

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 2 June 2005

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

HIV/AIDS PANDEMIC

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): I move:

That this house notes the reports and recommendations of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association study group on the role of parliamentarians in combating the HIV/AIDS pandemic.

I have moved this motion because I recently had the pleasure of attending the CPA executive meeting in Sydney, as part of my role as the regional representative. I was very impressed with the project work undertaken by the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and its constituent members around the commonwealth, particularly in a project they have to do with HIV/AIDS, and I think it is important that I bring it to the attention of the house. I have therefore moved this motion.

It is good that over recent years the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association has endeavoured to get involved in what I would call humanitarian projects. So, rather than just concentrating on parliamentary procedure and developing better forms of parliamentary practice and democracy throughout the commonwealth, they have also looked at ways of improving the quality of life for those people who live within the commonwealth. I think that is an important second string to the role of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association organised a study group on the role of parliamentarians in combating the HIV/AIDS pandemic, and they held a study group meeting in New Delhi, India, early in February 2005, which was hosted by the Indian branch of the CPA. The recommendations I am distributing today to members' boxes in Parliament House makes very interesting reading, and I hope members take the opportunity to read the recommendations from the CPA's study group. I understand that there will be another seminar on this very topic at the conference in Fiji in September.

The recommendations are about how parliamentarians throughout the commonwealth can help address the HIV/AIDS pandemic. We have to bear in mind that Australia, by world standards and especially by commonwealth standards, is probably the leading nation in the way in which it goes about treating, preventing and educating people about AIDS. A lot of the other countries in the commonwealth do not have our sophistication or resources in dealing with this issue. These recommendations are targeted at the commonwealth, and I will read some of them. Under the heading 'What should parliamentarians do?', it states:

- Ensure that they are informed about AIDS, act as advocates for those infected and affected, and demonstrate an openness of approach in dealing with AIDS.
- Vocalise to reduce stigma, social taboos and discrimination by helping to make AIDS a visible issue and addressing the myths and facts of AIDS.
- Address poverty issues that are intrinsically linked with AIDS.
- Visibly demonstrate their political will and commitment to ending AIDS.

- Involve parliamentarians and others to join national AIDS bodies and provide support.
- Involve faith-based organisations, NGOs and community-based organisations in addressing the issue of AIDS.
- Involve people in decision making, especially vulnerable and marginalised groups.
- Encourage the use of peer counsellors to facilitate access to information.
- Effectively utilise parliamentary processes to provide for increased accountability.
- Establish all party groups or caucuses on AIDS.
- Sign up to a creed of best practice for combating AIDS and countering stigma and discrimination.
- Support the commonwealth youth program's positive living ambassadors initiative.

Under the heading, 'What should legislatures do?', it states:

- They should promote AIDS education for parliamentarians; constituents and communities, and especially young people and those who are vulnerable; and schoolchildren, especially by ensuring that HIV education is included in the national curriculum.
- Establish standing committees on AIDS and receive a report from that committee on an annual basis to the parliament.
- Ensure that governments implement a multi-sectoral approach to combat the negative effect on the sustainability of economic and social development as a result of AIDS.
- Act as resource mobilisers.
- Address gender issues, including gender-based violence; empowerment of women; human trafficking and exploitation; and the role of men and boys.
- Monitor and evaluate the government's role in capacity building, especially things like improving the public health service and particularly the primary health care sector; provide for safe blood transfusions, voluntary counselling and testing; lifelong anti-retroviral therapies; the management of opportunistic infections; and investing in human capital and encouraging the retention of trained professions, especially in health care.

There are about another 15 or 20 recommendations in that section, and about 20 recommendations under the heading 'What the CPA would do?' I have distributed this to members today through their boxes, and I hope they take the opportunity to read it. It is important that we understand what the CPA is doing in relation to AIDS and how the other countries and, indeed, our own country, can look at those recommendations and see whether we can improve community education and therefore achieve a reduction in AIDS.

As part of their broadening of the role of the CPA, they are now bringing in keynote speakers to the executive committee meetings to try to educate members from around the world about various issues. It just so happened that at the Sydney executive committee meeting they had Justice Michael Kirby speak about the AIDS issue. It surprised me to learn that the commonwealth has 30 per cent of the world's population but 60 per cent of the world's AIDS population. Justice Kirby's submission to the executive committee was that AIDS is very much a commonwealth problem, and that the commonwealth countries need to do more to address the high incidence of AIDS. Of the world's AIDS population, 60 per cent resides within commonwealth countries.

Justice Kirby took the opportunity to address members of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association from countries all over the commonwealth to try and bring to their attention

the plight that their countries and the commonwealth has with AIDS, and try to encourage them to take back to their countries a passion to deal with this issue at the legislative and parliamentary level so that those countries can put in place proper procedures to deal with AIDS so that we do not continue with what can only be described as a pandemic. It was an excellent presentation by Justice Kirby, and I congratulate the CPA on bringing such a noted speaker on such a relevant topic to the attention of the CPA members. Justice Kirby, to his great credit, distributed and referred to a speech about this issue made at the London School of Economics on 8 February this year by Dr Peter Piot. 'Why AIDS is exceptional' is the topic of the speech. Dr Piot is the UNAIDS Executive Director. When you read this speech—a copy of which I have distributed—it is chilling reading. It states:

A mere disease, a disease that is not easily contagious, a disease that was circumscribed epidemic just 25 years ago, has morphed into a pandemic of cumulatively over 65 million people!

It goes on to state:

By next year, without far higher treatment rates, 11 sub-Saharan countries will have lost more than every 10th person, in their labour force to AIDS—by 2010.

So, within five years more than one in 10 people in their work force will have died as a result of AIDS, within that short period of time. It continues:

Five will have lost more than every fifth person in their labour force. Within the next five years, every sixth or seventh child in the worst affected sub-Saharan countries will be orphaned largely because of AIDS.

These are, indeed, chilling statistics, but I do not think that we as a parliament and the Australian community more broadly are aware of them in relation to this disease. I have distributed a copy of Dr Piot's speech today, and I hope they take the opportunity to read it, because I think it is a sobering reminder of how lucky we are in this country, and also what an important role the commonwealth can play in combating this disease.

Interestingly enough, it is India that is one of the hot-beds of AIDS, and not necessarily some of the other countries that the community might think. I understand that India is one of the main countries now where AIDS is taking control, and it will have a massive effect on its economy, because it wipes out the young work force of the future. Not only is it a social, family and human issue but it is also an economic issue for those countries. Dr Piot says that adequate financing is important. He states that, though funding for the response in lower middle income countries has soared from under \$300 million in 1996, they now contribute something like \$6.1 billion in 2004. But that is half of what they need in 2005; they need around \$12 billion in 2005 to deal with this pandemic of AIDS in the commonwealth countries.

I am in the process of writing to the Premier of Victoria, Steve Bracks. Australia hosts the Commonwealth Games in 2006. I think Australia should attempt to make those Commonwealth Games an opportunity to educate the commonwealth countries about AIDS. I think that the athletes should be encouraged to carry AIDS messages and become ambassadors, if you like, about the AIDS issue. Because there will be television and a lot of publicity going back to those commonwealth countries, we can get the athletes and Commonwealth Games on board, and we can send a very positive message back to those commonwealth countries about the need to implement proper AIDS education and health policies within those countries.

I have also taken the opportunity to write to the Australian Cricket Board, which has a number of activities right throughout the commonwealth, whether they be through the test matches, one-day games, or a lot of their Cricket academies. We all know that cricket is a game of the commonwealth. It can be used as a very positive role model if we can get the Australian Cricket Board on-side to deal with the Indian Cricket Board and the other cricket boards about delivering a positive message about the treatment of AIDS. I was stunned when I heard the statistics about AIDS within the commonwealth. As I said, 60 per cent of the world's AIDS population lives within commonwealth countries. I thought it was my responsibility as the CPA rep to bring both the report and the speech to the attention of the parliament. I think it is something that the parliament should note, and I encourage members to read not only the recommendations and the speech that I have distributed, but if they want the full report it is available from the CPA website.

Debate adjourned.

APY LANDS

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: On 30 May, earlier this week, the member for Mitchell asked me: 'Why will the Premier not agree to a meeting with the former coordinator of the APY lands, Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue,' and I replied: 'I met with her a few weeks ago, actually, and we had a very good discussion—but I am quite happy to check the file. I am happy to meet with her at some stage. I have done it is many times before.' I just wanted to say that, as members know, I was overseas for two weeks and before that I was in Mount Gambier. My recollection was that we had met in April, but I have checked the file and I understand that I last met with her on 23 March.

An honourable member: How many times?

The SPEAKER: Order! It is not question time now.

HIV/AIDS PANDEMIC

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Mitchell wish to speak to the matter before the house?

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Yes. I am speaking in support of a motion moved by the Hon. Iain Evans in relation to a study group report on the role of parliamentarians in combating the HIV/AIDS pandemic. The report was prepared by a study group under the auspices of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Some people may think that that association does little more than gather at conferences and discuss the problems of the world without doing very much, but a number of study groups and working groups of this particular CPA do a lot of good through education, diplomacy and support, especially for countries that are still developing their economy and their democracy.

The fact is that parliamentarians, as community leaders, can do a lot in educating their own community and other communities abroad about how to deal with HIV and AIDS. The problem is not one that is just restricted to other commonwealth countries. We have our own fears, prejudices and ignorance about HIV/AIDS in our own community. It is probably only the fact that we have a relatively low incidence of HIV/AIDS compared to parts of Africa and other parts of

the world that it is not raised more often as a public issue. But, certainly, that prejudice and ignorance is there. One of the most obvious myths is that, if someone contracts the HIV condition, they will die shortly. However, that is not the case. With an appropriate fitness regime, retroviral drugs and appropriate medical treatment generally it is possible to live a long and happy life with an HIV condition. Indeed, a good friend of mine recently turned 60 after many years of living with HIV, and I am glad to say that he is fit and well.

I want to make specific mention of South Africa, because I have visited it several times (not necessarily as a member of parliament) and it typifies probably the worst of the ignorance and prejudice that exists in relation to HIV/AIDS. The health minister of that country has publicly stated by way of advice to the people of South Africa that, if one lives on a diet of garlic, lemon juice and beetroot, one will not catch AIDS.

Ms Bedford: Or anything else.

Mr HANNA: Or anything else, as the member for Florey interjected. This sort of absurdly ignorant tripe would be laughable if it was not for the fact that many lesser educated people in South Africa will take notice of what their national health minister says. Other South African leaders betray a similar ignorance. Modern science has a lot to offer for those who suffer from HIV/AIDS and those who are at risk of contracting HIV/AIDS through their sexual practices, whether they be homosexual, heterosexual or something else, and that is the way forward.

Parliamentarians can play a role. The fact is that we have a prominent role to play in our own community. On the rare occasions that we travel interstate and overseas we have a prominent role to play when we are dealing with community leaders, leaders in the economy and leaders of society in different ways, and we can play a very important role in spreading the message that HIV/AIDS is largely preventable through safe sexual practices and, indeed, is largely treatable, in terms of the symptoms and development of the disease, if proper medical science is applied. This is a motion which should go beyond politics and which should be supported by all members of the house.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I also would like to support the motion in the name of my colleague the member for Davenport, and I commend the member for Mitchell for what he said. Lest this house think that ignorance is confined to the health minister in South Africa, I remind this house that tens of thousands of citizens in the United States had died before the then president of the United States, Ronald Reagan, uttered the word 'AIDS'. Indeed, when the nature of the condition was discovered by health specialists in the United States, the health specialists reporting it in an official government publication actually said that this was a disease thought to affect homosexual men.

When the publication appeared, the words 'homosexual men' had been struck out. The medical researcher was most angry about this and went to his supervisors and said, 'Why has this major characteristic of this new phenomenon been struck out?' The answer was, 'Because if you want it published—and it is important that people in the medical profession are made aware of the existence of this new condition—if you mention the word "homosexual" it will never be published.' That was the prevailing attitude of authority in the United States at the time. And it is a story in itself how tens of thousands of same-sex attracted people, the Christian church and other institutions forced AIDS onto the

agenda of America because Ronald Reagan, the then president of the United States, beholden to the Bible belt, really thought that, if it did exist, it was the punishment that gays deserved for their immoral and wicked practices.

There are even people who said, 'This is the wrath of God visited upon the sinful.' We have seen AIDS move and, as I understand it—I am not a doctor—there are at least two strains now, one of which is still largely predominant in the same-sex attracted community, or the HIV drug using community, and the other which has evolved and is sweeping through Africa through normal heterosexual sex. So, by not containing it early enough—and I do not know if we could in some of the countries where it appeared—it has become a bigger pandemic than ever it was. We are very fortunate in Australia because, despite what I would still describe as the inherent prejudice of many of our houses of parliament, nevertheless, the governments of Australia, and the affected groups, took a pragmatic and cooperative approach. People who were same-sex attracted realised that it was a matter that affected them, and they did something about it. Governments who did not want to be seen approving same-sex relationships, nevertheless, set up clinics and a whole lot of health preventative measures which were very sensible.

So, this country, because of the sensible and pragmatic approach taken by executive governments in authority at the time, and by affected groups, has controlled this problem much more than it has been in places like South Africa. As my colleague, the member for Davenport, said, we represent, as part of the Commonwealth, 30 per cent of the world's population, yet represent 60 per cent of the world's AIDS cases. There is something very wrong. In commending the member for Davenport, I strike a word of warning to this house, and it is that, as prejudice is alive and well in America so prejudice is alive and well in Australia. There are those who will not have the guts to get up in this debate and say, 'Serves them right,' but there are those, I believe, in this house, who believe that it does—that it is not only a medical condition but it is a moral judgement on people in respect of a lifestyle.

When we debate various measures in this house, I am afraid that it is my personal opinion that just beneath the surface some of this ignorance and prejudice exists. I do not condemn my colleagues for that but I think that we are not just a reflection of society in this house but that we are also elected to lead society, and, while we cannot lead our electors further than we can explain to them the journey that they are making, we should nevertheless try to be an example.

I think that that is the nitty-gritty of the member for Davenport's motion to the house. I can well remember the first time that one of my constituents came to me and told me that he was HIV positive. I will not use his full name, but his name was Graeme, and I think the minister knew him as well because we share adjacent electorates. Graeme was HIV positive and he was then in stage four. He was a man 10 years younger than myself, and he was quite clearly—without being a doctor—you could see that he was dying. I rang one of the government departments because Graeme could not get a disabled car permit.

When I rang the government department, it was typical of our bureaucracies because it was all about the fact that he was not incapacitated in any motor way. He could still use his arms and legs so, therefore, he did not fit the criteria, even though he was incontinent, and had lots of other medical problems which meant he needed to be very close to his car, and able to get quickly from A to B, because he had all sorts

of physical problems and biological problems. They said, 'No, he does not qualify.' In fairness to them, I said frankly (and I can say this to the house now because the man has died), 'This guy is dying, and if you give him a temporary car park it is not as if he is going to use it for very long, and it might be a decent and humane thing to do.' In total fairness, they gave him one.

I can tell the house that the postscript to this was rather funny. The cocktail of drugs then came in, and Graeme lived for the next 13 years, which always slightly embarrassed me and I was never game to ask him whether he had retained his incapacitated car park. However, because of the new cocktail he had 13 years of additional life. He died in the middle of last year, much better resolved to his condition. I saw him not long before he died and he said, 'Look Mark, I had 13 years more than I expected to have.' He had worked through all the issues that I think many people go through on the way to their death, and he died—maybe not happy, and certainly before his time—but, at least, aided along the way.

I think part of Graeme's journey is the message to this house, that people through lifestyle, and through various factors, will contract this disease and it is indiscriminate. Not every same-sex attracted man gets it. I would put to you that if it were God's judgement, some of those who may be the most promiscuous—whom you would most expect to get it—seem to avoid it, and some who get it, seem to be very unlucky. It is like every disease: indiscriminate, and it strikes down some and does not strike down others.

I think the member for Davenport is wise in bringing this motion before the house because he highlights the need not only in South Africa, not only in Zimbabwe and those other cases where this pandemic is rife, but also in this country as well. If we, as members of parliament, are going to do our job, we must reflect the attitudes of the people we represent but we must always push to take community consciousness to a higher level, to actually increase social justice for all our citizens, and to increase concepts of equity and fairness. If by bringing this motion before the house the member for Davenport does nothing other than put before our conscience that even in South Australia we need to do better then he has done well by it. So, he is correct. There is a message, maybe a different message from parts of the Commonwealth, but there remains a message for us as well. I therefore commend him for bringing this motion to the house, and wholeheartedly support it.

Mr RAU (Enfield): I also commend the member for Davenport for bringing the matter to the house. I think it is an important issue for us to have regard to. I had the experience, many years ago, of working as an adviser to the then federal minister for community services and health, Dr Neil Blewett, when he was involved in the initial phase of the AIDS Awareness Program. I think it is very fortunate that Australia had such farsighted policies in those early days, because, in this country, we have been spared some of the more extreme consequences of this dreadful pandemic as a result of the very early, quite brave decisions taken by the Australian government to move into a public awareness campaign which did not gild the lily but deliberately set out to shock people into taking some responsibility for the consequences of their own actions. We are still living on the dividend of that early intervention by government, and it is a dividend that I am afraid we are now starting to squander, because we have not kept up the same level of pressure and momentum in the public awareness program about this

disease in this country. Over a number of years I think a more complacent attitude has tended to creep into the public psyche about this illness.

This illness, perhaps more than any other, is bound up with moral, ethical and other baggage which make it extremely difficult to treat this problem as it should be treated. I am one of those people who is firmly of the view that, until the moral baggage, prejudice and political correctness which seek to pander to minority groups and not to upset their feelings is all removed from this debate, we will never see the best possible effort that we can put in to solve this problem. I think it is very important that we recognise this.

The member for Unley, in his remarks, talked about how there is a danger in this from the moralists who say, 'It is your fault. You deserve this.' I agree with him. There is no room in this debate for moralising, standing on high ground and pointing the finger at other people. However, ultimately, this debate is not about lifestyle or morality, or even the rights of minorities, because I fear that the one thing that the member for Unley did not mention is the fact that this debate is clouded just as much by people who stand up on the minority rights platform and beat their drums as it is by the people who stand on the moral platform. Both of them are more interested in pursuing their particular view of the world than they are in solving this problem.

Actually, this is a medical problem, in the same way as many other medical problems: it is caused by a virus. Having regard to the fact that this virus is incurable at the present time, there is only one way to stop people being infected, and that is prevention. Cure does not exist. All that can be done is to modify the degree of inconvenience and slow the slide to death as a result of the contraction of the virus. If we are serious about dealing with this problem—not just in Australia but around the world—we need to be serious about preventing people acquiring the virus in the first place.

The member for Unley said that this disease is indiscriminate. That is not entirely true, because there are certain behaviours which increase a person's risk of contracting this virus. Without stepping into the politically correct minefield, I give one example—intravenous drug users, sharing needles. This is a simple example of where—and I hope I have not offended the politically correct—people are playing Russian roulette. You can play Russian roulette with this illness in many other ways; so, it is not entirely indiscriminate. It is true that whether the chamber is loaded on a particular occasion may be a matter of luck, but whether you are engaging in an activity which is going to increase the chances of your becoming infected with this ailment is not a matter of luck: it is a matter of choice.

Individuals need to consider the information that is available to them, and governments need to be able to get the information out. Governments need to keep up the pressure and keep informing the public about the behaviours that are risky, why they are risky and, if people want to continue to engage in risky behaviours, how at least that can be moderated to some degree with the use of condoms and other such things. I think it is a very important debate. We are very lucky in Australia, as I said, that Dr Blewett, in his capacity as the minister for community services and health, did an outstanding job in what was, in the context of the current thoughts of the time, a very brave and groundbreaking educational program. I should say that it was supported by the opposition at the time. It was not as if it were a question about which there was great debate across the political divide in Canberra.

However, the fact is that some pretty important initiatives were put in place at that time. As I said before, I think we have been reaping the dividends of those government initiatives now for over 15 years, and we in Australia should not simply look at the tragedy that is going on in Africa and say, 'Thank goodness that is not us.' Obviously, any sensible person would say to that, 'Thank goodness that is not us'—

Ms Bedford: Yet.

Mr RAU: Yet; exactly—and wipe their hands of that and say that it is nice that they are getting drug cocktails or whatever under the arrangements they have made with the drug companies. We need to say to ourselves that it is an alternative future for us still. The fact that we are not there now is not simply because we are not Africans: it is because we have had courageous governments which were prepared to take the steps that needed to be taken in a timely fashion and which were frank and open with the public.

