underneath a semi-trailer. His mate who was with him at the time and witnessed the incident, knew from what he had been saying that he had done it deliberately.

Whatever happened to this young man when he was in Boggo Road as a consequence of being convicted for driving

whilst on a suspended licence ultimately led to his death. He was a fine young bloke, immature and stupid like a lot of the young people who will be subject to the penalties under this bill, but I simply make the point that, under these mandatory provisions of suspending someone's licence for six months or two years, given the immaturity of some of these people, in my view, they will reoffend. Some of them will go to gaol and some will lose their job, because how do you keep your job if you have lost your licence, particularly if you need it to get to and from work or if you have a job that requires you to be able to drive.

So, with these mandatory sentences we may end up producing hardened criminals or forcing immature young people down the road of committing further offences and facing further prosecution. Being tough on crime, hoon driving and speeding sounds good, but I raise a note of caution that we need to hasten slowly with some of these provisions. Having said that, I understand the will of the house and I will support the measure, but I would have been more comfortable with it if the court had a role to play.

I commend the minister for including the provision in regard to roadworks (clause 45A(2)). I think it is easy to miss a roadworks sign, particularly if no-one is present. I express concern, in principle, about the way in which reckless and dangerous driving might be interpreted by the police. The bill introduces a penalty for a first offence of not less than 12 months and for a second and subsequent offence a period of imprisonment of not more than three months and a minimum licence disqualification for a period of three years. I wonder whether the minister will explain in his reply just how the police might implement this provision.

If someone is booked for reckless and dangerous driving because they fail to indicate when they are changing lanes—if mum is bringing the kids home from school and fails to indicate—and if a policeman chooses to take a fairly ambivalent approach towards charging someone with this offence, they could find themselves facing a very severe suspension period for what arguably was or was not reckless or dangerous driving. I wonder how there will be some consistency in sentencing given the mandatory nature of the sentences involved. Perhaps the minister has better knowledge than me about this and perhaps he can explain in his closing remarks how this might be implemented so as to ensure that well-intentioned law-abiding citizens who make mistakes while driving but not in a reckless or dangerous way do not fall prey to this bill.

In concluding my remarks, although clearly we need to introduce these laws and make sure they are adhered to, I point out to the government that we need to look at the condition of our roads and also at driver training. I know it is easier to implement tougher laws than to police them, but I think we need to look at approaches which require drivers to attend at hospitals where accident victims might be undergoing treatment; to carry out training and retraining; to attend lectures and so on that expose them to the dangers of driving and the risks of serious injury; and to watch films and have briefings that could mature the driver. The problem really is testosterone and immaturity, and some of these people will not be deterred by the penalty, no matter how tough it is: they will reoffend. With those closing remarks, I commend the bill. As I said, I support it, but I raise those concerns for the minister and the government to consider.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I thank all those who contributed to the debate. I commence by

putting on the record that, while I am putting the bill through the parliament, this was the work of the former minister, Trish White, the member for Taylor. The credit for this legislation that will make our roads safer should go to her, and it will be a good legacy. She will know that she has contributed to making our roads safer. I thank the shadow spokesman for his support.

I will quickly answer some of the issues raised. In response to the member for Heysen, I think she understands the bill correctly and I will run through the matters she has raised. Disqualification by a court might well be treated differently from disqualification through the administrative act of expiation, the principal reason being that, when one goes to court and is disqualified and then drives disqualified, it is considered to be a contempt of the court. Authorities will almost always want to charge you in those circumstances, because judges do not like people ignoring them. The same range of penalties will apply for driving disqualified through an expiation, but that aspect will not be taken into consideration by the court. It can certainly still apply the same range of penalties but it may well be that the court will take a different attitude because it does not constitute a contempt. We do not think that is wrong, because we think the fact that one has not elected to be prosecuted and tie up the court system and has gone through an expiation and taken an administrative route makes a difference, and the bill contemplates that.

The question of subsequent offences was raised. Of course, there will not be subsequent offences if this bill is passed. Treating a section 46 offence of reckless and dangerous driving as an earlier offence is quite valid. At present, as I understand it, when the police deal with a speeding offence of this nature where people have exceeded the speed limit by more than 45 km/h, they will investigate the matter to see whether a case of dangerous and reckless driving is made out. Sometimes it will not be, but that is the genesis of the section 46 offence. It is possible to have a section 46 offence without excessive speed—that would be very unusual—but we say that, to be charged with a reckless and dangerous driving offence, you would have to have done something particularly stupid.

The member for Waite suggested that not turning your indicator on, or something like that, would be sufficient. To make out the offence is very difficult. There are offences of driving without care or failing to indicate, which are in a much less serious category, but making out this offence is difficult. I did practise in the area but I never did one of these cases, and it has to be materially dangerous but it also has to be reckless on the part of the driver. It has to be something that attracts that definition. Recklessness at law is something that has been well discussed, and you cannot make it out easily. We think it is entirely appropriate that, if someone has done something so stupid, reckless or dangerous in the past, it should be treated as a prior offence, because the person is plainly not learning.