The public has learnt from that, and it has saved us an enormous amount of pain and anguish. But it is a continuing job—it has not finished, just because of Dr Blewett's advertisements with the grim reaper and the bowling ball 15 or 20 years ago. People are now confronting the issues of these behaviours and risks who were not even born when that campaign commenced; there are people who do not remember what a close-run thing it was to actually get a blood test to identify whether blood donors were HIV-positive, and how close the blood supply came to being corrupted back 20-odd years ago.

I very much support the honourable member's motion, and I think it is a very important thing for this parliament. However, I think all of us in this parliament, as representatives of the community in South Australia, need to be aware that is not satisfactory just to rest on our laurels and say, 'Well, 20 years ago state and federal governments did a good thing, and we now reaping the rewards. The problem is fixed and let's move on to the next thing.' The problem is not fixed and it never will be, but I believe we can still do more to maintain the practices that we know are required to make sure that the groups at greatest risk are fully informed what is going on, because as soon as we take that pressure off those people they will move back to their default setting—which is risky behaviour and problems which can be avoided, such as intravenous drug-users sharing needles, and so on.

I commend the motion and hope that all of us see governments, both state and federal, keeping up the good work that has been done over many years and not assume that the problem has been solved. There are new people coming on stream every year—new people who are being introduced to drugs and new people who are being introduced to sexual practices—who have not heard about the stuff that has gone on in the last 20 years, and we need to be looking at them every year, continuously.

Motion carried.

SPIRIT OF GALLIPOLI INITIATIVE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): I move:

That this house—

- (a) congratulates the Returned & Services League and the Association of the 9th Battalion Royal Australian Regiment for the successful Spirit of Gallipoli initiative; and
- (b) commends the History Trust of South Australia and the Migration Museum for their contribution to the event.

Members will be aware that we spoke on this matter in the house on 9 December, when I put a motion seeking some

financial support from the state government to assist with this fine initiative. The motion was roundly supported in a bipartisan way by all. In fact, the Premier, to his great credit, came in with a \$15 000 contribution and, in a sense, kick-started government's involvement in what was already a well advanced initiative put together by the RSL. Later, I wrote to DeAnne Kelly, the federal minister, and she provided a paltry \$2 000 under the 'Saluting Their Service' grants program.

Mrs Bedford: You promised more!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes; I think she could have done much better, to be frank. The RSL raised a substantial contribution from its many sponsors who, I should draw to the attention of the house, included: Singapore Airlines, Ramsay Health Care, Channel 7, Johnson & Johnson, Graphpak, Signs Inc., The Bureau, Medals Mementos and More, and Sea Link. Of course, the event was also supported by contributions, raffle tickets and various other devices by members of the RSL. It was supported, as I mentioned, by the South Australian government, General Cosgrove, the Honorary Consul of the Turkish Republic in South Australia Mr Mutlu Kadife, by members of the RSL (as I have mentioned), the Turkish War Veterans Association, the South Australian Migration Museum, the History Trust of South Australia, the War Veterans Home, the Repatriation General Hospital, the Royal Australian Regiment Association, the Korean and Southeast Asia Forces Association, Frances Bedford MP, Major-General Morrison, Dr Peter Furze, and Murchison Grade Control Pty Ltd, as well as Dr Martyn Ewer of Mitcham.

All these people made this event possible, and members will recall that it involved bringing five Turkish war veterans from Turkey to Adelaide for the 90th commemoration of ANZAC Day on 25 April. The commemorations included a range of events which reaffirmed the bonds of comradeship and friendship that already exist between the Returned and Services League of Australia and the Turkish War Veterans Association. There were a number of activities apart, obviously, from a welcoming. There was a wreath-laying ceremony at the Light Horse Memorial, visits to RSL state headquarters, meetings with the Turkish community, visits to Parliament House and the Repatriation General Hospital, and a series of commemorations which included the Migration Museum's opening of its exhibition, 'Gallipoli: The South Australian Story'.

Other events included the Kapyong Day Memorial Service—and members will recall that great battle during the Korean War, which occurred on the cusp of ANZAC Day. Indeed, one of the Turkish veterans was a veteran of that war. Then, of course, there was the North Terrace vigil on ANZAC Eve, 24 April; similar vigils at Blackwood and at Morphett Vale; and then the Dawn Service on 25 April, a gunfire breakfast, the ANZAC Day March and attendance at the Cross of Sacrifice. Later, the Turkish veterans were whisked away to Canberra to complete their tour. Overall, it was an extremely successful event which I think caused many to reflect on the spirit of friendship that has emerged from those dark days of 1915.

In particular, I want to congratulate Margaret Anderson, the Chief Executive of the History Trust of South Australia and Chief Executive of the Migration Museum as well for their fantastic 'Gallipoli: The South Australian Story' exhibition which was launched, and which Minister Weatherill attended, at the Torrens Training Depot during the period of the Spirit of Gallipoli initiative. It was a very good exhibition, which overviewed the role of so many South

Australians in the campaign. Personal stories were told and the display included many personal items, memorabilia, maps etc, belonging to individual South Australians who had served at Gallipoli and subsequently. Stories were told in the exhibition of the 27th Battalion, the 9th and 3rd Light Horse and that famous 10th Battalion, the predominantly South Australian battalion that played such a vital role in the Gallipoli campaign and other campaigns that followed. I should particularly mention Warren Featherby's role as the coordinator of the event. Warren, from the 9RAR Association, very much drove the whole project. He put in weeks of work leading up to and during the event. It was pretty stressful for him and his family—

Ms Bedford interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Yes, I think his wife needs a pat on the back as well. As always with such events, they are driven forward by volunteers. The RSL had some resources to use but, essentially, it was the personal commitment from Warren and others in the 9RAR Association who made it possible. I should also mention Dr Kemal Turker from the Turkish community, who was very involved with the RSL and with Warren in making this event possible. There were others from the Turkish community—Mutlu Kadife, Demiray Simsek, Hulya Gilbert, Mehmet Kirtas and many others—all of whom threw their time and effort into making the Spirit of Gallipoli initiative such a success. There was a little bit of controversy surrounding the event in that there was some concern and, in a way, quite legitimate concern from some members of the community that the event might go beyond the spirit of Gallipoli.

In particular, some of the Cypriot community, the Kurdish and Armenian communities were understandably concerned that this event might brush over many of the injustices that have been committed by the actions of the Republic of Turkey in the years that followed the First World War; in particular, the invasion of Cyprus in 1974. I was in Cyprus shortly after that invasion, and it was a terrible and dark time for all Cypriots. There have been other very serious concerns raised by Armenians, by the Pontian Brotherhood and, as I mentioned, Cypriots and Kurds concerning actions of the Republic of Turkey. The government of Australia and, I am sure, members in this chamber, would share many of those concerns and would raise those concerns quite openly and wilfully with the Republic of Turkey.

I want to make the point that the Spirit of Gallipoli initiative by the RSL was not about the actions of the Republic of Turkey since the First World War and not about the terrible and scurrilous invasion of Cyprus. It was about the bonds that brought together at the time of the Gallipoli campaign these young men of both Turkish and Australian birth who found themselves enemies, fighting as part of a broader war, caught up in circumstances they probably did not fully understand but totally committed to their respective countries: in the case of the young Turks, defending their homeland and, in the case of the young Australians, fighting for their country, for the empire and for their families, all with the highest moral objectives in mind and all doing their best for what they believed was right.

That is what this project, the Spirit of Gallipoli initiative, was all about. If we can look at it in that way and respect it in that way and commend the RSL and the 9RAR Association and all involved for making it possible, I think we go some way towards recognising that, after war, we can accept its terrible evil and make the world a more peaceful and better place. I certainly felt, during the Spirit of Gallipoli initiative,

that there was a feeling of forgiveness and of wanting to put the past behind us. Even though the sons, grandsons and great-grandsons of the veterans, both Turkish and Australian, were there commemorating the event, there was a feeling that what had happened those 90 years ago could be forgotten and in the spirit of friendship we could go forward together. That message of goodwill is a message of goodwill that applies to all conflicts.

It was remarkable to see a Turkish veteran, the leader of the Turkish delegation and our own President of the RSL with their arms around each other speaking at a public meeting and moving on into the future, having put the past behind them. It was really quite touching. I say personally, to those communities that had some concerns about this event, that I share their concerns, but that was not what this event was about. Those issues were not raised during the Spirit of Gallipoli initiative. They are separate issues which warrant everyone's focused attention and which have occurred mainly since the First World War. The Spirit of Gallipoli initiative does offer some hope that Turks and others can put the past behind them and go forward to a better future. In that respect, all the communities that have raised issues should take some comfort.

I commend the RSL and 9RAR for what they achieved, and I thank the Premier for coming up with the money. I thank my colleague Frances Bedford, the member for Florey, for her personal commitment to the event. It would have been nice to see more of the Premier during the event but I know that the member for Florey was present at just about everything, as was I, and it was nice to see the government's support for the event. I think that was demonstrated by the History Trust and by the Migration Museum and the fantastic job they did in making it possible.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I commend the motion and the member for Waite. He has been a tremendous support to me, as well, as I move around the returned services community. We do everything in a bipartisan fashion and there is absolutely no question about our commitment to the well-being of the veteran community in South Australia. How lucky we are to have such a wonderful idea as the Spirit of Gallipoli come out of our group of returned people here in South Australia. As the member for Waite said, Warren Featherby was the catalyst for this, along with Mick Mummery, the RSL and the 9RAR. Through their hard work they managed to have this wonderful success.

Hard work has never been a problem for our soldiers and nor has been taking calculated risks. That is what they did. This germ of an idea grew from the passion of the men who visited Gallipoli and became friends with their guides over there, who were returned Turkish soldiers. They began the whole process without any backing, so when the Premier made the first grant it was very reassuring for them, along with their growing list of sponsors. I think it was Singapore Airlines that came in without any questions whatsoever, and we need to thank that company for its sponsorship of the Turkish veterans' flights throughout Australia. The friendships that have come from this wonderful idea have built on the ties that bind us all. The member for Waite will correct me if I am wrong, but I believe the Turks were our allies in Kapyong.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: Yes.

Ms BEDFORD: Dr Donald Beard, who was the surgeon for the RAR, who went with them to Vietnam and who was heavily involved with the establishment of the Modbury

Public Hospital, was at Kapyong Day, and he and Len Opie told us incredible stories about that battle, because one of the Turkish servicemen from the group was in Kapyong on that day.

The really poignant event was when we went to the Migration Museum for the launch of the exhibition. Following the Aboriginal welcome to land by Uncle Lewis O'Brien—and I mention this because it is Reconciliation Week—I took up Uncle Lewis's remarks and said how it was important for us to remember that Aboriginal people had been on Gallipoli that day. After my speech a woman came up to me and said, 'You have your facts wrong, you know.' I said, 'Really? How is that?' She said, 'There were no Aboriginal people on Gallipoli. I have searched all the records.' I said, 'We'd better go and speak to Uncle Lewis about that.' Of course, the last name of the young Aboriginal man who was at Gallipoli and who died later on in the war was Walker, I think, and, as the woman said, she could not pick Walker as an indigenous name, and that made everyone in earshot realise that indigenous people were at Gallipoli.

The whole week of engagements was a wonderful thing to witness and I was very privileged to have the Premier allow me attend so many events. I know that there were some he wanted to attend, but he was not able to, so it was my privilege to have been part of it and my very great honour to be able to attend so many events with the returned services people in our community. I thank everyone involved in the Spirit of Gallipoli, and I thank the member for Waite for his support. It was a wonderful experience.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): I, too, speak in support of this motion and I commend the member for Waite for bringing it to the attention of the house. The Spirit of Gallipoli was a tremendously successful initiative, bringing five Turkish ex-servicemen out to Australia to celebrate the iconic event that ANZAC Day is in this country. It has proved to us all that, irrespective of which country's army or defence force you belong to—and this particularly relates to the First World War, perhaps not to other subsequent conflicts—at the end of the day everyone is an individual human being. Those five elderly gentlemen coming from Turkey to South Australia is really strong evidence that that was the case. They are obviously respected in their communities, just as thousands of World War I, World War II and Vietnam veterans, indeed, veterans from any conflict that Australia has been involved in, are respected. By the largest percentage, they are very respected members of the community, and that is exactly what these Turkish gentlemen are. I think it has a positive effect on our view on history, and the initiative was an outstanding measure.

I commend the state government for its support. The federal government was also supportive of it, and it was a bipartisan move by everyone. There was some criticism of the RSL's involvement. I had a good conversation about the matter with the State President of the RSL at an RSL dinner at one of the sub-branches in my electorate. He put the issue very clearly to me, and I am absolutely supportive of the RSL's stance on it as well.

Over the last three years and a few months, I have enjoyed the very strong relationship I have been able to forge with the RSL sub-branches in my electorate. They are a tremendous group of people with a common interest, no matter what their age or what conflict they were involved in through the decades. My wife and I always have real pleasure in attending the RSL functions that are held in the Kavel electorate. It is

a strong organisation in our electorate, and we have a number of sub-branches—Lobethal, Hahndorf, Gumeracha, Nairne and Mount Barker, to list a few. My wife and I look forward to those diary commitments when we have the opportunity to go along to the annual dinners and commemorate what a great organisation the RSL is.

As I think I have mentioned previously in the house, I think the RSL is part of the fabric of our society today, and it is one of those institutions that forms the backbone of our community. It is very pleasing that the younger generation who, for a number of reasons I will explore in a minute, support those institutions and days such as ANZAC Day dawn services. We saw the tens of thousands of young Australian who attended the dawn service at Gallipoli, as well as the hundreds of people who turned out for dawn services I attended in the Kavel electorate. Anything up to 400 people attend the Mount Barker dawn service, and Hahndorf was the same, about 300 people attending the dawn service there. I had the pleasure of being involved in the dawn service at the small village of Houghton, which is my home district; at least 300 people attended that service on ANZAC Day.

I think the increase in patriotism among the Australian community has come about, although not entirely, because of the stance taken by the federal government on these issues. During the Whitlam, Hawke and Keating years of federal Labor, the Defence Forces and their funding were not a priority. In some ways, I think people got the idea that as a nation—perhaps it was as a result of federal policy—we were ashamed of what we had done. I can tell members that the people in my district and I have never been ashamed of what occurred and consider and believe that due recognition should always be paid to those people who were involved in one way or another in defending our country.

The current federal Liberal government is extremely proud of the achievements of our Defence Forces, and that is recognised in more ways than one. I think the position the federal government takes on these matters is reflected in the general community's feelings. I know a lot of people do not agree with it, but we see that troops are being committed to the Iraqi conflict and to other areas of the world. We have been into Timor and straightened out that mess, and there are issues in Papua-New Guinea, where Defence Forces will have to be deployed. Also, Defence Forces were deployed to remedy the situation in the Solomon Islands, where rogue individuals were reigning terror on the locals. I do not think anyone disagrees with that, but I know there are fairly strong feelings for and against the deployment of troops to Iraq. However, the federal government makes no excuses for that, because it supports supporting that conflict, and all power to the federal government for continuing with its stance.

We have seen what happened to the Vietnam veterans when they returned from that conflict. Until a number of years ago, they received no recognition for the trials and tribulations they endured, and they had to deal with the resultant scars and adverse effects that they brought back with them—and we continue to see that even now, some 40 years after that conflict. I know a number of Vietnam veterans (they are 10 or so years older than I), and they are dealing with issues that are a legacy of that conflict. I commend the member for Waite for bringing this matter to the house, and I support it fully.

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I also had the pleasure of attending a number of events in the Migration Museum at the History Trust and the vigil at the War Memorial. I had the

opportunity of speaking to the leader of the Turkish delegation. As the member for Waite said, this was a very controversial decision and it did upset some people. But as the leader of the Turkish delegation said, 'Remember, it is the politicians who make decisions to go to war; the soldiers just carry out those orders.'

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise to support this motion and I commend the member for Waite for bringing it here, and, again, recognising his exemplary record in serving our country in the way he has done. As an ex-soldier myself—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: No; two years' national service. I am also a member of the RSL.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I also have a very good relationship with my RSL sub-branches, as the member for Kavel just said, and I rely on them to not only give me advice politically, but they also support me in most things we do, and they are all very good friends of mine, particularly in the sub-branches in Kapunda, three or four in the Barossa and particularly Mannum, as it has a very strong branch, and it has a yearly dinner. In this job, I always appreciate getting invited to functions early. The Mannum RSL always gives me 11 months notice, and I always go. It has key speakers like Bruce Ruxton and others, and they really put it on. They have a full house there at the Mannum club. It is one of those events that members do not miss. I commend them, and I really enjoy it. That is what makes being a member of parliament so enjoyable.

I return to the motion. I have no problem with bringing the five Turkish ex-servicemen here. I had no problem with that. I knew it was going to be controversial, as the member for Norwood just said, but I do not believe we should carry these ill-feelings from generation to generation. I think it was a very mature and understanding thing to do to bring them here and say, 'Look, we as a nation don't hold a grudge against the Turks for what happened.' After all, it was the decision of the British; it was not our decision, nor was it theirs. They were just defending their country. Really, the debate is: should we have even been there? We cannot rewrite history—we were. That is the debate.

I think we came of age when these five Turkish ex-soldiers came to our country. I think we have come of age, and we have all accepted it. I think we all have to accept it. It is history. Even though it is a vital part of their heritage, and we know that and we all accept that, I think it is a part of our nation building. It is an event of which all Australians—even though we lost; arguably, we did not win it—are immensely proud of what happened and how our soldiers fought there. As a country we have come of age. As we know, the ANZAC tradition is going to live on. We thought that, 10 to 15 years ago, it was going to die as the ex-servicemen and old diggers died off, particularly from the First World War. We thought it would die, but, no, sir, the opposite is happening now; there is a resurgence. Our young people have such different values to me—a person in the second half of his life—but I am really heartened to see young people, teenagers, having this commonality in which we can all share the pride of our ex-servicemen. I certainly get a good feeling about that, when a family can go together and in one commonality we support what we are going through ANZAC. Even though our diggers are dying off, I believe the ANZAC tradition will live forever.

Finally, I want to congratulate the RSL and the 9RAR for their efforts in relation to the spirit, and for bringing out the diggers from Turkey. I would also like to thank the History Trust and the Migration Museum. I also want to say to the member for Waite, thank you for bringing this motion to us. It is great that, in a parliament of 47 people, you have people like the member for Waite, with the background that he has, coming into this place. Not only was he a military person but he was a military person who served with extremely high office in the proudest corps in Australia. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): In closing the debate, I thank honourable members for their contributions. I think the message that the contributions send to the RSL and the 9RAR Association is that the parliament thinks that they have done an outstanding job in coming up with this idea and implementing it so well. As the leader of the Turkish veteran delegation would say to people as you went from event to event: politicians decide there is to be a war, not soldiers; soldiers get the job of fighting it. It behoves us all to have a little think about that, because there is an irony and a truth in it that warrants careful consideration. It also shows us that here in South Australia we have a vibrant RSL.

Mr Jock Stretton, a Vietnam veteran, as president has taken over and heralded a new guard, if you like, at the RSLs. This is happening right around the country now. The Vietnam veterans are starting to take charge of the organisation, receiving the baton from the World War II generation. It is great that they came up with innovative idea like this. It brought schoolchildren into the cusp, and involved them the process; it brought the broader community in; it brought the parliament in; it brought all the ex-service groups in; and it brought a whole range of outside groups into the ANZAC Day event, and I think sent a very positive message back out that, after war, there can be some reconciliation and moving on. In that respect it was good. It was a terrific effort from our local South Australian RSL and our local branch of the 9RAR association that they came up with the idea and made such good job of it.

Motion carried.

RURAL PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I move:

That this house condemns the government for its total lack of major public works projects, especially country roads, country health facilities, country schools and country recreational facilities.

The Rann Labor government (or, as I heard the Attorney-General say the other day, the Rann Labor national coalition government—and that is pertinent to this motion) has obvious disrespect for people in rural South Australia. As a member of the Public Works Committee, I have noticed, since it formed government in 2002 (with the support, as I said, of these Independents), the total lack of money being spent on infrastructure anywhere in South Australia, but particularly in country areas. I expected a resurgence in the last 12 to 18 months, but it just has not happened. Quality roads, hospitals, schools and recreational facilities are few and far between in the country regions of South Australia—as you, sir, would know (and I move across a large section of it), from the Barossa right up to the Mid North. Even though these rural communities are crying out for financial help, the city-centric Rann Labor national coalition government

continues to push them aside and ignore them. It just does not recognise any priority.

Country South Australia is not a priority for this government. Due to its total ignorance with respect to country South Australia, we as a state are falling behind. We continue to see a real explosion of infrastructure in other parts of Australia—in Sydney, Darwin and Melbourne—and we as a state remain stagnant. We should make comparisons with the other states. We need to drive around the highways. You know when you reach the border, because the road improves. In the Outback in Queensland and South Australia you travel on some of the roughest roads, and at the Queensland border it becomes a bitumen highway. As a consequence, a lot of the activity that would normally come to Adelaide is now going to Brisbane—because of the road access. I become very concerned when I compare our situation with that of other states.

The 2005 Productivity Commission report on government services reveals that the Rann Labor government spends just \$9 a person on road safety and traffic management issues compared to \$29 a person annually in other states. When one compares that to \$46 a person, for example, in Western Australia, one wonders how South Australia can spend only that much. What is the difference between us and Western Australia? We have a similar population versus size versus road kilometres—in fact, we probably would be in a better situation than Western Australia. I despair: \$9 a person on road safety and traffic management, yet \$800 million is taken out of the hip pocket of the motorist here in South Australia in one way or another, again, in the areas that are part of the road safety contribution. I cannot believe that that can be so, and it is not well known.

In its 3½ years in office, the government has failed to address the \$200 million road maintenance backlog (a figure which came from the RAA): \$200 million needs to be spent, and this is the sort of money that the government is blowing on other things. We have new trams. I have no problem with new trams. As the member for Glenelg said yesterday, I think, we do support trams. However, we must have a priority. It is no solace to the people living in the Outback or the Mid North, where they have these terribly rough roads, that Adelaide has new trams; some of them very seldom visit Adelaide.

The Rann Labor government needs to inject more money into infrastructure in both city and country areas to ensure economic growth for the state. To say that the Public Works Committee has been swamped with projects of late is ridiculous. It did change yesterday: we had two projects, but both were really hangers from the previous government. Even though those projects have been funded by this government, the idea and the demand came from the previous Liberal government. We are 3¼ years into the term of this new government.

Yesterday, the committee began discussing stages 2 and 3 of the Port River project—which, of course, is a fixed bridge versus a lifting bridge. The Public Works Committee has had very few meetings over the last 18 months. I commend our staff for doing what they can: we certainly have been trained very well. We get on pretty well as a committee and we endeavour to do good things for the parliament, but we just do not have these high-level infrastructure projects coming to the committee. Of course, any project over \$4 million has to be referred to the committee, and you do not get much for \$4 million today (even though it is to be amended to \$5 million). I hope that that will change. How-

ever, I do not see it changing, because we are now just over nine months out from a state election.

As I said, the only projects with which the committee has been dealing are the leftovers from the previous government. When will it build its first major piece of infrastructure to create jobs and boost the economy? As a member of the committee, I am disappointed by the lack of major public works only nine months before the election. The Minister for Infrastructure really is the minister for not much in this case. The Port River expressway, the dredging of the port and the bridges are all city projects, I agree, but they are good for the state and I commend them. However, as I said, they came from the previous government.

What about country roads? I read this morning: \$20 million to be spent over three years. I thought, 'That could not be right.' That is a little over \$7 million a year. That is just totally ridiculous. I cannot believe that is correct, and I hope someone will pick up on this and say that I am wrong. I cannot understand how the RAA and others are not making more noise about that when one considers the state of our roads. Take Barossa Valley Way as an example. When one drives along our most marvellous tourism corridor in South Australia, the Barossa Valley Way, between Nuriootpa and Tanunda down to Lyndoch, one will see that it is a bloody disgrace. People fly in from overseas, and everyone knows the Barossa; they go there to enjoy the ambience and to taste and buy some wine and send it home, and they get on this road and cannot believe it. They ask, 'What's going on here?'. I have been told that it is a Third World road, and it is.

I know there are plenty of projects that could be prioritised in my electorate: the Sturt Highway, the Barossa hospital, school upgrades and a much needed recreational facility—not to mention work in the Eyre Peninsula for grain transport, the railway and the roads, South-East highways and road and rail connections. The Rann Labor government has failed to reinvest in infrastructure despite being awash with cash. Under the government's South Australian infrastructure vision it falls short, particularly for regional areas of South Australia. So, why does the government not act on the recommendations of the Economic Development Committee—its own committee, it set it up—giving high priority to provision of new infrastructure, vital to the success and future of the state? The Committee for Economic Development of Australia's Recent Growth report said infrastructure is buckling under the demands of Australia's economic success and subsequent growth. Vast new trade investment opportunities are here, and it is all vastly outstripping our infrastructure capacities. So, the huge backlog in infrastructure investment in water, energy, land and transport is a challenge for the state government, a challenge which urgently needs to be overcome in order for South Australia to flourish. Complacency like that from the Rann Labor government is not acceptable. While there continues to be a total drought in major capital works under this government, the state continues to suffer, particularly regional communities.

Take a look at this budget. It appears the government is oblivious to the fact that country areas also have needs. The money allocated to road upgrades and maintenance in country areas is a pittance, and the high percentage of people killed on our roads are killed in country areas, yet the government sees fit to spend \$35 million on red light cameras in the city. That beggars belief. Is that arrogance, an oversight, or is it just stupidity? How can this be justified? The Rann Labor government needs to drop its city-centric attitude and start

valuing country regions. I urge them to start spending money and paying attention to infrastructure needs and capital works projects in country areas. They are still sitting on substantial funds—obviously holding it back for the election. I suggest that when they do let it go, that they think about where they target it. Country roads, hospitals, schools and recreational facilities should be a high priority for the Rann Labor government, particularly if it intends to get re-elected, and particularly if it tends to govern with the Independents again, because, after all, they are who keeps it there, and where do these Independents come from? They are both country members. We have been pretty nice to our Independents. It is pretty difficult to get stuck into people that you have a bit of time for, but the political reality is that if you come from country regions you are keeping a government in power that is not country-centric at all.

Failure to implement more capital works projects will result in South Australia's dropping further behind the eight ball, as neighbouring states experience further growth in opportunities and economic value. If we are not careful, we will be ploughing up bitumen roads. It has happened before. If a road gets to the point that it is so rough it is dangerous, they plough them up, and it has happened before. When you have \$200 million of roads assets, when you have hundreds of kilometres of roads that are deteriorating—and a lot of these roads that were designed and built in the 1950s, there comes a time when you cannot catch up. You do not have enough money to do the job when they all start deteriorating because we are on a time bomb. As the trucks get heavier, as success continues, these roads, these assets, are going to be continually worn down to a point where (as the member for Taylor would know as the previous minister for Transport) they are dangerous, and you have to deal with them. We are on a time bomb, and it is ticking away. As we sit here, every road in the state is getting more worn out and becoming more dangerous. You cannot ignore a thing like this because it is a ticking clock. If you run away from your responsibilities, it will have to be addressed some day. You cannot say that the next government will do that because it could be yours. Let us hope that it is not, but it could be.

I believe that when we were in government from 1992 to 2002 we got a very good start. I know that in my own electorate we had a major highway—\$19.6 million on one project alone, for which the Hon. Diana Laidlaw was minister. That was the Morgan-Burra Road, a fantastic road, and very important strategically. It is a great help to the people of the Riverland, they continually remind me about that—\$19.6 million—that is more than this government is going to spend for the whole year in the whole state if the predictions are right. Twenty million over three years is ridiculous, and I hope it is wrong. I commend this motion to the house. I do not like to be too political in relation the Public Works Committee because it is a committee that I enjoy working on. I enjoy the camaraderie with all the colleagues who work on that committee but, enough is enough. Three and a half years in, I almost feel as if I am taking money under false pretences as a member of the Public Works Committee because we are not doing the work that the government has put us there for. I urge the house to support the motion.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I am not sure whether the member for Schubert actually believes what he is saying himself, but I think that he is living in fairyland because I cannot agree with this motion. I think that this state government is doing

an excellent job in regional South Australia, and I am certainly very happy with what I see happening. I spoke last week about the Strategic Infrastructure Plan for South Australia that has been introduced, and this is a first-off. This is a plan that looks at the whole of South Australia—all regions—and if you read through the document carefully you can see that there is a real commitment by the government for regional South Australia, and there will be an incredible amount of work happening from this. We are looking at a more coordinated, more efficient, more sustainable, and innovative approach to building our state—not ad hoc measures that have happened so much in the past. I was delighted to see this plan when it was released, and I realised that regional South Australia is going to benefit greatly from this plan.

A number of projects have already been highlighted in the recent budget, and a number of priorities for South Australia and regional South Australia where money has been allocated and, certainly, where money has not been allocated as yet, it is a priority for this government to put that money in over the next few years. I am very pleased with what is happening, and I cannot support his motion at all. For example, some of the issues that have been discussed, and allocated money, are on Eyre Peninsula. Eyre Peninsula is going to benefit greatly from this state government with a \$10 million component to upgrade road and rail networks, and improve grain handling facilities for the export of grain from Eyre Peninsula.

While we were in Mount Gambier recently \$2.3 million was allocated for the Penola Road entrance to Mount Gambier upgrade, which is a real issue down there. Other priority regional projects announced included improving the condition of local roads in the state's road freight network, upgrading the number one berth at Port Lincoln, and we have announced the pipeline from Roxby Downs to Andamooka. I was very pleased with that announcement in my electorate because I know how important it is for the people of Andamooka and surrounding areas. That was a huge commitment by the state government to improve water conditions in Andamooka. Also, apart from the Andamooka project, I know that the government is looking at water in regional South Australia, particularly in the remote parts of the state that have severe water problems. The government is looking at what can be done; it is not an easy solution because, of course, it would have been done in the past. However, this government has committed to looking at what is happening there and to make some announcements in relation to getting some water out there for the people in those areas.

Also, this government has committed \$1.1 million to the regional infrastructure project through the Regional Development Infrastructure Fund—that is a really important fund for regional South Australia—and, of course, this was in addition to the \$1 million that the Premier handed over recently in Whyalla for the upgrade of boating facilities at Fitzgerald Bay. That is an essential part for us, and I believe that the rest of Eyre Peninsula will also benefit from that down the road. We have committed \$400 000 to improve facilities at Port Broughton. Although we are upgrading facilities for the fishing fleet in Port Lincoln, Ceduna, Arno Bay and Cape Jaffa, the member for Schubert says that we are not doing anything.

Power supplies on Kangaroo Island have been a major problem for some time, and we have made arrangements to fund the development of a new ferry terminal at Cape Jervis, so we are certainly looking at Kangaroo Island and what can be done there. We are undertaking a program to replace the

ferries on the River Murray, and we continue to commit funding to important road safety measures on regional roads, such as overtaking lanes and shoulder sealing. In my travels, considering the amount of travel I do each year, I know how vital this is. The overtaking lanes are a vital part of road safety and enable people to get to and from Adelaide and other areas more safely. This is a major and very important commitment. We have committed more than \$20 million in the coming three years to those two projects alone.

Significant works have been done, including salt interception schemes along the River Murray, and identifying appropriate locations for new irrigation schemes that will not adversely impact on the river. Pumping has been done at the Murray Mouth, and there have been upgrades to the weirs and barrages. Of course, we know about the arrangements to upgrade the water supply on the Eyre Peninsula. I have already mentioned the pipeline at Andamooka, but the pipeline that will be built from Iron Knob to Kimba will certainly go a great way to resolving some of the major issues in relation to water on Eyre Peninsula.

Desalination plants are mentioned, and I know that a major study is being done at the moment into the possibility of a desalination plant at Whyalla, which will service Whyalla and Roxby Downs and which will certainly benefit Eyre Peninsula. I believe that the water from there will be able to go through that pipeline from Iron Knob to Kimba and service Eyre Peninsula, thereby resolving many of those water issues.

The Minister for Tourism announced plans for \$2.5 million to be spent on revamping tourism in outback South Australia, and to do this we have to revamp the infrastructure.

Mr Venning: And the roads.

Ms BREUER: And the roads, yes; that is part of the infrastructure. That money will go in there, and I know that the minister has a major commitment to tourism in the Outback and the areas to which I have referred. I am sure that many new works will follow in that area. A considerable amount of work has already gone into that. In the recent budget, announcements were made, and I would like to summarise some of them. As to the \$2.6 million that is to go towards the \$4 million upgrade of the Port Lincoln Airport, the member for Flinders has been most churlish about. However, I certainly wish that \$4 million upgrade had gone into the Whyalla Airport. It will, however, be an incredible thing for Port Lincoln and that region of the state.

One of the important parts of regional development and regional infrastructure is the regional development boards. This government has committed an incredible amount of money—an extra \$520 000—to those regional development boards to look at the regional business advisers' programs. That is essential for development in our regions. I do not know how we would survive without our regional development boards, and I congratulate them all because I think they do an excellent job, as I am sure the minister will agree. We have committed \$6 million to the Regional Development Infrastructure Fund over the next two years—that is, \$6 million—and the member for Schubert is trying to tell us that nothing is happening.

The government has allocated over \$5.7 million over four years for an upgrade to the road and rail assets on the Eyre Peninsula grain transport network. We hear much from the member for Flinders about the conditions in those areas. This will go a great way to resolving many of those problems, and I think that we should applaud the government for what it is doing in this respect.

We have over \$2 million allocated, as I mentioned when I talked about tourism, for current marketing programs to promote the diversity and quality of the state's regional tourism destinations. Road safety in regional areas certainly has been given priority, and we have allocated \$1.4 million over four years to combat speeding on rural highways. We have also allocated \$3 million to build more rural overtaking lanes, as well as a further \$2.6 million to be spent over three years to improve road safety; this includes the heavy vehicle industry, which is a vital part of our freight network in South Australia but which is a major problem for people who are travelling on those roads constantly.

The salt interception schemes on the River Murray have been allocated \$2.4 million, along with \$1.8 million for projects on the River Murray, including improved biodiversity, rehabilitation and research into a wider use of water. We have committed \$1.2 million to establish the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Resource Information Centre, as well as an increase in the Eyre Peninsula water supply from \$25.2 million to \$48.5 million—I do not think that should be sniffed at. That is an incredible allocation. Country fire services have also been provided with new vehicles, and a lot of work has gone into their facilities, which are also vital.

The Outback Areas Community Development Trust has developed a strategic plan, and we are putting \$1.1 million into that. The trust is a vital part of the state for those regions that are not covered by local governments. I do not think many people appreciate the value of that trust, which does an amazing job on a shoestring budget. We have recognised its importance and value. We originally set up this trust under Don Dunstan. We have now recognised the work that it is doing and have allocated money to give it more flexibility and the possibility to be able to develop infrastructure out there, to advise and to do all the work that is vital to that part of the state.

Of course, the government has put a lot of money into facilities in schools, expenditure of \$17.9 million having been announced in the budget for Birdwood High School, Ernabella Anangu School, Pipalyatjara Anangu School, Nuriootpa High School, Kapunda High School and Victor Harbor High School. A couple of those schools are in the member for Schubert's electorate, yet he is still being churlish about it, and still whingeing.

I congratulate the government. We have put an incredible amount into country health for regional doctors, our hospitals and health services and, despite what the members for Finnis and Schubert and many other people say, we have not neglected country health. We are putting an incredible amount of money into country health, and I am certainly very satisfied with the work that has been going on in my electorate.

I also feel very strongly about other country electorates, where I know the money is going in. We are not ignoring rural South Australia and we are not a metro-centric party: we are looking at the whole state and we are doing incredible work. We are not sitting back whingeing and coming up with all sorts of reasons not to build what we have promised to build. I congratulate the government on the work it is doing. Time expired.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): First, I congratulate the member for Schubert for moving this motion; it is long overdue, and it is an issue that needs to be debated in this house because this government has absolutely ignored

regional South Australia. And may I say, the government is so embarrassed about what is happening—or not happening—out in regional South Australia that I think we could question whether they have actually misled the house.

When we were down in Mount Gambier, members of the government told the opposition that they had posted us a regional infrastructure plan, yet not one member of the opposition has received that, sir. It has not been sent to our electorate offices and it has not appeared in our boxes here in Parliament House—to my knowledge, I am not aware of one member of the opposition has received that infrastructure plan through their electorate office or in their Parliament House box. If the government does have a regional infrastructure plan, it certainly does not want anyone to see it—and I can understand that because the government—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: That's right; maybe it is there and, as my colleague the member for Bragg says, it is so thin that we have failed to notice it—perhaps that is the case. Unfortunately, I am being flippant, as that is not the case. I know they have produced a document, but I suggest that it is like every other document that this government has produced—and it has produced plenty; it is long on rhetoric but short on action: plenty of words but no detail.

I remember speaking to the budget a few days ago and noting that the Treasurer has \$2.2 billion more per year to throw around than the previous Liberal government had only three years ago—that is a 23 per cent increase in revenues. Members on this side of the house have continually asked where that money has gone—what has been done with it. Well, the problem is that a fair bit of it has gone into producing very thick documents that say nothing. I have a shelf in my office which is full of these documents, and you could trawl through them with a magnifying glass but find very little action—plenty of words and plenty of motherhood statements (they are great on those)—

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: Spin, my colleague the member for Schubert, the mover of the motion, says. It is high time that the government was brought to task on its lack of attention, particularly with regard to infrastructure in regional South Australia. I remind the house again that 50 per cent of this state's exports, 50 per cent of South Australia's sales—SA Inc., what we sell to the rest of the world, whether it be across our state borders or internationally—is derived from our regional areas. So, when we are running Business SA we realise that we are going to improve our quality of life—increase the number of jobs we can supply for our children, improve the social infrastructure that we can give to our society, as well as the environmental infrastructure.

When we do the sums for that, when we do the business case, the most important thing is what we sell to the rest the world. By bringing in those dollars we can utilise the wealth created by other people to improve South Australia—and 50 per cent of our ability to do that is created outside of greater metropolitan Adelaide. This government fails to recognise that, and it has failed to do so for at least three years. The budget that has just been produced tells us that the government still has not yet recognised that, and it will continue to fail to recognise that into its fourth year of being in office.

One of the problems I constantly encounter in my electorate is lack of skilled labour. We are also encountering problems getting unskilled labour as well, but skilled labour has been a problem for a longer time in my electorate. One

of the problems we face in getting skilled labour to a place out in regional South Australia is that skilled workers are unable to encourage their families to come with them. You might wonder why, because the lifestyle in regional areas, living in regional towns, is quite fantastic. But when a business contacts, interviews, and offers a job to a skilled person, that person's spouse might say, 'Yes, we will go and look at this town; we might move out there'. I can cite a typical case, that of a diesel fitter who was attracted out of New South Wales to come to the South-East some time ago. His wife happened to be expecting a baby and she said, 'If we are going to Mount Gambier the first thing I will do is ring the local medical clinic down there and get an appointment for a check-up and get everything under control.' When she rang up she was told of the delay she would have in getting an appointment with the local doctor, and she said to her husband, 'We are not going to live there, because we need those sorts of services for me to feel comfortable and to raise our family.' That is the sort of infrastructure we need; we need those sorts of services, such as the health services.

Education is another aspect, because anyone who understands anything about regional economies knows that many professionals and semi-professionals, when their children get to high school age and beyond—when they get into the serious years of their education, particularly if they are going on to tertiary education and especially if that is at university—will leave the regional centre and move to the city. They will move to Adelaide or interstate to one of the major cities, to chase a job or get the best educational benefits for their children. That happens every day of the week in country South Australia, yet the government fails to recognise it. We need to expand and upgrade educational opportunities. One of my colleagues in the other place, the Hon. Angus Redford, in concert with some of our federal colleagues, has ensured that we have some university places in the South-East at Mount Gambier. I know that the member for Bragg has also been involved in that. That is the sort of thing we have to encourage and do more of, but this government does not even consider it, does not put any money into it and does not even pay that sort of effort lip service.

We need services. It is not just physical infrastructure, the roads, rail and bridges, the schools and hospitals in a physical sense; it is the people behind it, the professionals and semi-professionals we need to put resources into to ensure that they will go to rural areas. But we need to put the whole package together. The government has failed to recognise that, because it has failed to recognise the importance of our regions. It has failed to recognise that 50 cents in every dollar that comes into South Australia from outside (because we are able to sell to the rest of the world) is derived from our regions.

Looking at this year's budget, recognising that extra \$2.2 billion that the Treasurer had to spend for the benefit of South Australia and to build the economy, I expected that the regions would fare reasonably well. I was bitterly disappointed. Looking at my electorate in particular, I virtually cannot see one cent of new initiatives that is going into my electorate. That is not because my electorate is well endowed with infrastructure: nothing could be further from the truth. We need a new hospital at Naracoorte, a major project that has been put on the back burner although it had been on the top of the list for regional health infrastructure.