The member for Waite has concerns about mandatory penalties under the act. Everyone will always have some concerns about mandatory penalties, but the truth is that this is not unique among road traffic offences. A number of them, including drink driving, are already mandatory sentences. It may be harsh to have a two year suspension for subsequent offences, but the truth is that we are told that, if you are travelling 45 km/h over the limit—so you are not just speeding: you are travelling 45 km/h over the limit—you are 500 times more likely to have an accident. In a spread in the

Sunday Mail we saw that the community does not accept the level of road accidents, and speed is right up there as the big reason. This is not a mandatory sentence that applies to people except those who speed excessively. And, fair go: I am a bloke and have done some stupid things in a motor car in the past myself, but at 45 km/h over the speed limit you are going a bit too quickly, and we think that these are appropriate penalties. If they do mend some behaviour, it will save young lives. It may well save a life if a person who has been potted for the first time doing 45 km/h over the limit knows that after six months they get their licence back but if they do it again they go for a couple of years, and we are prepared to do that.

I make this one point. The member for Waite refers to the conditions of our roads. Obviously, we have to keep our roads in good condition but I, for one, am sick of people not taking responsibility. It is their responsibility to drive to the conditions. So I think our society, too much, absolves the individual of responsibility for their own actions. I say that we should maintain our roads, of course, but it is up to the individual to exercise some commonsense and drive according to the conditions. It is the person behind the wheel who has the primary responsibility for avoiding accidents. With respect to driver training, the member for Waite would know that, just this very week, we passed the graduated training system which will require young drivers to have more experience, and we think that is a good measure. As the member for Colton is here, I point out that, just recently, my last duty as the minister for emergency services was to launch a road safety program in schools operated by the fire service.

The program depicts quite graphic videos (and the cutting up of cars), trying to get the message across to young people. The measures are not all penalties, there is also education. We try to tackle it every way. I go on the record by saying that the road toll is unacceptable. Every death is a tragedy, and it is an avoidable tragedy. We want to avoid as many of those tragedies in the future. As I say, full credit to the member for Taylor who brought the bill to the house. She will have a legacy of making our roads safer. That is a good legacy to have. I thank the opposition for its indicated support.

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

NATIONAL ELECTRICITY (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (NEW ELECTRICITY LAW) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (AGGRAVATED OFFENCES) BILL

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

No. 1—Clause 6, page 6, after line 42 insert:

(2) Section 19—after subsection (3) insert:

(4) In this section—

harm, in relation to a person, has the same meaning as in section 21.

- No. 2—Clause 10, (new section 20), page 8, lines 11 to 13—
Delete subsection (2) and substitute:
(2) However—
(a) conduct that lies within limits of what would be generally accepted in the community as normal incidents of social interaction or community life cannot amount to an assault; and
(b) conduct that is justified or excused by law cannot amount to an assault.
- No. 3—Clause 10, (new section 21), page 9, lines 15 to 22—
Delete the definition of *serious harm* and substitute:
serious harm means—
(a) harm that endangers a person's life; or
(b) harm that consists of, or results in, serious and protracted impairment of a physical or mental function; or
(c) harm that consists of, or results in, serious disfigurement.
- No. 4—Clause 10, (new section 22), page 9, line 27—
After "A" insert:
lawful
- No. 5—Clause 10 (new section 23), page 11, lines 35 to 42, page 12, lines 1 to 5—
Delete subsections (4) and (5)
- No. 6—Clause 10, (new section 25), page 12, line 21—
Delete "reasonably"
- No. 7—Clause 13 (Heading to Division 9), page 13, line 21—
After "**Kidnapping**" insert:
and unlawful child removal
- No. 8—Clause 13, page 12, after line 21—
Insert:
38—Interpretation
In this Division—
child means a person under the age of 18 years;
detain—detention is not limited to forcible restraint but extends to any means by which a person gets another to remain in a particular place or with a particular person or persons;
take—a person takes another if the person compels, entices or persuades the other to accompany him or her or a third person.
- No. 9—Clause 13 (new section 39(3), (4) and (5)), page 14, lines 2 to 23—

- Delete subsections (3), (4) and (5)
- No. 10—Clause 13, page 14, after line 23 insert:
40—Unlawful removal of a child from jurisdiction
(1) A person who wrongfully takes or sends a child out of the jurisdiction is guilty of an offence.
Maximum penalty:
(a) for a basic offence—imprisonment for 15 years;
(b) for an aggravated offence—imprisonment for 19 years.
(2) For the purposes of subsection (1), a person acts wrongfully if—
(a) the person acts in the knowledge that a person who has the lawful custody of the child (either alone or jointly with someone else) does not consent to the child being taken or sent out of the jurisdiction; and
Note—
As a general rule, the parents of a child have joint custody of the child (see *Guardianship of Infants Act 1940*, section 4).
(b) there is no judicial or statutory authority for the person's act.

REGIONAL SITTING

The Legislative Council, in reply to message No. 58 from the House of Assembly, indicated that it has made reciprocal arrangements in respect of messages and bills to be delivered to and received from the House of Assembly during the sittings of the House of Assembly at Mount Gambier from 3 to 5 May 2005.

ACTS INTERPRETATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

At 5.50 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 3 May at 2 p.m. at Mount Gambier.