Roads, as everyone knows, and as the whole parliament saw when we were in Mount Gambier, are a huge priority in the South-East. There is not a cent to address the impending

freight task for the South-East in my electorate. I could talk on this topic for an hour or so but, unfortunately, my time is limited. I will leave my comments there but, once again, I congratulate the member for Schubert for bringing this to the house's attention. I implore the government to get serious about the economic development of South Australia, in particular in our regions.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I, too, applaud the member for Schubert for having moved this motion. It is a pity that the government did not take note of what has been said for the past year or so now when it was framing its budget. When I think back to the things that occurred from an infrastructure and capital works point of view in my electorate over the eight years we were in government, it was quite astronomical. The interesting thing is that, from memory, most of it occurred in the last four years, and that is because we inherited such a massive debt that we had very little spare money to do anything of an infrastructure nature in my electorate or anywhere else in South Australia prior to that. Even when we had the bare minimum amount of money, we did as much as we could, and I will cite some examples shortly.

The disturbing thing is that, as I noted last night, we have a \$2 billion greater budget than was the situation when we left government 3½ years ago, so the money is there but is just not being used. I will give a few examples. A brand new TAFE facility was built at Kadina at a cost of \$5 million or \$6 million. I want to thank the current Speaker, the Hon. Bob Such, who was very supportive of that and who, in fact, helped TAFE facilities throughout regional South Australia as well as in the metropolitan area. We had a TAFE facility upgrade at Yorketown, one of the sub-campus of Kadina TAFE. In fact, the Kadina TAFE reminds me of a small university. It is a magnificent architectural job and the students really appreciate it. I was very pleased to be able to do a course there myself the year before last.

In schools, we had a major upgrade of Moonta Area School, something like \$4 million, which was completed in the latter months after we had left office. Thank goodness it was so far advanced that the Labor government could not stop it. Balaklava High School received a major upgrade, particularly in its science wing and a few classrooms surrounding that science block, which was long overdue. Kadina Primary School had a major redevelopment of many of its classrooms, got rid of many of the so-called temporary classrooms and now has a permanent structure. Ardrossan Area School likewise received a major upgrade in certain of the buildings, and even Warooka Primary School, a smaller school at the bottom of Yorke Peninsula, had a significant upgrade to one of its buildings.

There are other examples. If we look at the CFS, the biggest project ever undertaken in my electorate occurred at Port Wakefield. Thank goodness all the design work had been done, the moneys had been well and truly allocated by the Liberal government and it was completed in the early years of the Labor government. Throughout my electorate, a multitude of equipment went into CFS stations that is still benefiting those stations. In the area of hospitals, Wallaroo managed to get a completely new outpatient building, which put Wallaroo right up with the modern hospitals. At Maitland there were major extensions, which help Maitland continue to be very viable. Yorketown also had a major upgrade.

I turn now to roads. The Corny Point to Marion Bay road is a classic case of the state government sharing the task of

sealing roads with local government. The Corny Point to Marion Bay road is a local government road but most of the people who use it are non-locals, in other words, tourists, and we put several million into that. It was completed in the first few months of the Labor government, and I was very disappointed that the then minister for tourism described it as quaint and indicated that the Labor government would not be putting money into that sort of thing again. I will give her 10 out of 10 for honesty because she was 100 per cent right. The government has not put any money into that sort of thing and our roads keep going from bad to worse.

We had the complete upgrade of the Wallaroo to Kadina road, which was a project and a half. It finished up costing something like \$8 million. I think we spent something like \$1 million upgrading the road through the town of Port Wakefield. Then there was the Port Wakefield to Kulpara road, of which all but a few kilometres had been completed by the Liberal government when we left office 3½ years ago. Members know that I have been asking questions here but they would not know that I have been writing to three ministers now and I am still waiting for the last 5.2 kilometres to be completed. As I said in my contribution last night, it would appear from the regional infrastructure plan that it may well occur before I leave this institution.

The coast road widening from Ardrossan right down to the south of Stansbury was a massive undertaking. That has enabled road trains to use that route. We also commenced work on the road north of Ardrossan, and to all intents and purposes that has been completed. We also commenced the construction of overtaking lanes, and at least two overtaking lanes were constructed, and now we have an additional one out of Port Wakefield leading on to the peninsula. I have questioned why that money was spent on an overtaking lane so close to a divided road when it could well have been used on roads elsewhere, but I do not deny that it will add to safety.

There were a multitude of things and time does not permit me to go into any more details. Therefore it is exceptionally worrying that this government has undertaken so few public works. I refer members to the member for Schubert's contribution because he highlighted what has not been done. In the whole area of public works, more needs to be done. One simple example is the proposed ferry from Wallaroo to Lucky Bay. A new ferry operator has shown interest in the last nine months, perhaps even a year, and was very keen to have the first ferry going for the Cornish festival in the third weekend in May—the long weekend—but was not able to. Why not? Because the state government has refused to provide any assistance for the mooring pylons that are needed at Lucky Bay to ensure safe berthing. Wallaroo has the appropriate facilities, which is okay, even though the government has not contributed a cent to that. Why, for the sake of a few thousand dollars, would the government not help the ferry operator at least give it a trial run?

Tourism is so important to my electorate and, under our government, the Dryland Farming Centre, which is now called the Farm Shed, received half a million dollars, which got it under way. The federal government then put in \$250 000 and I know that the local government has put in a lot of money. However, in this day and age, it appears that no money is to be put into that sort of thing at all. That centre has helped bring thousands of tourists to our area and it is recognised as one of the best museums in the country. It is in the league of the museum at Longreach. I was talking to someone from New South Wales recently, who said to me,

'Do you realise this is the best museum we have seen in Australia? We have been touring for the last two or three years and we have seen just about every major museum that exists in the country.' Again, it is something that we should be proud of and we can be thankful for the public works contribution. Whether it is country roads, country health facilities, country schools, country recreational facilities, the Public Works Committee is there to provide new projects. I call on the government to make additional moneys available to help regional South Australia, particularly at a time when the drought is still with us and things may go from bad to worse.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

HOSPITALS, BAROSSA

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I move:

That this house condemns the current government for failing to honour the previous government's commitment to build a new Barossa hospital.

I am very disappointed to be bringing this motion to the house today because it is an issue that has been with me for many years, in fact, over 10 of my 15 years in this place. It is becoming very much routine for me as I continue to bring to the government's attention the deplorable state of the Angaston Hospital building. Last week's budget confirmed how committed the Rann Labor government is to building a new health facility in the Barossa Valley. There was absolutely nothing, not a mention, not a hint, not even a forecast; yet when I speak to departmental people at the Public Works Committee they say that it is of the highest priority, and we in the previous Liberal government had given a commitment to build it. The Barossa and its people are large contributors to the state's economy, but still a meagre \$16 million cannot be committed to provide a decent hospital whether it be over one, two or even five years.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Yes, we can give it to a university from America, but we cannot build a decent hospital for the biggest growth area in the state. It is a hospital with the capability to service the needs of an ever-expanding population, not to mention the large Asian population. The current building is an old house. Angaston and now the Barossa have never really had a purpose-built hospital, and it is now common knowledge that the Angaston Hospital is the worst hospital building in the entire state of South Australia. I cannot believe it is—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: Exactly right. All those people who come and have a look, particularly members of parliament, cannot believe that this is allowed to continue.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr VENNING: The member for Bragg says, 'Well, you use everyone else's.' It continues on like this, and it is incredible that the people of the Barossa get the service they do from the magnificent staff at this hospital.

Ms Chapman: It is a credit to them.

Mr VENNING: It is a credit to them. They were accredited by the previous government, and they just battle on. We know there are occupational health and safety problems. I have seen a list of claims, and the government must know about them. There is a long list of claims, with the different levels in the building—all those things a modern building has this building does not have, such as lifting devices and all

sorts of things. It is not worth spending money on this building. It is like putting a T model Ford in the Formula 500; you do not get there. There is no sense in putting new tyres on it, because it is not going to do it.

Whilst the facilities at the Tanunda Hospital, which is the pet hospital, are much better than those at Angaston, but there is still much that could be improved there as well. I believe that building will continue to be a medical facility. But, again, neither hospital has had any major funds spent on it in recent years, apart from the \$300 000 spent a couple of months ago to upgrade all the toilet blocks in the Angaston Hospital, which I thought really was a waste of money. On a regular basis—as much as on a weekly basis—5 500 people travel outside the Barossa Valley to receive some form of medical treatment. That figure represents only those who are involved in the council's transport scheme, which is where the statistics came from.

The dialysis machine was another health saga. The Lions Club, of which I am a member, worked hard to raise money for a new machine. It raised over \$26 000 towards its purchase, only to be told that the need for such a service was not great enough in the region. For 10 years now, with the support from my colleagues and members of the Barossa community, I have been canvassing for a new Barossa hospital. A commitment was made by the previous Liberal government then minister (Hon. Dean Brown) to establish a new Barossa hospital. I have a letter from the then minister (Hon. Dean Brown) saying that the cabinet had that very day signed off on this project and that it was to start within three years of the date of that letter. A commitment was made there and then for the first grant of money towards it, which was to do the preliminary planning and feasibility in the community. For people to say that we were not going to deliver a hospital is quite wrong. You cannot build a hospital next year just like that: it takes time. Even if the government agreed today to build a new hospital, I would not expect it to be there inside four or five years.

As members would know, land was purchased, or set aside, at Reusch Park, on the northern side of Nuriootpa. It was formerly Housing Trust land. It still remains vacant, but it is still earmarked for a new hospital. The land is very much derelict, and I have often had to ring the department to get them to clean it up. However, the big concern is how long will this land remain vacant and how long will it be secure for the future need for a new hospital. On numerous occasions, I have asked the minister whether this land will continue to be saved for the hospital, amid the rumours that have been circulating about the possibility the land could or would be sold, and whether the Rann Labor government will not buy or hold this land for the hospital. I have had no commitment at all in that regard, and it is a great worry. No-one can deny or confirm this rumour, which has me very worried. The Barossa Valley community would be most disappointed, angry and extremely disheartened should the land be sold off. Land is very scarce in the Barossa, and land that is available for development is very expensive—it is probably now the same price as land in Adelaide; CBD prices are common in the Barossa Valley.

This is an ideal site for a hospital. It is right alongside the Sturt Highway, well positioned, and right alongside a new development, where a private developer is building 300 independent living units for aged people. So, it is all go. It is a great site, and there is a lot of pressure on it. It would make the government a lot of money if it decided to sell the site. However, I want a guarantee that the government will not do

that and will hold on to it. I cannot understand why the government continually refuses to make some sort of a commitment to this project and honour the commitment made by the previous Liberal government to build a new Barossa hospital. If we were in government, the hospital project would be under way right now, and the people of the Barossa would have a tangible guarantee that they would have a new hospital sooner rather than later. I find it appalling that no country hospital even rated a mention in the budget. That begs the question: where do the government's priorities lay, and the Independents—and country Independents, I remind the house—that keep this government in power?

I urge the government to honour the commitment made by the previous Liberal government to support the people of the Barossa and build a new hospital, or at least be seen to be in favour of allocating some money, because any funding at all would be a start. As we know, the government is awash with cash—just take a look at the minister's health budget last year. The government has \$2.2 billion more to spend this year than did the last Liberal government. There was a \$35 million surplus in the health budget last year—\$35 million unspent—which could build at least two or two and a half Barossa hospitals. Fancy having \$35 million unspent in conditions like this—with a situation like we have in our country hospitals. It is inexcusable.

The government has been in power for 3½ years, and it could have gone to the Public Works Committee with these projects. What has been going on? Why is there \$35 million unspent? Maybe the government is going to spend it this year. I do not know. The government has had 3½ years to get it sorted, and for that to happen is inexcusable. How cruel is it, when you have people with a facility like we have and they hear that—and no-one has refuted this—the health minister underspent her budget by \$35 million. You wonder why people get very aggro; you wonder why they get cynical about politicians; you wonder why they get cynical about governments, particularly when they put out paid advertisements to say how good they are. It really gets up my nose, particularly when they criticise the previous government for doing a series of ads which was nowhere near as political as these.

Again, political agendas aside, this problem cannot go on any longer. Action is well and truly overdue. I will do all I can, even down to printing bumper stickers at my own expense to keep highlighting this problem. As a sitting member up there, I will keep plugging away. I will do everything I can to highlight the problem, whether it be in Public Works, whether it be here on the floor of the house, whether it be here or in the media, or anywhere at all, it is the highest priority for the people living in the Barossa. Spare a thought for the employees who, as I said, work in these deplorable conditions. Their commitment and enthusiasm, despite the conditions, enable them to provide a service which is second to none.

I am going through the occupational health claims list, and I will probably highlight them in this house at a later date because, even though they are private, I think people need to know what an old facility this is, and the harm that it is doing to the people working in it. Community response and support for this project is absolute. A petition I launched has been circulating in almost every shop, office and corner store in the Barossa Valley, right now, and members of the community are rallying together to make the government stand up and notice them. I urge the government to do the fair and

responsible thing. The Barossa's success is South Australia's success.

The Barossa is booming and it is growing. It has huge increases in aged care and independent living units being built right now. There are massive amounts of them because, sir, it is a great place to retire. We have two large facilities: we have the Tanunda Lutheran Homes which, of course, the Queen visited when she was here a couple of years ago. That is a huge development and growing like topsy every day. We also now have the Barossa Village, a brand-new 128 unit facility, as well as a swag of independent living units for themselves. Half the housing built in the Barossa is for aged care independent living style. With all this happening, all these aged people, of course, need hospitals. When you have a look at the facilities that they are expected to use, it just does not wear.

As the government runs into the election, I know it is sitting on a heap of money. I know it is keeping it back so they can let it all go in a rush so makes them look really good running into the poll. I would be happy if, a month out, you announced that there is going to be a Barossa hospital. Yes, you will get some votes, and I do not mind that either. Some of these issues are bigger than the politics. They are bigger than the Independents, or the individual member of parliament. I think that, as a member, if I cannot get this project out, I see it as a failure for me, a failure for the government, and a failure for the parliament for not recognising a reasonable and fair thing to do. Everybody in the state is entitled to reasonable access to reasonable health facilities. This, sir, is not one. I urge the house to support this motion, and help the people of the Barossa and provide them with a new Barossa health facility. I urge members to support the motion.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

MOUNT GAMBIER DISTRICT HEALTH SERVICE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): I move:

That this house congratulates the staff and the Board of the Mount Gambier District Health Service for their commitment and achievements in improving health services and patient safety following the recommendations of the Stokes Report.

Many in the house may be aware of the report of Professor Bryant Stokes, which was commissioned by this government to review the operations of the Mount Gambier Hospital following a number of concerns about the facility. By way of background, I was involved in the select committee that visited the hospital shortly before the last election. This review, conducted in collaboration with Dr Alan Wolfe, was released in March 2004. The review identified a number of operational problems in regard to the provision of health services and made clear recommendations on how the hospital could improve.

Since then, the Mount Gambier District Health Service Board and staff have worked incredibly hard to make positive changes. Last year, Professor Stokes revisited the Mount Gambier Hospital and provided an update on progress. Professor Stokes found that there had been significant improvement in the safety and quality of the hospital, and found that the hospital was performing at an acceptable level. Professor Stokes also identified that the backbone of the hospital was the nursing staff, and acknowledged its efforts and commitment to patient care.

Some of the outcomes post-review include the expansion of surgical and obstetrics services—this has been a major initiative welcomed by the community. Anaesthesia services have been strengthened with the support of Professor Guy Ludbrook from the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Surgery is functioning on an improved scale, and I would like to put on record acknowledgment for the efforts of Professor Guy Madden. Although Dr Gallichio, the former director of medical services, has now moved on, I understand that his appointment resulted in greater engagement of staff in decision making, and as a result, staff generally feel more valued.

Particular thanks must go to the board of the Mount Gambier and District Health Service and, of course the Chair, Mr Peter Whitehead. Clearly, Mount Gambier Hospital has managed to achieve a dramatic turnaround and move forward from what was a very difficult period. I would like to acknowledge the hard work and efforts of all staff of the hospital and members of the board who have helped make this possible change. It is, indeed, a job well done. It has taken a lot of hard work and dedication to address the issues raised in the Stokes-Wolfe report, and some difficult problems have had to be worked through. The results speak for themselves. Without the commitment and dedication of the staff and board to the Mount Gambier Hospital none of this would have been possible. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

LIMESTONE COAST TOURISM

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That this house congratulates the South-East Local Government Association and the Coorong District Council for their commitment and support to tourism by the signing of a joint three-year agreement with the South Australian Tourism Commission to fund the marketing of tourism by Limestone Coast Tourism.

The three-year agreement has provided an excellent opportunity for planning projects that can run over a longer period of time, including the linking of the Limestone Coast to the Great Ocean Road in Victoria. The Limestone Coast Tourism Board has been able to commit to this longer term project, and funding was approved for a \$5 000 contribution by Limestone Coast Tourism to the project for the full three years of this agreement. It is currently developing a fuel saver campaign that will cross over financial years. The initial campaign is based around funding from the 2004-05 year. As there is secured funding in the next year, it is also possible to allocate further resources to the campaign in the 2005-06 year. A past project that has benefited from the agreement is the Discover the Limestone Coast Trails Guide, which was delivered across a two-year period. The project was also co-funded by state and federal partners in the confidence that funding from Limestone Coast Tourism was secured for the life of the project.

Tourism in the Limestone Coast has improved dramatically, and this funding program will allow for Limestone Coast Tourism to capitalise on the recent growth. In the 12 months ending December 2004, overall domestic visitor numbers to the Limestone Coast were up 8 per cent and visitor nights were up 14 per cent on the year ending December 2003. The South Australian Tourism Commission continues to support the region through other means. The SATC has funded the region by a total of \$183 500 to various festivals and events over the last three financial years. Some of the festivals and

events supported in the past include the Penola Coonawarra Festival, Frances Folk Festival, Port MacDonnell Bayside Festival, Taste the Limestone Coast, Moot Yang Gunya Festival, Padthaway Harvest Festival, Generations of Jazz, Coonawarra Cabernet, Palaeontology Week and Trucking 1000-2005.

The South Australian Tourism Commission also has developed a new advertising campaign highlighting the state's fresh and intimate food and wine experiences. The campaign is based on its wine tourism strategy and recognises what makes South Australia's food and wine so compelling—places like the Limestone Coasts's own wine-growing regions such as the Coonawarra, Padthaway, Mount Benson, Wrattobully and Penola. The three-year funding agreement is an incentive to develop longer term strategies for the security of assured funding. The agreement will also allow a continuity of programs while retaining staff experience and expertise, and also help to achieve the aim of a sustainable and growing tourism industry across the limestone region.

It was, indeed, a pleasure to be in Mount Gambier for the first sitting of the regional parliament. My electorate of Norwood has had a longstanding connection with the South-East and, of course, most people know that Mary MacKillop started the school at Penola.

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

Ms CICCARELLO: Yes. As the Minister for Families and Communities (the member for Cheltenham) said, the Premier announced at the Adelaide Oval that the second bridge would be named after Mary MacKillop. I am very proud of that, because Mother Mary MacKillop established the first convent of the Sisters of St Joseph and the first chapel in Kensington, and lived in Norwood for some 12 years. She lived in Queen Street, the same street in which I live, as did Catherine Helen Spence and—

Mrs Geraghty interjecting:

Ms CICCARELLO: Yes, indeed. May Gibbs, who wrote Gumnut Babies, also lived in Queen Street, Norwood. So, they are four women who lived in Queen Street, Norwood. Mother Mary MacKillop, who had come to Norwood, was looked after by the Jesuit priests at St Ignatius when she was excommunicated—

Ms Chapman: What about my gym partner?

Ms CICCARELLO: Yes. The member for Bragg said that her gym partner lives next door to my sister in my mother's house. So, we also have a connection with the electorate of Bragg. Father Tennyson Woods, who encouraged Mother Mary to start the teaching order of the Sisters of St Joseph, also was a well known identity in the South-East. In geological terms, he explored a lot of the Limestone Coast and identified where the old shores were. I think he was also responsible for discovering the Naracoorte Caves. As the member for Norwood, I arranged for a class from Mary MacKillop Primary School in Penola to travel to Norwood. The students were billeted for a week and had a wonderful opportunity to get to know about Norwood and its history and also to visit the convent where Mother Mary had lived.

They were also very pleased to be invited down to the Norwood Oval where they met Gary McIntosh, who had just won the Magarey Medal. He showed them through the change rooms of the Norwood Oval, and the children were very excited. It was a wonderful opportunity because it gave the country children an opportunity to see what city life is like, and I think that this sort of thing is very important and should be encouraged. Once upon a time I think people had

grandparents, or aunts and uncles in the city, and they could visit more often. But I think these sorts of things are good. If children who live in the metropolitan area can visit the country, and vice versa, so that they can establish friendships—and lifelong friendships were established during the visit of the Mary MacKillop Primary School.

Another connection that Norwood has with the South-East is that Lake Bonney was named after Charles Bonney, the first mayor of Kensington and Norwood, and he brought over herds of cattle and sheep. It is wonderful to see that Lake Bonney is now the site of a very important wind farm in South Australia.

Ms Breuer interjecting:

Ms CICCARELLO: Which we visited. We also visited Portland (with the member for Giles) where Mary MacKillop left to come to Port Adelaide when she came up to Norwood. She was very concerned when she arrived at Port Adelaide—and I know that some people have queried and questioned why the second bridge should be named after Mary MacKillop, because some people indicated that she had no connection with the area when, in fact, she did. She was so concerned when she arrived at Port Adelaide—and I think it might have been called Port Misery in the early days—with the plight of the people, particularly the children. She has to be commended for having fought very hard to be able to teach children from families that could not afford to send their children to school. Some of the hierarchy in the Catholic Church thought that she should be teaching the children from rich families, but she insisted that everyone was entitled to education. She has been a very significant person in the history of South Australia, and also in education, and I look forward to perhaps the new pope making her a saint.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Ms CICCARELLO: We did not have the success with Pope John Paul but we hope that the new pope will recognise the fact that she is a very important and significant person in Australia. I will not go on talking about the wonderful connections that Norwood has with the South-East. The only thing that disappointed me—again, in my time as mayor—is that I had hoped that we would have a sister city relationship between Norwood and Penola to encourage tourism between our two areas, because we often encourage people to go overseas, but it is good to see that the Tourism Commission now encourages intrastate tourism, as we have such wonderful opportunities here in South Australia. Again, I would like to say how pleased I was to visit the South-East, and commend them for everything that they are doing. I would like to commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

[Sitting suspended from 12.58 to 2 p.m.]

PAPER TABLED

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for the River Murray (Hon. K.A. Maywald)—

Save the Murray Fund—2003-04.

QUESTION TIME

The SPEAKER: I assume the Deputy Premier is taking questions addressed to the Premier?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): Absolutely, sir.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Treasurer. Was the \$300 000 a year increase in staff funding to the DPP's office, as announced by media release on 25 May, the Treasurer's idea; or did the Attorney-General or the Office of the DPP ask for these additional funds? The Treasurer's minute to the Attorney-General dated 30 May 2005 stated:

As Treasurer I had not received any direct representations for any additional funding to cover cost pressures in the DPP's office as opposed to new initiatives in the State Budget.

The minutes of the DPP's meetings with the Attorney-General on 26 May 2005 confirmed this as follows:

Pallaras said that Foley said the funding increase was his idea and he hadn't received a single piece of paper from the DPP arguing for an increase to the recurrent funding.

He further said:

Kevin Foley put in an extra \$300 000 without even being asked by the DPP.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Obviously, I will check the process, except to say this—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Settle down; calm down and give me a chance to explain. The essence of that was that, from memory, there was not any budget bid anywhere near what Mr Pallaras had suggested in his unprecedented press conference on the day before the budget was brought down. The point I made to the Attorney, which I think I have made publicly since, was that the issue of the substantial cost pressures that Mr Pallaras was indicating publicly via an unprecedented press conference was that the Premier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am happy to answer the question if they want to hear one, sir, but if they are not interested in hearing the answer, I will not waste the house's time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The house will come to order.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You look like a steamroller has just gone over you, Robbie—ah, Rob Lucas!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Premier and I discussed, from memory, when the Premier was in the United Kingdom as part of his overseas visit, that there may have been a need to provide some extra funding to the DPP's office up and above what was officially requested by the bilateral process. That is my recollection, and I think that is what the Premier said, and that is entirely consistent with what I have said.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr CAICA (Colton): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. Can the minister inform the house of any new initiatives of the government to prevent climate change?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the member for Colton for this question, and acknowledge his great interest in this issue. Today the Premier and I have announced a package of major new measures to tackle climate change. First, we released seven greenhouse papers called 'Tackling Climate Change', and this is the first step in developing the state's greenhouse

strategy, which is expected to be finalised next year. There are six industry-specific papers which describe the gases emitted by industries, the challenges in adapting to climate change, the threat and opportunities for innovation. The next step will be for the community to have their say through a series of workshops and forums.

Secondly, we have announced a new performance standard for new or renovated homes from 1 July 2006. Where gas is available these homes must include a gas, solar or heat pump hot water system. This will mean an effective ban for electric hot water systems which emit up to 3.3 tonnes of greenhouse gases each year for each house. In comparison, a gas-boosted solar system emits only 0.3 tonne a year. Energy savings will offset any additional costs if the home purchaser chooses to go solar rather than use gas.

This morning the Premier also turned on the solar panels on the roof of Parliament House, and I was interested to see that the member for Schubert was up there glowing in the—

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Well, you were invited, I am sure, by somebody (it was not us). There are 126 panels, each producing 160 watts—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Mr Speaker, I thought the house was enthusiastic about our solar panels. I am sure it had nothing to do with the Attorney's entrance. As I was saying, there are now 126 panels on the roof of this building, each producing 160 watts. The system has the capacity to save 29 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions each year and, as members would know, the government has already installed panels on the museum and the art gallery, and the zoo as well as had panels installed, I think, during the previous government's term.

We can also announce that world expert on climate change, Professor Stephen Schneider, will be a thinker-in-residence in South Australia. Professor Schneider is the co-director of the Centre for Environmental Science Policy at Stanford University.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I am not too sure what the objection is from those opposite, but we are lucky to have someone of his skill coming to South Australia. South Australia is taking a lead on this issue on the national stage. We already lead the nation in renewable wind energy; we have joined other states in committing to meeting our Kyoto Protocol targets; and we have established the Premier's Round Table on Sustainability chaired by Professor Tim Flannery, which has already reported on this issue. In addition, just recently the Prime Minister finally agreed to the Premier's request to have climate change put on tomorrow's COAG agenda.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): I have a supplementary question. Can the minister advise to which areas of the state the government is extending mains gas so that more houses can take advantage of this announcement?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The solar or gas powered hot water system is a performance based system, so it can apply to any technology as long as it produces less than the average of 1.5 tonnes of CO₂ each year. The announcement applies to those parts of the state where reticulated gas is already available; we have not made that arrangement for those parts of the state where that is not available. Those parts of the state already get subsidies for placing solar panels on their

roofs, so there is a package already in place for those parts of the state which are not on the reticulated gas system. I hope that this initiative will, in fact, encourage a greater extension of the gas network across South Australia.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Davenport has asked his question.

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): I welcome the Attorney-General. Now that he is present in the chamber, will the Attorney confirm that the Attorney-General's Department will this year charge the DPP's office nearly three times as much for overheads as it did last year, and how does he justify such an increase? Last night the Attorney was finally able to tell the house what the DPP's budget actually is. This information shows that the amount the Attorney-General's Department is charging the DPP's office for the cost of overheads, such as accommodation and computer costs etc., has gone from \$490 000 last year to \$1.45 million this year, an increase of \$960 000 or 296 per cent.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): First, may I apologise: I was unavoidably detained with a member of the judiciary, but I am pleased to be here now and to answer this question. The Leader of the Opposition this week has not understood the difference between a program and an actual in a budget. He did not understand the difference so he asked us what the difference between the two figures for the Office of the DPP was and we gave him the correct answer, and he is carrying on because one of the figures estimating the difference between the program and the actual did not correctly show the difference. The information was provided to him and, given that the Leader of the Opposition has been a premier and was a minister for a long time, you would think he would know the difference between the program and the actual.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: I do.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Then why were you asking the question? It was a plain and uncontroversial answer. No minister of the Crown has the grasp of minutiae that would enable a minister to answer today's question, so what I will do is contact the Attorney-General's Department and ask it, first, if it is true—because so often in this place and in the other place members of the Liberal opposition rise in their place and ask entirely falsely-based questions and the bushfire is usually put out by dinner time. However, on this occasion I will see if it is true and, if it is, I will give the Leader of the Opposition a detailed and considered answer.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: As a supplementary question, is the extra million dollars flexibility to make up for the loss of flexibility with the closure of the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account?

The SPEAKER: The Attorney does not have to answer. The member for Giles.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I am very sorry that that particular issue has ended in a whimper rather than a bang.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, you had clearly called the member for Giles. The minister does not have leave to stand up and answer whenever he feels like it.

The SPEAKER: Order! As the member for Unley would know, the chair is always correct. The member for Giles.

APY LANDS

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is to the Minister for Families and Communities. What are the latest developments in service provision to the APY lands?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I acknowledge the honourable member's powerful advocacy on behalf of the people of the APY lands. I have regular meetings with the member for Giles in my capacity both as Minister for Families and Communities and as acting Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, and I found important and wise her advice about how I should approach some of the issues in her electorate, which also comprises the APY lands. In line with this government's commitment to tackling the entrenched issues and difficulties on the APY lands, we are regularly examining ways in which we can improve services and support the APY lands better in terms of service delivery. In December last year, the Department for Families and Communities reviewed its work and the work of the statewide Aboriginal Youth Development Program as it operated on the APY lands. As a result of the review we created—

Mr Brindal interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The previous government didn't have a difficulty with it because it didn't exist under them.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister is not to debate the question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Perhaps the member for Unley can restrain himself. It might make it easier to answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister for families answers the question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I prefer not to hear your private conversations, believe me. I am pleased to announce that, as result, we have created a position, Manager, Substance Misuse and Youth Development Program to better coordinate and support the many programs, services and workers who work on the lands. I am pleased to announce that Mr Peter Kay has been appointed to that position. Peter Kay has significant experience in drug and alcohol programs and was the manager of these statewide programs. Peter has been living on the APY lands for the last six months and has good working relationships with all the non-government agencies and communities working on the APY lands. He has a Masters in Business Administration and is currently undertaking a doctorate in public health at Flinders University. His position will provide coordination, training and support for youth workers already on the lands who are employed by and responsible to the community.

I note that we had some political point scoring by members in the other house about lack of support for youth workers. I make these two points. The program was put on the lands by this government and there is an enhanced level of support now being provided to these workers.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Did you hear his qualifications? Perhaps you would like to hear them again. This is a man who runs a statewide service. He has a Masters in Business Administration.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no need to repeat the answer.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He is currently undertaking a doctorate in public health at Flinders University. How much more qualified do you want than that? I also announce today that two further appointments have been made that will greatly improve—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Sir, can those opposite please be quiet? They did nothing about this for eight years and they are going to listen to a government that is doing something.

The Hon. D.C. Kotz interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is out of order and will be warned any minute. The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I also announce today that two further positions have been appointed that will greatly improve the Department for Families and Communities service delivery on the lands. Archie Baker has been appointed as Manager, Special Needs Program. This position will manage aged care, Home and Community Care Program and disability services on the lands, as well as the positive behaviours and early intervention for mothers and babies programs. Archie Baker has an extensive employment history in the delivery of human services in both South Australia and the Northern Territory.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Wright will be warned in a minute.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: His extensive background in the delivery of statutory social work services includes work with young offenders and within the child protection system. Archie has a background in the delivery of a range of integrated human services in remote indigenous communities in the far West Coast of South Australia as well as the Far North of the state. He has recently completed a Graduate Certificate in Public Health.

I also announce that Jacqui Lawson has been appointed by the Department for Families and Communities as Senior Coordinator of all families and communities programs on the APY lands. Jacqui is a former manager—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It must be galling to those opposite to listen to this. It must be galling to hear a government doing something about the APY lands.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will just answer the question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Jacqui is a former manager of policy at the Aboriginal Housing Authority. Her extensive ability in providing strategic policy advice will ensure that the programs provided on the APY lands will be sustainable and provoke positive outcomes for Anangu. Jacqui's networks across the public sector within the commonwealth and state governments will ensure that these services are provided in a connected manner. Jacqui's career in the Public Service is complemented by previous experience in the business and finance sector, with supporting tertiary business qualifications. All three positions are in the Department of Families and Communities and they are funded from the Premier's APY task force. The entire Department for Families and Communities in the APY lands is coordinated by Chris Larkin, formerly head of the Aboriginal Housing Authority. This is an example of just one government agency—the Department of Families and Communities—and its level of commitment to the people of the APY lands.

McGEE, Mr E.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): My question is to the Treasurer. Why did the prosecutor in the Eugene McGee case, Theresa Anderson, have difficulty accessing the police file on that case? Yesterday, Ms Anderson told the Kapunda Road Royal Commission that she had experienced difficulty accessing that file.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I assume that question was to me as Minister for Police. I do not know the answer to that question, because—surprise, surprise—I am not the person who makes decisions about who should have access to police documentation and files.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Bragg—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: One would have thought that this was of some significance.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, that is what I was getting to. I know the member for Bragg is a learned lawyer and knows everything there is to know about everything. I do not know the answer to that question, but I undertake to get the member an answer from the appropriate people—and I assume that is the Police Commissioner. I am more than happy to report back to the member at an appropriate time. Whether or not that is before the conclusion of the royal commission is something I will take advice on.

EDUCATION, INDIGENOUS

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. How will the Australian government's quadrennium funding agreement for indigenous education affect South Australia's strategy to improve Aboriginal education outcomes?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): The house will remember that yesterday I announced the Aboriginal employment and education strategy for South Australia for the next five years (2005-2010), and in that strategy we give the highest priority to the education outcomes of young Aboriginal South Australians.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop and the Treasurer are out of order.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Unfortunately, the Howard government does not give the same priorities to these people, who need additional support and extra care to help them in literacy and numeracy programs and to help them remain in schooling to gain good retention outcomes. The changes proposed in the new quadrennium funding will irrevocably alter the basis for funding for Aboriginal children in South Australia, and we have predicted that there will be about a 20 per cent drop in funding to South Australian children.

Under this disastrous plan, the Indigenous Tutorial Assistance Program will only fund support for children who fail year 3, 5 or 7 benchmarks, instead of all young Aboriginal children getting support when there can be early intervention. They have to wait to fail in year 3 even to register for support. As well as that, we predict that 1 500 South Australian children will miss out altogether on tutorial assistance support, because they will not provide any funding for any Aboriginal child in a school with fewer than 20

students of Aboriginal origin. That means that, whilst in South Australia we have a significant number of Aboriginal children, they will only qualify to have more than 20 children in 53 out of our 318 metropolitan schools. It is an absolute disgrace. What is more, in view of the high mobility within Aboriginal families, it means that, if a child who is gaining support in a school with more than 20 children moves to another suburb and finds themselves in a different school, that support will cease because there are fewer than 20 children in that school.

It is an appalling way to administer a socially just system that was originally aimed at supporting indigenous children. However, it gets worse, because now the major bulk of the funding (50 per cent) will go to remote and distant rural areas, which means that the children will get support only if they stay, for instance, on the Pit lands. If they come to Adelaide and study at Wiltja or they go to another regional centre, their funding will be reduced. It is a nonsense to fund a child with needs according to their postcode, because that child still has needs. Undoubtedly, there will be an impact on those children's education.

It is particularly inequitable, because the funding has been designated to give 50 per cent of Aboriginal funding to children in remote and regional isolated areas, when in fact in South Australia only 18.2 per cent of indigenous children are in remote areas, which means that the bulk of children, that is, 80 per cent of children, will miss out because they do not qualify for that support. It is an appalling way to support indigenous education, and it is a tragedy just when we are arranging a better outcome, better targets and better performance in our system.

I would particularly like to say that this quadrennial funding 'agreement' is not an agreement, because an agreement is where two parties discuss a problem and negotiate a good outcome. The federal government has heard our complaints; it has seen them in writing; it has looked at the documentation; it understands how South Australia will lose out; and this is not an agreement. It will be an arrangement based on force and not an agreement. If those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. The member for Mawson is reverting to his wayward habits, and he had better be careful.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: If those opposite care anything for indigenous children in our state, if they care anything for their outcomes, they should immediately contact the minister and the Prime Minister to point out that South Australian children will suffer.

APY LANDS

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is to the Acting Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister explain the basis for the Premier's false statement made in the house on the 5 May—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member cannot allege a false statement or misleading—

Mr HANNA: Thank you, sir. I will rephrase that. Will the minister explain the basis for the Premier's uncorrected statement made in the house 5 May 2005 in relation to 'properly supported youth workers in every community' on the APY lands? The review and program audit of the Youth Development Program on the APY lands prepared by the department of the Minister for Families and Communities

dated 4 May 2005, the day before the Premier's statement, specifically states in relation to two key communities on the APY lands, 'Fregon: no youth worker is currently appointed. Amata: Amata community has not been successful in recruiting a youth worker.' The onus is on the Premier to explain.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): The suggestion that the Premier somehow misled the house is indeed misguided.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, if the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I understand that the member for Mitchell has been given some sage advice from Professor Lowitja O'Donoghue not to play politics—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morphett!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Not to play politics—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: How do you know that?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Because I happen to be a member of that committee—not to play politics in this area. I would ask—

Mr Hanna interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume his seat. I warn the member for Mitchell that the next time he does that he will be named and dealt with by the house. Banging of the desk is a childish and inappropriate action by any member in here. I point out that I warned someone recently for doing exactly the same thing, and it happened to be on this side as well. The Minister for Families and Communities.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: What we do know about the circumstances of the APY lands is that there is plenty of opportunity for political mischief to be played by using the various differences of opinion that exist on the lands. It is a question of whether or not you choose to take advantage of them.

Mr BRINDAL: I rise on a point of order, relating to relevance. The minister is supposed to address the substance of the question, not cast aspersions on my colleague who asked the question.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The minister is debating it. The question related to a matter involving the Premier. He can clarify that later if he wishes.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, sir. It is important to understand where the questions are coming from. If members had heard the answer that I gave earlier, they would have realised that we, in fact, appointed a manager to support the very youth workers that are being spoken about—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We are having some difficulty in recruiting new workers in a couple of positions on the lands—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume his seat. The house will come to order, and we can then consider moving on. I point out that we are halfway through question time, and the opposition may get its fourth question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, sir. When the story of the APY lands is written about in a few years' time there will be a very clear contrast between the actions of this government and those of the previous government.

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Certainly. I will return to the point, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: As I said in my previous answer, we have increased the level of supervision and support—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume his seat. The minister is now clearly debating the point. I call the leader.

HINDLEY STREET, ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): Is the Minister for Police aware of the reasons why the Premier has failed to respond to the urgent concerns expressed to him in letters from 15 proprietors in Hindley Street regarding the antisocial behaviour in the precinct and asking to meet with the Premier? A lawyer representing the 15 proprietors in Hindley Street wrote letters to the Premier dated 4 January, 8 February and 21 February regarding action in response to the violence in the area. The Premier was invited to a meeting to discuss the level of violence and the range of possible solutions that the proprietors have put forward. Not only has the Premier not met with the group, but none of these letters has been acknowledged.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): I am aware of a letter from a Mr Antonio Tropeano to the Premier which—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, not at all. I have a letter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: A personal attack? I just mentioned the person's name. Are there sensitivities about the name?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: All I know is that a Mr Tropeano wrote (via, I assume, his law firm, Fletcher and Lawson) a number of letters to the Premier; I agree. The particular one I am looking at is dated 28 May. My advice is that the letter was written to the Premier. It came to my office, and it has been sent to the police. I want to make a few points about this issue to the house because, clearly, it is an operational matter, but I have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Police has the call.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It is like a pantomime over there, sir. You can predict their reaction. You always know the member for Bragg will have some clever comment.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Police will answer the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Mawson will just go, 'Shock, horror', and Marty in the middle is not too sure whether or not he should take a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will answer the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am advised by the police that, in the past three years, the crime rate within the central business district of Adelaide has reduced by 23 per cent. I am advised that Adelaide LSA senior officers have met—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The shadow minister for police said, ‘You can’t believe those figures; they’re rubbish.’ What a slur on the police. I will defend our state’s police force against the constant attacks of members opposite.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: I have a point of order, sir. The question was far more specific than the answer.

The SPEAKER: Order! And there is another point of order—it is called not interjecting—which the leader needs to abide by. The Minister for Police needs to answer the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sure, sir. As I said, I am advised that Adelaide LSA senior officers have met with lawyers representing the group of Hindley Street traders on several occasions, and I am advised that they have acted on their concerns. Operation Rosina was implemented earlier this year to target behavioural offences involving youth in the Hindley Street area on weekends. The operation involved police activity such as foot, bicycle, mounted patrols and uniform patrols.

Ms Chapman: And it is not working.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Hang on; can I finish the answer?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bragg.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Bragg says it is not working. Let me complete this particular—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the member for Bragg, and she will be named on the spot.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It involves STAR Group personnel, and police motorcycles to provide a highly visible police presence in the area. I can advise the house that that particular—

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Leader of the Opposition says, ‘That is not what they’re saying.’ Can those opposite for once not be so critical about police because this operation, I am advised, resulted in 78 apprehensions and 47 vehicle defects. That is a significant result for a particular operation. I am further advised that Adelaide police are also working with a number of agencies to address ongoing issues within Hindley Street. These partnerships—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am about to explain, know-all member for Bragg. These partnerships include working with the Adelaide City Council to improve street lighting and camera surveillance—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am giving you some answers. Work has been done. We are putting in increased lighting and camera surveillance in Rosina Street and other targeted areas. Community constables from the Adelaide LSA are working with the community in the development of strategies to reduce crime.

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order: the question did not ask what they had done: it was why has the Premier not replied. The minister is required to address the substance of the question, not go off on some wild goose chase of his own.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member does not give a speech. I think the police minister needs to wind up his answer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: All I am saying is that the police have responded with action, and I challenge the opposition to this question, and we need an answer to this debate: is one of the things that the Hindley Street traders are calling for—and the Leader of the Opposition in a press release today says that the Hindley Street traders have constructive ideas on how the precinct could be better policed. The Leader of the Opposition is backing the Hindley Street traders, and they are proposing voluntary police officers. Do you support that or not?

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order: this has nothing whatsoever to do with the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the minister has concluded his answer now.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Do you want volunteer police? The association will like that!

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order.

The Hon. I.P. Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Hammond!

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond): My question is to the Premier.

The SPEAKER: No; I was pointing out that the member for Hammond should not interject. I will call the member for Heysen because the member for MacKillop was not abiding by the standing orders.

CHILD ABUSE

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Is the Minister for Families and Communities aware of complaints to his office, or subsequent complaints to the Ombudsman regarding methods used by his department’s Special Investigations Unit and, if so, what action has he taken to address the concerns raised?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): At least those opposite are not burdened by the notion of consistency with their questions because we get criticised when we leave children with—

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: On a point of order: on relevance. The minister has carried on from where he finished last time when you, sir, told him to get to the point.

The SPEAKER: The minister should not engage in debate. He should answer the substance—

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I was just prefacing my remarks by pointing that out. It is important to understand the context of the criticisms of the Special Investigations Unit. We set it up in circumstances where there were concerns about abuse in care, that is, foster kids being abused by foster parents—a nasty matter, and a matter that is presently causing the Mullighan Inquiry to pore over decades and decades of abuse.

The Hon. I.P. Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond was seeking the call but he might as well be wishing for a lot of things, because he will be waiting a while if he does not improve his behaviour.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This government set up the Special Investigations Unit to grapple with the question of abuse. Of course, it has now had some success. Some people have been uncovered, which has now led to charges which are now before the courts—and people are

angry about that. People are facing the courts charged with the most heinous crimes against children in their care.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: They are matters before the courts. It would not be sensible to name them. If you just read the court lists and follow a bit of the reportage, you would be able to work it out for yourself. We have a situation where we have a Special Investigations Unit that is taking complaints seriously. We have to balance that with the other question that, from time to time, a false complaint is made. We also know that children have been taken into care in circumstances where there has from time to time been an allegation of abuse or proven abuse, and it could be the case that an allegation is manufactured. We also know that we are in an environment where a lot of people can be struggling for custody of these children, so it is in the interests sometimes of parents or guardians, prospective guardians or former parents to raise allegations or at least to promote suggestions of allegations. This is a complex environment in which we—

The SPEAKER: I think the minister has probably answered the question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, if they do not want answers, sir, I am happy not to give them.

CHILD ABUSE

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): I have addressed this before. This is the very point of contention that has been raised by a person who is presently facing criminal charges in the courts. I do not know why the member for Heysen wants to come in here and rehearse these arguments in this parliament when this man is facing the most heinous crimes in court just down the road. I do not agree with the contention—I hope he faces the justice that he deserves in those courts.

STATE FLEET

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): My question is to the Minister for Administrative Services. Before changing its motor vehicle replacement policy from 40 000 kilometres or two years to 60 000 kilometres or three years, did the government conduct a study of the likely impact on the South Australian car industry and, particularly, employment? The opposition is informed that the state government currently purchases approximately 9 000 cars per year. The majority of them are built in South Australia. The opposition has been told that the new policy starting on 1 July this year will see a reduction of many thousands of vehicles purchased in the 2005-06 financial year.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): I will be happy to get the details for the member but, in addition to that, I would also be pleased to organise a briefing for the shadow minister, and I undertake to do that as a matter of urgency.

Mr WILLIAMS: I have a supplementary question. If the minister does not have the details of that, can he tell the house if the government discussed with the car industry unions its

plan to slash the number of vehicles that it will purchase in the next financial year?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: That is related to the earlier question that the member asked. As I said, I will check that detail for the member, and I am also happy to organise a briefing for him.

HOSPITALS, WUDINNA

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The house will come to order.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Health. Why has the minister refused to release the clinical review into serious allegations of health mistakes, bullying and maladministration at the Wudinna Hospital? The health minister has refused to release the clinical review into the Wudinna Hospital which was undertaken six months ago and, yesterday, she admitted to the house that she had not even read it. The same policy was adopted by the Queensland government on two recent medical disasters—an orthopaedic surgery fiasco at Hervey Bay and the Doctor Death scandal involving 87 deaths at the Bundaberg Base Hospital.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): As I said yesterday, the clinical review to which the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Just be quiet and let me answer the question.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Leader may not get the call again if he is interjects.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Thank you, sir: that would do us all a favour. As I said yesterday, the matter is in the hands of the Wudinna Hospital Board, which has responsibility for the Wudinna Hospital. I understand it is dealing with that issue and I will be awaiting its advice.

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Kavel!

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: My question is again to the Minister for Health, and it follows on from the answer she has just given. Why has the minister left the action on the clinical review report on alleged health blunders at the Wudinna Hospital up to the hospital and regional boards when the allegations included lack of action by those very boards? Although the clinical review report was undertaken six months ago, the minister admitted that she had not read it. The Wudinna allegations included a lack of appropriate action by the hospital board chair and the then CEO of the hospital, both of whom are now involved in the regional health service.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: As I explained yesterday, the matter is in hand by the board. As members may recall, the board did obtain the services of two independent reviewers to do that work for it, and I know that it has taken legal advice in terms of how it should proceed with the matters contained in that report. Again, as I said to the house yesterday, I will endeavour to find out where it is in the process but I know that it is working through the issues.

APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What do

the latest figures reveal about the numbers of apprentices and trainees in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I thank the member for Florey for her question. Unlike the comment just made by the member for Hammond, we are actually doing very well on a national level, and I am sure that everyone in this house will be pleased to hear the good news that South Australia has recorded its highest ever number of trainees and apprentices.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. S.W. KEY: In a report released yesterday by the National Centre for Vocational Education and Research, in its Australian Apprentice and Trainee Statistics, December 2004 Quarter, the NCVER estimated that there were 33 900 apprentices and trainees in training in South Australia. This is 9 per cent higher than last year, and I think everyone would agree that this is good news.

The other news is that South Australia is the only state or territory to experience a rise in the number of people commencing traineeships and apprenticeships over the last quarter. Our state recorded a 5 per cent rise in the number of new apprentices and trainees in that period, and this compares well to the rest of Australia. Female participation in traineeships and apprenticeships also rose by 8.4 per cent in the year to December 2004, and South Australia's proportion of female apprentices and trainees in training is 36.5 per cent—1.2 per cent higher than the national average. The number of South Australians commencing a traditional apprenticeship in the year to December 2004 also rose by 10 per cent. So, on a whole lot of levels, the indicators are very good for South Australia. This really is a tribute to the commitment by people in the training and work force development area, both in the public and the private sector, and they need to take some credit for this happening.

We have put a number of strategies in place to try to encourage people to take up apprenticeships in traditional trades, and these include the pre-apprenticeship program, which is an intensive 6-month course that helps job seekers take up traditional trades. I have previously reported about our training and apprenticeship hotline, and I am pleased to say that hundreds of people—particularly grandmothers, I understand—have been ringing up to find out about traineeships and apprenticeships for their grandchildren. So, thank you to those grandparents out there who have taken this interest. Also, importantly, a number of people have rung up for themselves to find out what apprenticeship occupations are available, and to speak to a person who understands the area, about where they can go and what they need to do with regard to traineeships and apprenticeships. I think I have noted before that the emphasis is to make sure that there is a person to talk to when you ring up, and also that it is someone who understands the area.

This distinguishes it from some of the services offered interstate, where you speak to a machine, rather than a person. We thought it very important that you have someone on the other end of the phone. The other area worth noting is the excellent effort that has been put in place by the group training organisation InSkill SA and also the pre-vocational courses that are offered through TAFE SA. There has been a real push to make sure that not only in the print media but also in radio advertisements we promote traineeships and apprenticeships. Some of the members in this chamber may have heard the quite good, I think, apprenticeship ads that we

have been running recently. We are also trialling a training subsidy for existing workers—

Mr BRINDAL: On a point of order, sir, it is a fascinating answer but my point of order is relevance. The question was: what have the figures got to do with the numbers? I cannot see how the answer relates to the question.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the minister needs to winds up the answer.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Certainly, sir: I was intending to do that. I must say I am a bit disappointed that the member for Unley, as a previous minister for employment and training, is not interested in this. Just to finalise my comments, I will say that the new defence contracts in South Australia's skills area will make sure that our numbers increase even further. I guess the main point that comes from today is that South Australia has recorded its highest ever number of trainees and apprentices.

OVERSEAS-TRAINED SURGEONS

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Health give an absolute assurance that all overseas-trained surgeons with limited registration who are working in South Australian public hospitals are doing so under appropriate and direct supervision as requested and required by the South Australian Medical Board? It has now been revealed in Queensland that Dr Patel, who has been linked to 87 deaths at the Bundaberg Base Hospital and is now known as Dr Death, had limited registration and was supposedly operating only under direct medical supervision, which did not occur.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): The events in Queensland are extremely concerning and I am sure that, when the royal commission and other inquiries have finished in that state, there will be ramifications for health service delivery all over Australia in terms of the assurance of quality and safety in the provision of services. I have been speaking with members of the Medical Board of South Australia on a range of issues in relation to overseas-trained doctors. In fact, not so long ago, concerns were raised with me by some doctor recruiting firms that they were being held up and that the Medical Board was being obstructionist in terms of getting through the business of giving accreditation to certain doctors.

I must say that in all those discussions the Medical Board was absolutely clear that its first and foremost role in all this is, of course, to protect the safety of the public, and that is reassuring to hear. The Medical Board in South Australia is very aware of its responsibilities in that regard. The whole issue of overseas trained doctors, the work force shortages that are currently very extensive in Australia and the fact that, because of these work force shortages, health services across Australia have been forced to rely on overseas trained doctors—

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I rise on a point of order. I appreciate the comments that the minister has made about the Medical Board but the question was quite specific. I wanted an assurance that in the public hospitals these doctors were only working where they are required to under supervision. I just want that assurance.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: As I was saying, sir, because we are so reliant on overseas trained doctors it is important to have the processes in place, and my understanding is that Medical Board certainly takes that role very seriously indeed.

INFLUENZA VACCINE

Ms RANKINE (Wright): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given the reported shortages experienced earlier this year, can the minister update the house about the current availability of the flu vaccine?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): This is particularly pertinent because we have now officially entered the winter season and it is particularly important because we have had an unusually warm autumn and no rain and it does not feel like winter, but the flu will be on its way. Earlier this year I was informed about a disruption to the supply of the influenza vaccine which affected supplies right across Australia. This situation came about following the failure of the flu vaccine to pass batch testing by the Therapeutic Goods Administration. I am pleased to inform the house that supplies have now been restored, and I would like to take this opportunity to remind all South Australians to visit their doctor and get a flu vaccination now that winter has officially commenced.

This vaccination can prevent hospitalisation and certainly reduces the severe complications of flu infections. We know that there are particular groups in our community who are at greater risk. South Australians aged over 65, as part of that more at-risk group, are eligible for a free flu vaccine. I am pleased to inform the house that in this state we have an excellent take-up record for flu vaccine among older South Australians. Last year, South Australian seniors led the nation with an 83 per cent vaccination rate compared with the national average of 77 per cent. Seniors are also eligible for a free pneumococcal vaccine. Free flu vaccinations are also available to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people aged 50 years and over and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people aged 15 years and over with high risk medical conditions. Those who are not eligible for the free vaccine can purchase the vaccine on prescription for about \$20 and have it administered by their local doctor.

The flu can result in significant illness and can affect the health of our families and work mates. Many employers have seen the value of the flu vaccine and are offering it to their workers. The cost of the vaccination pales into insignificance against the cost to a business of workplace sickness and I would encourage all employers to consider the value of providing sponsored flu vaccination programs in their workplace.

PRESS CLUB REMARKS

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond): When did the Minister for Police first discuss with the Police Commissioner or any other South Australian police officer or any minister the intention to raid the ABC and confiscate the Press Club videotape of the remarks I made to it? Did he bully any or all of these in those discussions?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Minister for Police): I find the member for Hammond's questions in this place becoming sillier and sillier by the day.

The Hon. I.P. Lewis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Hammond!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That was stinging. I would have thought that even the member for Bragg, in all her abundance of wisdom, would also know that the Police Commissioner and I are hardly going to be discussing an operational issue such as if or when or why the police would choose to raid the ABC studios to get access to a tape of anyone's contribution.

I inform the house that they are not matters that are the subject of discussions or advice between the Police Commissioner and me. For goodness sake!

CLARE VALLEY WATER TANKS

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. When will the minister rule whether small businesses and bed and breakfast establishments in the Clare Valley will be able to use water which runs off their roof and is then captured in rainwater tanks? Several of my constituents who operate small businesses and bed and breakfasts in the Clare Valley have been instructed that they cannot use roof run-off in their rainwater tanks. They have been told that, instead of roof run-off, they will have to fill their tanks with water purchased, carted and pumped into the tanks. On pointing out to the officers that the tanks are already full with rainwater captured last year, which they have been told they are not allowed to use, they have been told to turn on the taps and empty the tanks and then fill them with purchased water.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order. The Minister for Environment and Planning.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Environment and Conservation): I thank the member for that fascinating question. It sounds totally absurd. I have not been advised of such a state of affairs, but I certainly will have it investigated for him.

KAPUNDA ROAD ROYAL COMMISSION

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney-General has leave.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: On 5 May, the Governor in Executive Council appointed Mr Gregory Reginald James QC to be a Royal Commissioner to inquire into and report on matters set out in the terms of reference for the Kapunda Road Royal Commission. Mr James QC has requested that his terms of reference be extended.

Today, just before question time, the Governor in Executive Council approved adding to the commission's terms of reference. After existing paragraph 1 (second appearing) this paragraph is inserted:

1A Whether the police investigation of the conduct described in (1) and (2) above was undertaken appropriately, efficiently and expeditiously in all respects.

After existing paragraph 9, this paragraph is inserted:

9A You may also include in your report more general recommendations as to reasonably practicable reforms of the law, practice and procedure relating to disclosure in criminal matters that will better serve the interests of justice.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop is out of order! The Attorney.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Commissioner has sought the amendments to the terms of reference to put beyond doubt his authority to consider those matters.

Arguably, these matters already fall within the original terms of reference. Clarifying the terms of reference will avoid time-consuming legal argument about the scope of the terms of reference.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg will listen.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The Commissioner does not consider that the amendments to the terms of reference are likely to increase significantly the work required of the Commissioner, or put back the time at which he will be required to report. For these reasons, the government believes it is in the public interest that these amendments were made.

CHARTER BOAT MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I am pleased to inform the house of the release of the new management plan for the state's charter boat industry. Charter boat fishing is an increasingly important tourism-related industry, where charter operators provide access to and enjoyment of our marine fish resources for recreational anglers under professional and specialist guidance. This plan is the result of extensive industry and community consultation since 1998, when formal management of the charter boat sector was first considered. Following the establishment of a working group in 2004, which included members of the Charter Boat Owners and Operators Association of SA, the South Australian Recreational Fisheries Advisory Council and the Marine Scale Fish Fisheries Management Committee, a draft management plan for the industry was developed and later released for public comment in October last year.

The plan provides a structured framework for the management and rational development of the industry that will ensure that both the industry and our valuable fish stocks remain sustainable into the future. Left unmanaged, the continued expansion and development of the industry was likely to have prolonged biological impacts on fishing stocks, as well as an economic consequence for the commercial, recreational and charter sectors. Under the plan, all charter boat operators will be licensed and subject to fisheries management tools, including gear restrictions and specific bag and boat limits for passengers. Importantly, the formal licensing scheme will come into effect from 1 August this year.

Over the next few days, the Department of Primary Industries and Resources SA will be writing to those people who have expressed an interest in applying for a charter boat licence. The charter boat industry is closely connected with recreational fishing and regional tourism in South Australia. The plan has the support of key industry players, and it provides the best way forward for the development of this valuable tourism-based industry.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

DOUBLE DEMERIT POINTS

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): Today, we have seen the most cynical piece of politicking from the Deputy Premier. He accused me of playing politics over double

demerit points because the government's slipshod and hastily cobbled together legislation has been tossed out of the other place. He has been on radio today holding me personally responsible for the next road death on a holiday or long weekend. If that is not playing politics, I do not know what is. Two people are playing politics in this house, and neither of them is me. One is the Deputy Premier and the other is the minister—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: On a point of order, sir, the Deputy leader of the Opposition just accused the government of misleading the parliament. I ask that the member either withdraw and apologise or move a substantive motion.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear what was said but, if the deputy leader said that, he should withdraw.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Mr Speaker, I said, 'This house has been misled.' I made no accusations against any individual in the house, so I do not withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Members should be careful. However, if it is a generality, it stays that way.

Mr BROKENSHIRE: Last week I asked the minister to provide the evidence to back up his claims about how effective double demerit points would be. I asked him to provide the opposition with the Road Safety Advisory Council's recommendations on this issue. I also asked him more than 20 times over a period of two hours during the debate. He refused to provide them and claimed that the documents I wanted did not exist, and he said that for one reason only: the documents did not support his case. A week after we debated the bill the documents have finally surfaced. And guess what? They confirm what we knew all along: there is no evidence to support the government's claims that double demerit points are an effective road safety initiative. And get this. The minister's own department recommended against their introduction. What a sham the bill was and what a sham the minister's contribution to the debate was.

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for West Torrens!

Mr BROKENSHIRE: This house was asked to rush through a piece of legislation on the word of the Minister for Transport with nothing to back it up, and we believed him. But it will not happen again, because his nose has grown a bit over the past week. That is what this government is all about: spin, spin and more spin. There is so much spin that we are all getting giddy.

The minister claimed that the double demerit points bill was a road safety initiative. That is wrong. The bill was about creating the illusion that the government cares about road trauma when, clearly, it does not. That is what this government is all about in almost every issue it says it is tackling. It is all about increasing penalties instead of attacking root causes, whether it is crime or road safety, and that is because increasing the penalties does not cost it anything.

The Productivity Commission report shows that the Rann government has halved spending on road safety in three years. It now spends only \$9 a head compared to a \$29 a head national average. It is not serious about road safety. It is only after a news grab and creating the illusion that it is doing something when, clearly, it is not. The government will go to any lengths to create that impression, including the depth of deception to which the transport minister was prepared to plunge last week.

It is unfortunate that the minister is not here today, because I was very much looking forward to his coming into the house and apologising to me and the rest of the opposition

for being so deceptive when we debated this legislation last week. However, I do not really expect an apology from the Minister for Transport or the Deputy Premier. In fact, they have no respect for this house (just ask the DPP), the democratic processes of this parliament or the people of this state. This government—and, in particular, the Minister for Police and the Minister for Transport—thumbs its nose at the parliament, at democracy and also at the electorate of South Australia, and it needs to be condemned.

ARCHITECTURE

Mr RAU (Enfield): I would like to lift the tone a little in my short contribution today. I want to talk about the arts—in fact, I want to talk about the queen of the arts, which is architecture. In particular, I want to talk about the premier site for architecture in Adelaide, Victoria Square. I invite members to go to Victoria Square and stand in the middle (do not get run over but stand near the middle), do a 360-degree turn and have a look at the smorgasbord of architecture that surrounds them in Victoria Square. We have the old Moore's building, a fine old building which has been restored very well and which performs a great public service. We have the old maritime building a little further down the way. There are also a couple of other buildings getting down towards the post office that are not too bad.

We have the Supreme Court building which was formerly a magistrates court, a very nice building except for the blot at the back of it: that dreadful library building which deserves to be gelignited. Across the road we have the delightful little original Supreme Court building which is the beginning point of my contribution on the arts this afternoon. The original Supreme Court building was an original 19th century building and had enormous character. Some person whose concept of what is artistic differs dramatically from mine got hold of that building and, much as my four-year old works on Lego, added pieces which do not fit on top of it.

So, we now have a lovely 19th century building on top of which there is a sandstone facade—a very poor outlook as far as I am concerned—and what do we have above that? We have a brick edifice. The building is awful and it is a shemozzle. It is a disgrace, in my opinion, that in an area like Victoria Square, we have buildings of that calibre, when we should be adding to the great quality of buildings which are already there, trying to do something positive. It looks like a contribution that a four-year old would have made with a mixed set of Lego.

We now move on to the new Federal Court building. I admit the new Federal Court building replaces an awful eyesore, but let us have a look at it. Leaving aside the big copper piece on the side of it—I was scratching my head this morning trying to work out where I had seen it before, and I remembered, and I went to the library, Mr Speaker—and you saw me down there, doing some research on it. The building that this is designed to copy is a building called the Palast der Republik, which stands in East Berlin, now a part of Berlin. The Palast der Republik was constructed in the 1970s in the prevailing style for East German buildings with bronze mirrored windows. In 1976, the Volkskammer, which was what passed for a parliament, moved in. It was built on the site of the old Berliner Stadtschloss, which was the city palace, which was demolished because it was politically unsound according to the government of the GDR.

We now have Adelaide's own version of the Palast der Republik sitting there in Victoria Square. Its use-by-date, in

my humble opinion, has already passed. It is a post-modern, Stalinist state, architectural statement which needs to be, hopefully, removed as soon as possible. I realise that that is not practical in the short-term. I know, because I have been to many art galleries in my time, that there are some people who believe that two old boots and a toilet roll stuck on a piece of canvas constitutes art. I am not one of those people, but I am satisfied that the people who consider that to be art would also be mightily impressed with what is popping up on the southern side of Victoria Square.

LAW AND ORDER

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I am minded in making my contribution today to support the member for Enfield. Rarely have I seen such a fastidiously ugly edifice grow in our city. It is the most appalling building that I have ever seen.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: I would prefer Magic Mountain in Victoria Square than that building. It is truly appalling.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: Well, you could cover Magic Mountain with snow, you could do something with Magic Mountain. I do not think you could anything with that building.

The subject on which I would like to speak today was briefly canvassed in question time, and has certainly been canvassed by our leader, and that is the deterioration in the law and order situation in the City of Adelaide. The government can come in here, bring out statistics, and it can prove by using those means best known by accountants and economists that black is white. But, in fact, when traders in a precinct tell you that there is an increasing problem, I think it would be wise for this parliament to listen to the traders. If people living and working in an area do not know the area, then I do not know who does. Despite what this government is trying to assert, there is a deteriorating problem in respect to law and order in the city, and that should worry each and every one of us, especially people like the member for Florey, who I know is deeply concerned for social justice issues.

I, for one (and I know the minister sitting here agrees), do not believe that our homeless and dispossessed, the people who are most disadvantaged in society, should all be foisted out of the city because it is not quite good enough for them to be there any more. The essence of a city is a cosmopolitan mix of all peoples, and perhaps the people who most need to be nurtured in a city are our most disadvantaged because, homeless or otherwise, they are closest to hospitals, police stations and all those facilities which their socioeconomic status generally denies them. I do not believe that these people should be foisted out.

However, we have a situation where a succession of governments, city councils and developers have revitalised much of our city. If we look now the population that constitutes the square mile of Adelaide, we see that it is much higher than it has been for many decades and, interestingly and excitingly, it includes many international students who are living in city buildings, even on Rundle Mall itself, because the University of South Australia has a dormitory in what I think was the old State Bank building in a set of student digs. With these people coming into the city, we create the elements of a truly cosmopolitan city.

Unfortunately, that is not supported if that city is not well lit and if, in that city, there is an increasing element of danger. Hindley Street traders are saying repeatedly that the city is less safe than it should be, and it is not only Hindley Street

traders who say this but others, too. That should not be a matter of politics—Labor versus Liberal. It should be a matter of public concern for the Corporation of the City of Adelaide and for every member in this place. We are talking about—

Ms Ciccarello interjecting:

Mr BRINDAL: The member for Norwood raises the matter of cars, which is interesting, because, statistically, if you want your car stolen, bring it into the city. Signs are now all over the city saying, 'Lock up your car. Be careful. The car is likely to be stolen if you park it in the city.' That is a great message for our international students and visitors to our city: come to this city and you are likely to get your hire car vandalised or stolen. It might only be a hire car but at least it is used. There is a problem in our city. There is a problem related to law and order, and it is not going to be fixed by rhetoric. It is not going to be fixed by the government's coming in here, fiddling the numbers and telling us that local traders do not know what they are talking about.

The people who live in the city are worried about the city. We are paid to represent all South Australians and to see that our capital city is a model of which the rest of Australia can be proud. A government that comes here and abdicates its responsibility has no right to govern. I call on this government and all the ministers immediately to increase policing in the city and any other factor which will make this city a better and safer community.

Time expired.

SOUTHERN, Mr. D.L.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Many people have played a special role at the Modbury Public Hospital. One such man was David Lyndon Southern, who sadly passed away on 18 March this year. His obituary in *The Advertiser* on 21 May gave details of both the professional and personal side of a man who was one of the longest serving and most respected health executives in South Australia. He had worked in both city and country positions during a career that spanned over 30 years. David was part of the original commissioning team responsible for the development of the Modbury Public Hospital in 1972. Although I had known David since 1990 through my work in the community, I now know how little I knew about him.

David overcame adversity to forge a successful career. When he was six years old he developed polio and spent 18 months away from school with his legs in plaster. I suppose this could have been the catalyst for his interest in health issues. To keep up with his schoolwork, he had lessons by correspondence before returning. He went on to complete a tertiary education before taking up posts in places such as Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, Barmera, Wallaroo and Mount Gambier. Plans to return to the city probably began when the Modbury Public Hospital was first mooted. It is a facility that plays a vital role in the community of the north-eastern suburbs, and it is located in the Florey electorate.

David became involved with the Western Rehabilitation Service in 1975 and was involved in setting up the Queen Elizabeth Hospital's dialysis service located in North Adelaide. He also played a vital role in establishing a specialist industrial injury rehabilitation service, the first of its kind. In 1983 he became Deputy CEO of the Modbury Hospital board of management, becoming CEO in 1995—a position he held until his untimely death.

He managed to fit in many other extracurricular activities with his busy role, among them vice president of the South Australian branch of the Australian College of Health Executives. He also held executive positions with the Australian Healthcare Association, the Royal District Nursing Association of South Australia, and the Northern Metropolitan Community Health Service. He also played a role in the Adelaide North-East Division of General Practice, which is housed within the Modbury Public Hospital, and which is still well known for its good work.

David was also heavily involved with the Modbury Public Hospital Foundation, and many of those excellent projects are still going—I know that he had a great deal to do with the renal one in the beginning. He received a Centenary Medal in 2003 for his contribution to health in South Australia.

What few people knew about David was his interest in cars. He had begun restoring a Jensen Healy and owned a 1950 FX Holden. David loved his family and, despite being on up to 18 committees at one time, he loved spending time with them and with friends on snow or water skiing holidays. David is survived by his wife Margie and twin daughters Natasha and Amanda, and son-in-law Tim.

That such a fit man could suffer a heart attack shocked everyone, and it is a warning to us all—particularly in here with our sedentary lifestyle. On 14 March he was rushed to hospital, and the news of his death on 18 March can still scarcely be believed by many of us. Through my work I saw David regularly, and I particularly remember his interaction and forbearance with the Modbury Hospital local action group at the time of the privatisation of the hospital's management. We, of course, had chats at the Adelaide North-East Division's functions and meetings from time to time, and I also especially think of his role in the Modbury Hospital Foundation's launch of the Modbury Hospital camellia at Newman's Nursery a couple of years ago, as I have a photo of that day in my office because the Newman's Nursery family were there, including the current owner's mother—Mrs Hall snr. I also have a plant of that camellia in a tub by my dining room window which I have, unfortunately, almost killed with fertiliser; but it lives on, and I actually think of David every morning.

David's passing has caused great sadness, and on behalf of my staff, who had a great deal to do with him and his staff, and the residents of Florey I extend my sincere and belated condolences to his family, friends and his staff. He was very well loved and respected and will be long remembered.

ENCOUNTER MARINE PROTECTED AREA

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I wish to speak about the Encounter Marine Protected Area proposed by the government, which affects only my electorate. It covers the eastern waters of Kangaroo Island and the coastline from the Murray Mouth right around past Carrickalinga North; all that area, including the islands, forms part of that marine protected area (MPA).

To assess public reaction to this, there have been three public meetings on the MPAs. The one on Kangaroo Island was attended by 130 people—an enormous attendance indeed for a public meeting on Kangaroo Island. I called another one at Yankalilla and one at Victor Harbor, and I invited anyone who wanted to come along. There were a number of key speakers whom I had asked to come speak, including representatives from the Department for Environment and Heritage. I also invited the minister to come to the two

meetings I organised—and I understand it was the same for the one on Kangaroo Island. I might add that the minister was a notable apology, because clearly he does not want to hear the facts about the whole process under which the MPAs have been proposed.

First, at two of the meetings I actually put a range of issues to a vote, and I can advise that there was overwhelming support for the concept of marine protected areas. However, there was unanimous rejection, at two of the meetings, of the proposals for the Encounter MPA put up by the government. In other words, not one person there stood up and voted in favour of those proposals. Although there was no formal vote at the meetings, it is clear that about 95 or 98 per cent of the people of Kangaroo Island totally rejected the proposal put forward by the government. What are their objections? First, that the whole process is clearly flawed. The parliament should have passed the legislation first. Once that has been passed by parliament and we know what the framework is, then you can go ahead and have broad consultation around the entire coastline of South Australia. When you have had that entire consultation, then you can put up proposals for the full coastline of South Australia and then finally put those proposals out for three months' consultation, instead of going around trying to put the cart before the horse. The view was expressed at these meetings that this is arse about.

It was clear that the departmental officers were highly embarrassed by the whole process under which these had been developed. There has been no effective consultation whatever, despite the claims by the minister and the acting minister. In fact, the consultative committee that had been set up by the previous government was told by this government in late 2002 that all proposals before the committee were highly secret and they were not to discuss them with anyone. And yet they were consultative committees! At these public meetings, we could not find anyone who had been consulted. We could not find anyone able to stand up and say 'Yes, I've been consulted', whether they were recreational fishers, Sea Rescue Squadron, commercial fishers or any other group within the community.

There is no economic impact statement, no social impact statement, we have not seen the legislation and we will not see the legislation, apparently, until late this year. It has not even been drawn, so how could the departmental officers claim that people would be compensated and how they would be compensated when the parliament has not even determined that factor? Furthermore, they are bad proposals. Imagine closing off the western part of Bashams Beach even to kids fishing off the beach, right next to the Port Elliot caravan park where thousands of people a year fish off the rocks or off the beach because that is their holiday.

Imagine stopping that or stopping fishing off the beach at Carrickalinga North. This proposal would mean that about 80 per cent of the area within five kilometres of the beach ramp at Victor Harbor would be closed off to fishing, forcing a lot of people in their dinghies etc. out to deep sea. It would remove 60 per cent of the rock lobster catch, so on behalf of those people I ask that the proposals be withdrawn and—

Time expired.

FESTA DELLA REPUBBLICA

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): Today, 2 June, is a very significant day for Italians around the world, because today we celebrate the Festa della Repubblica, Italian National Day, which celebrates the creation of a new Italy from the heritage

of her eventful and sometimes tortured past. We also celebrate the successful and vibrant nation that Italy is today. After the disastrous consequences of the Second World War, few could have believed that Italy's recovery would be so emphatic. It is a tribute to the people of Italy—assisted in no small part by millions of emigres—that Italy is now one of the world's great industrial and economic powers.

The declaration of the Italian republic, made on this day 59 years ago, gave Italians the opportunity to put the painful years of war and dictatorship behind them. It gave them the chance to renew the spirit that drove unification in the 1860s, led by Giuseppe Garibaldi. It is a credit to Italy and her people that they did not dwell on the past: they embarked on a journey into an optimistic future. Italy's cultural, economic, industrial and social rebirth surprised the world and became a model for national reinvigoration and reinvention. Italy and Australia share enduring links of tradition and culture, forged by the large number of people of Italian descent who live in Australia.

It is important to continue acknowledging the contribution that Italian migrants and their descendants made and continue to make to Australia. I know we do so every year and at every opportunity, but it is an immense contribution by any standards. It has permanently shaped many facets of contemporary Australian life. We can never overstate the relevance, importance and rewards that Italians have brought to Australia.

The South Australian Italian community has played a very significant role in shaping South Australia into a cosmopolitan state renowned for its fine restaurants, bars and cafes. Adelaide's Italians have excelled in many areas and have proven themselves to be outstanding citizens in many areas—business, commerce, arts and academia—with South Australia being a very cosmopolitan place with its fine restaurants, bars and cafes. The Italian community has had a wonderful influence on the eating habits of people in South Australia and, in my own area of Norwood, many people coming from overseas comment that The Parade is as close to an Italian street that you will find anywhere in the world.

The Italian community of South Australia has always had the full support of the government of Mike Rann and can look forward to even more support. Last Thursday the Premier proposed to his partner Sasha Carruozzo just a couple of doors down from my office on The Parade, so we now have very enduring links between Italy and Australia.

This evening I will be attending a function at the Marche Club which, for the first time, will be hosted by the Consul for Italy (Dr Simone de Santi), Mr Vincenzo Papandrea, who is the president of COM.IT.ES, which is the Council for Italians Abroad, and Mr Robert Berton, the President of the Italian Chamber of Commerce. Many people from the Italo-Australian community will be present to celebrate this very significant day in the history of the Italian nation.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Wednesday 23 June at 10.30 a.m.

Motion carried.

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

A quorum having been formed:

AMBULANCE SERVICES (SA AMBULANCE SERVICE INC) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 5 May. Page 2558.)

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): This bill amends the Ambulance Services Act of South Australia. I find it interesting what has occurred with this in the last few days. I will set out briefly the introduction of this bill. It was introduced by the minister while we were at Mount Gambier in the first week of May. The minister's speech and the explanation given to the parliament set out in some detail that there had been an agreement reached between the Priory and the state government by the previous government for the removal of the name 'Priory' and the name 'St John's'. That is all that the speech given by the minister and the explanation given in the bill dealt with.

When I was sitting there listening to this bill being introduced by the minister at Mount Gambier, I came to the conclusion that this would be a very simple bill. I remember being in cabinet where we agreed that the Priory would withdraw, at its own request—and I stress that it was at its own request—any reference to 'St John's' or to the 'Priory' would no longer be adhered to in the act. That was overcome by the Priory delegating to the minister its powers of appointment under the principal act to appoint board members. Therefore, having heard that, when I picked up the bill—and I guess I looked at it for less than 60 seconds—I realised that this was the greatest deception in terms of what was claimed within the second reading speech and the explanation and what the actual bill did. You could see at a glance that part 3 of the act, which set out the appointment of the board, was being totally deleted. In its place was the following:

Management of the affairs of SAAS is vested in a committee to be known as the Ambulance Board to be appointed by the minister in accordance with the rules.

A little further down in the substituted part 3, it provides:

The rules of SAAS are to be made, varied or revoked by regulation.

Here was the most profound change of all. The minister was taking out of the act the power to say who would be on the Ambulance Board and giving it to herself, and she was not even notifying the parliament that this profound change was taking place.

So, I undertook some investigations, and I was amazed to find that the Ambulance Board members had not been told that they were about to be abolished if this legislation went through—because that would be its effect. It completely removes the existing board and gives the minister the power to set up the board, under her own determination and with no say from this parliament as to how that board would be appointed.

I was equally amazed to find that, at the very time this legislation was being introduced into parliament down at Mount Gambier in the first week of May, the board had been having a workshop to determine the composition of the board. As a result of that workshop, a number of ideas came up and they decided to have a subsequent workshop to determine the power of the board. I understand the CEO of the Department

of Health gave an indication that the legislation was before the parliament, but there was no indication at all that that legislation removed completely the power of the parliament to set who was on the board and gave it to the minister, and to do it by way of regulation.

I find this a great deception in terms of the way this bill has been handled. I know that there was a meeting of the board on Tuesday night. I do not know what transpired at that meeting, but I do know that yesterday the minister put down on the *Notice Paper* of this parliament that this bill now be read and discharged. Why? Because she was caught out. She had been caught out in terms of having brought in legislation that was abolishing the board. I challenge the minister to tell me anywhere in any of her explanation or speech where she talks about how she is removing the board as it is with this legislation and, in fact, taking that power unto herself and setting it by way of regulation.

It means of course—because we know from regulation—that the government determines the regulations in Executive Council. It brings them in, and it can do that when the parliament is not sitting, and it can appoint the board, and this parliament would not have the chance to disallow those regulations before the board was appointed. I am concerned at the process and the lack of accountability in terms of how this legislation was brought in. I guess the minister might say, 'Well, there was some form of misunderstanding of the drafting instructions'. I point out that it took me less than 60 seconds, when I picked up the piece of legislation, to realise that this is what was occurring. That would suggest, if the minister has now introduced amendments, as she has into this parliament, that she had not even bothered to read this legislation before it went to parliament—if you accept that as the justification. I do not accept it. I believe the minister knew exactly what she was doing—

The Hon. L. Stevens: No. Of course not.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Well, it has to be one of the other. It has to be that either the minister knew damn well what she was doing and had not bothered to notify this parliament, or to put it in a speech, or it means that the minister took this very simple piece of legislation to cabinet, and put it before cabinet without even reading it. Either one shows a high degree of incompetence. It means that the minister, if you accept that latter argument, had not even bothered to read her own legislation before she took it to cabinet, or before she brought it into this parliament. Otherwise, she might like to explain to us what apparently suddenly occurred on Wednesday morning, because that is when the notice of motion to read, withdraw and discharge the bill was introduced on the *Notice Paper*, that suddenly brought about the change in heart, because this legislation has been sitting before the parliament now for four weeks. Or, she might like to explain to us what occurred between 1 o'clock yesterday when the green *Notice Paper* had on it that the bill be read and discharged, which meant thrown out altogether for those who do not understand, and suddenly saying, 'No, we're no longer going ahead with that; we're now introducing amendments and, in fact, here are the amendments,' which suddenly brings the composition of the board back into the bill and, therefore, back into the principal act when it is passed.

I think this parliament deserves a thorough explanation by the minister. I support the bill being in the act. In fact, I went to my party room last week and said, 'Look, I've just realised that we have been deceived on this and we should put up an amendment in terms of the composition of the act.' So, I went

to them again this week and I asked that it be deferred over, as the minister knows, to this week because in fact we just found out—I did not explain to the minister why—the deception that had been imposed. I was going to highlight it in here, but I wanted to see the extent to which that deception was taking place. It would appear that the deception was very extensive indeed.

The minister has now brought into the bill the composition of the ambulance board. She basically has done that to try to maintain the present composition of the board on a reasonably close basis. I support that general principle. I have a few problems with some of the fine detail of it, but I will deal with that when we reach the committee stage. However, I point out that I think this parliament deserves better than that. I have a copy of the ambulance services bill report that was tabled, and there is no mention in the report that we are abolishing the board.

I have the briefing notes that were sent to me by the minister's department (I appreciate receiving the notes), and there is no mention in those briefing notes of the abolition of the board. All they refer to is the removal of the words 'Priory' and 'St John' from the act. We have no objection whatsoever to that because, after all, it was the Liberal government that was initially involved in the negotiation of that with St John and the Priory. I support the bill, but with an amendment, which I will deal with during the committee stage. I would not have supported the bill (and I do not think the upper house would have done so, either) in the original form in which it was brought—

The Hon. L. Stevens: Of course, it wasn't going to be.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: What does the minister mean, it was not going to be? Clearly, it was. Somehow, there was a flash of light for the minister yesterday morning that this bill is unsatisfactory and should be withdrawn, and then she had another flash of light during the day and said, 'No, we will proceed with it, but we will move an amendment and put the board back into the bill.' I think this parliament deserves an explanation from the minister about how and why it occurred. I do not mind ministers introducing contentious legislation. They have every right to do that; that is what this parliament is about. But they should not try to slip something through the parliament without any reference whatsoever to it in the second reading speech which is brought into this parliament and which is a formal document. As I said, frankly, this parliament deserves better. I support the bill's moving into the committee stage.

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I want to thank the minister for introducing this legislation, and I want to make a brief reference to recognise the enormous contribution of volunteers in our South Australian Ambulance Service and also in the St John organisation. I have had the honour to attend two presentations for the South Australian Ambulance Service (the last one being in May this year), recognising those people who have given more than 25 years of service on a voluntary basis to our ambulance service in country regions. If it was not for these volunteers, in the main, our country regions would not have an ambulance service. Some of those awardees had clocked up not just 25 years but 30, 40 and 50 years—and I think one person had done something like 52 years of voluntary service.

It is not just a case of these people attending an incident and applying some first aid. Their level of professionalism is quite outstanding, and the training they undertake is enormous. It takes many hundreds of hours to obtain and maintain

the level of skill they need. I have seen first-hand the relief that is brought to a very distressing situation just by the sight of these people in their green uniforms—in their ambulance overalls. People's confidence in these volunteer ambulance workers is justified, but they certainly carry a great responsibility. Unlike many voluntary organisations, people's lives are clearly on the line when these people go out and undertake their volunteer service.

It was interesting to hear some of the motivations behind people initially becoming involved in the ambulance service. For some it was a personal issue, where one of their own had needed some help, and once that had been provided, and they were in a position also to be involved, they have continued to do that. It takes a lot for someone to give a level of service for as many years as those awardees whom I had the privilege of meeting had done. I think it is an indication not only that they give to their communities but also that they get an awful lot out of it. I have seen great camaraderie amongst those people in the ambulance service, and certainly a sense that they are doing something vital and very worthwhile in their communities.

I attended the second only recognition service for ambulance volunteers, and I think that is an indication of the culture change that is happening within South Australia in relation to volunteers—being led by our Premier taking on that portfolio responsibility—a culture change that is happening not only in the community but also within the Public Service. It was interesting while we were in Mount Gambier—as the Deputy Leader referred to the legislation being introduced down there—to talk to the chairperson of the volunteer network down there, and to hear her relaying the pride that some of her volunteers now express in relation to being a volunteer. As opposed to explaining why they might be unemployed, for example, people are saying very proudly that they volunteer for Lifeline, or as carers for young people with disabilities. So, individuals are taking a great deal of pride, and gaining an enormous amount of self-worth in the volunteer activities that they undertake.

Certainly, a change is happening within our Public Service—a recognition from the top down of the enormous contribution that volunteers make both within government and outside. I think the ambulance service certainly recognises the importance of its volunteers. I was chatting to one of the executives and said I was surprised that last year was the first time that they had ever honoured their volunteers, and he replied, 'We just expected them to keep on doing it.' And indeed they would, but I think it is really important that we say, 'Thank you,' even if it is in a small way to those people who make such an effort.

In relation to ambulance volunteers, it is not only the time and effort that they give, but also the time, effort and sacrifices that their families make, allowing their loved ones to sometimes disappear from the home for 12 to 14 hours at a time. In standing to support the bill that has been introduced by the minister, I would like to pay a tribute to our ambulance and St John volunteers who give so much of themselves to ensure that our community is safe.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Wright for her comments, and also the support that the deputy leader has indicated for the bill. The purpose of this legislation is to remove all references to St John and the Priory from the current Ambulance Services Act 1992. It is the government's intention to do only that in terms

of the way in which the governance of the ambulance service is constructed.

In terms of the issues that the deputy leader raised, the matter that caused me to place on file an amendment to the bill, as tabled originally in the house (and I put that amendment on file last night after explaining it to the deputy leader, and speaking with him about the issue), was that the present South Australian Ambulance Service was incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act 1985, and that was done on 1 July 1993.

Because the South Australian Ambulance Service is under the Associations Incorporation Act, amendments to that act caused the parts of the original bill concerning the make-up of the board to be legislated in a different way under the Associations Incorporation Act. That is why the make-up of the board was according to the rules, as in the original bill, and the rules are part of the regulations. That is how the bill originally was tabled. It was brought to my attention by the board that there was concern about the fact that the membership of the board was not going to be explicit in the legislation itself.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Actually, it is interesting, and I will talk about how the deputy leader saw it and the way we approached it in a moment. However, when those concerns were raised with me, we had a number of conversations with parliamentary counsel and took some advice in terms of the Associations Incorporation Act and that is why there was a bit of toing and froing yesterday but, finally, I have come back to the parliament with an amendment which makes explicit the establishment of the ambulance board, and that is the amendment that is before the house. I will speak about that in a moment. As I said, that was put on file last night. The deputy leader made a very dramatic speech and accused the government and me of intentionally deceiving the community and everybody else in relation to this issue. I put on the record that that was not the case. In fact—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I had read the bill. Perhaps the deputy leader might be silent. I noted in his comments that he said that, as soon as he looked at it, he saw this issue. My question is: why did he not pick up the phone and just have a talk with me about it? In accusing me of being deceptive, he himself was being deceptive. We have seen it many times, and I do not want to go into the other times that this sort of behaviour by the deputy leader is a constant—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader has had his turn.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: There you go. There is no obligation for me to work cooperatively. It is true. The public really like to see a bit better from politicians that we might actually be able to sort things out. I would have appreciated that from the deputy leader, but I know that the deputy leader is not the person who works in a cooperative way. We saw the issue and we have dealt with it. I think I have given the explanation and, of course, the deputy leader will not accept what I say.

I am pleased that, following the government's amendment, I have the full support of the Ambulance Board for the bill and the government's amendments. The board has given me that indication in writing; in fact, it unanimously agreed to support the proposed amendments to the Ambulance Services Act 1992 to facilitate the withdrawal of the Priory of St John from involvement in the South Australian Ambulance

Service. As I said, the late amendment was necessary to correct a drafting error, and I must say that there was an error there, but we have corrected it. The original draft bill did not reflect the government's intention as stated in the drafting instructions for the bill; therefore, it was imperative that we fix the matter before proceeding, and that is what we did. The amendment makes clear in the bill—and let us be pleased we fixed it—what had been as a result of compliance with the Associations Incorporation Act 1995 only included in the regulations. For clarity, we wanted to also include these clauses in the bill itself, and that is what we have done. I am pleased that the matter has been successfully resolved. Perhaps it could have been done earlier with some help from the deputy leader; anyway, it is done now. I thank—

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: We know that you read it and you saw it immediately but, unfortunately, you did not help. However, I thank St John for its involvement in assisting with the growth and development of ambulance services in South Australia since the early 1950s. I acknowledge St John's wisdom in the 1990s for recognising that the South Australian Ambulance Service had grown to a point where it was more appropriate for the state to assume responsibility for the running and further development of this essential public service. The ambulance service could not exist, as the member for Wright said, without the dedicated commitment of its highly professional work force of career and volunteer staff. St John has played a key role in developing the volunteer ethos within the ambulance service, particularly in rural areas, and the Country Ambulance Service Advisory Committee has successfully assumed this role. I, too, put on record my appreciation. I attended a recent meeting of the advisory committee and I was very impressed on a number of scores with their dedication, commitment and professionalism and the fact that, as volunteers, they really hold the service together in our country areas with some professional services in some areas but, certainly, for a vast portion of South Australia's country areas it is the volunteers who run the service for us.

I would also like to thank the Ambulance Board for their commitment in ensuring that the transition from the St John service of the past to the modern ambulance service of today is fully integrated into the state's health system. This has been achieved with the continued support and commitment of its volunteer and career work force and, as Minister for Health, I look forward to working with the Ambulance Board and the Ambulance Service, its professional staff and its volunteers, into the future to further integrate the role of the ambulance service as a health service. I would also like to recognise the composition of the board, which is a mix of independent directors and directors drawn from the work force and which has been a major contributing factor to their success.

Finally, I would like to put on record my thanks to the current chair of the Ambulance Board, Robyn Pak Poy, and to past chairs for their leadership in helping to bring about this reform in governance for the South Australian Ambulance Service. This will ensure that the service continues to develop and add even greater value to the health and well-being of the South Australian community. I commend the bill, with the government's amendments, to the house.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I move:

Page 2, line 14—Delete ‘section 12’ and substitute:
Part 3

This amendment is simply the precursor to the changes I am bringing in to have the establishment of the board in the act itself. It is self-explanatory, and refers to part 3 rather than section 12, which is a new part.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I support that amendment, because it effectively brings the composition of the board back into the bill, and therefore back into the act—which I support very strongly indeed. I might add that this is the second occasion this has been attempted by this government—I think the other was an education act. It would appear that they have adopted a new policy of, where possible, trying to take the boards out of the acts.

I have been in parliament a fair time and I know that the setting up of a board and its operation is probably the most important thing of all, as the powers of a board and how it is composed have a huge impact on the whole operation of whatever organisation is involved. That is why I am so adamant that the bill must include the composition of the board, rather than leaving it up to a minister. Otherwise, as was pointed out earlier, the composition of the board can be changed without this parliament even having a say in the issue.

I also support, in bringing back part 3, the continued operation of the Country Ambulance Advisory Committee. In the principal act it is not called that—it is just referred to as a committee made up of people from the country—but it does provide that at least one-third of the members must be volunteer ambulance officers and one-third must be volunteer administration people. I would like to comment on that briefly—

The Hon. L. STEVENS: On a point of order, sir, the Deputy Leader is now commenting on clause 13, I think it is.

The CHAIRMAN: I apologise; I have not been closely following what the Deputy Leader has been saying. We are dealing with the minister’s amendment.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I appreciate that. It brings part 3 back in again, and I am highlighting the fact that within part 3 (because you have to debate it somewhere) I just want to acknowledge the marvellous work that is done. However, if the minister wants to deal with it under clause 13, I am happy to do so, and I will repeat my comments then. I support part 3, which sets out the composition of the board, being reintroduced.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I move:

New clause, page 3, after line 24—Insert:

11A—Establishment of Ambulance Board

- (1) Management of the affairs of SAAS is vested in a committee to be known as the Ambulance Board.
- (2) The Ambulance Board consists of 10 members appointed by the minister as follows:
 - (a) 6 persons nominated by the minister of whom—
 - (i) at least 1 must be a legal practitioner; and
 - (ii) at least 1 must have knowledge of and experience in voluntary work in the community; and
 - (iii) at least 1 must have experience in financial management;
 - (b) 1 must be a serving volunteer ambulance officer selected by the minister from a panel of 3 such officers nominated by the Advisory Committee;

- (c) 1 must be a person serving as a volunteer in the administration of the provision of ambulance services selected by the minister from a panel of 3 such persons nominated by the Advisory Committee;
 - (d) 1 must be a member of the Ambulance Employees Association of SA (AEA) nominated by AEA;
 - (e) 1 must be nominated by the United Trades and Labor Council.
- (3) The Ambulance Board is subject to direction (which must be given in writing) by the minister.

This puts into the legislation the establishment of the Ambulance Board. It is pretty self-explanatory. The board consists of 10 members appointed by the minister, and they are outlined. The make-up of the board essentially mirrors the current make-up.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I seek your guidance, sir, in terms of how you want me to handle my amendment, which is an amendment to the amendment. Do we adopt the government’s amendment first?

The CHAIRMAN: No, you have to move your amendment before we vote on the minister’s amendment.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I move to amend the Hon. L. Stevens’ amendment as follows:

Proposed new section 11A(2)(e)—delete paragraph (e) and substitute:

- (e) 1 must be chosen at an election held in accordance with the regulations.

Proposed new section 11A—after subclause (2) as amended above insert:

(2a) Each employee of SAAS is entitled to vote at an election under subsection (2)(e).

(2b) If an election of a person for the purposes of subsection (2)(e) fails for any reason, the minister may appoint an employee of SAAS and the person so appointed will be taken to have been appointed after due election under this section.

First, I will speak to the minister’s amendment, to say that I support the broad principle of that, which is to bring the composition of the board back into the act, and generally I am happy with the composition of the board. However, I believe that there should be a further change in the composition of the board, and that is the amendment I am moving. The effect of that is to remove the nomination by the United Trades and Labor Council (UTLC). If you were going to be even-handed in this, you would put someone from Business SA there as well. I do not want to reflect on when this was originally introduced: that is a long time ago; but if you are to have a nomination from the UTLC you would also have a nomination from the Business Council.

There are also a number of other people that I would have thought would be on there. One person I thought ought to have been on there is a representative of the Department of Health, because the biggest single customer of the Ambulance Service now is the Department of Health. In fact, just over half the cost of the Ambulance Service is actually transferring patients from one hospital to another. Out in the country this is a huge issue, because every time a patient is admitted to a smaller country hospital and then has to be transferred to a major metropolitan hospital or to a larger regional hospital, they have to pay the costs. It is the sending hospital that pays the costs, therefore this becomes a very significant item of the budget.

It is an unpredictable one: they have no idea how great it will be, and almost universally all those country hospitals complain bitterly about the fact that they have to pay these costs. Invariably, they have no say over the fact that that transfer had to take place. Either the hospital was full and

therefore there was a transfer, the person needs a higher level of care than can be provided by that hospital, or the doctors are not available, so the patients are transferred at a cost to that sending hospital. That is one argument why I would have thought it appropriate to have someone from the department. I am sure that the minister, in her wisdom, will make sure that the person who is put on that board as one of her six nominations is a person who can quite articulately put the case for the hospitals and particularly for country hospitals.

I believe that it is inappropriate to have in legislation like this a nomination by the UTLC. I think it more appropriate that we allow the employees of the Ambulance Service to have an election and appoint one of their employees in lieu of the United Trades and Labor Council, so maintaining the balance, in terms of representatives of the employees, but that final position, instead of being simply nominated by the UTLC, shall be one to be chosen at an election held in accordance with the regulations, and the setting up of the regulations would require each employee of the SAAS to be entitled to vote at an election. Therefore, we make sure that it is employees of the Ambulance Service who are represented there.

That is surely good management. I am sure that the employees of the Ambulance Service would support this very strongly. A number of them have expressed a view at present that their views are not being heard within the service. I have had a number of complaints sent through to me, and this would, for the first time, put a direct employee of the Ambulance Service on the board. The other representative of the Ambulance Employees Association I understand makes a good contribution, and that is Mr Palmer. I understand that he makes a good contribution as a valuable member of the board. I think it is important to have an employee there. Mr Palmer is not an employee of the Ambulance Service. This way we would get one on there.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: The government does not support the deputy leader's amendments, and I want to make some simple points in explanation. As I stated at the beginning, the government's intention in bringing this legislation forward is simply to do one thing, and that is to remove the Priory of St John from the legislative arrangements of the South Australian Ambulance Service. That is why we have brought this bill forward. We are only doing that, and we are leaving the other arrangements in terms of the make-up of the board, etc., as they are. There is a tiny difference in terms of the six people nominated by the minister. We specify here that one must be a legal practitioner and one must have experience in financial management, but the rest is the same in terms of the make-up of the board as it is in the current arrangements. Our view is to keep it like that.

Now that the Ambulance Service is under the administration of the Minister for Health, considerable planning is going on between the Ambulance Service and the Department of Health. That planning has begun, but it will need to involve consideration on what the services are going to look like in the future, how they will relate to the Department of Health and how they will be governed. When that process has concluded, there is an intention to look at the legislation again, but that will happen after we have gone through proper process with all the stakeholders, and now is not the time for such a change.

Just in relation to the deputy leader's comments about health expertise on the board, Professor Chris Baggoley currently is on the South Australian ambulance board. He has now been appointed as Chief Medical Officer of the Depart-

ment of Health, and it is my intention to keep him on the South Australian Ambulance Service Board with that expertise. It is our intention that, probably within 12 months or so, we will be back with more arrangements before the parliament in relation to the South Australian Ambulance Service. We do not support the amendments of the deputy leader because we are wanting to keep the situation as it is and simply remove the Priory of St John. We will deal with governance issues of the South Australian Ambulance Service under the Department of Health in probably 12 months or so once we have gone through a comprehensive process with all the stakeholders.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I do not think the minister can hide behind the fact that she wants to keep everything exactly the same as it is at present. In fact, there are changes, which I acknowledge are fairly small changes, but for the first time she is putting a legal practitioner on the board and she is requiring that someone with experience in financial management should be on there. I think there is a valid argument to look at other issues. Before the minister's amendment came in last night, I took to my party room a proposal that there be a broader group of people on the board, including a medical practitioner appointed by the minister and a consumer representative appointed by the minister. They are the sort of people I believe should be on there.

I was not going to push that point here because that would fundamentally change the composition of the board, but I do believe that the ambulance employees, seeing we are not changing the composition of the board radically, ought to have the right to a representative on there, and it is far more appropriate than a nominee of the United Trades and Labor Council. I appreciate that that causes significant political problems for the ALP and its masters down at Trades Hall, but in terms of the representatives and the good management of the Ambulance Service I think it is very important. Therefore I strongly support my amendment and I urge others to do likewise.

The committee divided on the Hon. D.C. Brown's amendments to the Hon. L. Stevens' amendment:

AYES (20)

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

NOES (22)

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

PAIR(S)

Hall, J. L.	Rann, M. D.
Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.	Conlon, P. F.

Majority of 2 for the noes.

Amendments thus negatived; Hon. L. Stevens' amendment carried.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I move:

Page 3, lines 30 to 32 (inclusive)—Delete subsection (3)

This is a consequential amendment which follows replacing the other amendment and putting the membership of the board explicitly in the act.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: Earlier, I wanted to talk about the Country Ambulance Advisory Committee, and I will do so now. In fact, I think I was talking under the right section when I was asked to stop. I appreciate the Country Ambulance Advisory Committee being retained, and I want to acknowledge the marvellous work done by all ambulance officers, both paid and volunteer staff, as well as the board and the administration. I see this first-hand in my electorate, in a place like Goolwa, where volunteer ambulance officers will invariably spend half their day at times, several days a week, taking people to and from the hospital. Invariably, they are taking the more serious medical cases from Goolwa through to the Flinders Medical Centre.

They do so by putting in a huge effort. The hours and the pressure now being put on those ambulance people is very significant indeed. I think the Goolwa station is now one of the busiest in the state in terms of a volunteer service. I equally appreciate—because my office is just down the road—what the paid ambulance station officers at Victor Harbor do, and the large number of trips and work pressures that are on them, and the extent to which they have upgraded their skills as paramedics. I want to particularly highlight, though, the importance of the Country Ambulance Advisory Committee in terms of representing a lot of volunteers out there who make a huge effort to the ambulance service.

Clause passed.

Clause 9 and title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS (Hammond): As the bill comes out of committee, it is not clear to me whether the changes that have been made will in any way affect the services that are provided to the communities that are more isolated—it is a word I hesitate to use—but more distant from Adelaide and the major regional hospital centres. There is a very good reason for asking that. At present it is a service provided by volunteers from places like Karoonda, and they all happily do it. However, it galls those people who are paid to do it. I do not have a quarrel with the competency or the commitment which those paid officers of the South Australian Ambulance Service make to the work they do, which is essential for all of us who live closer to hospitals which can provide us with the care that we need. They are well trained, and they discharge their duties very well. The public's trust and respect for them is as high as it is for any other category of employee in the entire work force. It is equal, I think, to the reputation of fire officers. It is much higher than ours; it is much higher than police; and it is much higher than doctors, and so on.

However, in country areas there are two types of concerns, especially now in the area of the Mallee in the electorate that

I represent. It is a long way to hospital from there, and if you are injured on a farm it is a bloody long way for the ambulance to come with the ambulance officers in it (the ambos) to make an assessment of whether a helicopter is needed on the farm to get the farm worker disentangled from the harvester or the seed drill, or whatever other piece of equipment they are entangled in, and taken to hospital. When such an injury occurs, if it is handed over in its responsibilities different from what is now to those ambulance officers coming out of Mount Barker, it will be two hours before they get to Karte, which is about 50 kilometres, say, on a farm there, north of Pinnaroo, and make an assessment that it is better not to take the injured person out of the piece of machinery in an ambulance to somewhere to pick them up with the emergency helicopter. If that is what happens, then that will make our security and safety a hell of a lot poorer than anyone who lives in a densely populated area that is less than an hour from an ambulance call-out. There is a lead time. At present, they are rostered out of Mount Barker, not Murray Bridge, and I said before that that was bloody stupid, and I will say it again: ditto.

The other reason I raise it is because, increasingly, in consequence of efforts that have been made by me and other members over many years in this place, we are beginning to appreciate the wealth we can generate from the mineral deposits we have in this country, particularly in this state, more prospective than Queensland or Western Australia, believe it or not. Those mineral deposits are things like mineral sands, and the kinds of equipment that will be used to mine those mineral stands will be very well designed, they will be state-of-the-art and they will be as safe as any kind of mining equipment used anywhere in the world, but sure as hell someone will get injured, and they will be in the same boat then, a long way from an ambulance station. If things are tied up the lead time to get an ambulance on the road will be, again, much longer. So I worry about that. If you are going to dissociate St John altogether from the service, if the volunteers who have seen themselves as continuing to provide training in first aid in the communities such as Karoonda, Lameroo, the surrounding areas of Geranium, Parilla, Pinnaroo, doing the training for first aid for children and adults, children in the schools and adults who undertake those courses in the community on Saturday mornings and the like, are to be dissociated from the provision of an ambulance service up-front then we are all a lot less secure.

We are all worried about that, because we have never had an ironclad guarantee that we would not be worse off in the event that these changes were made. I know people say that there will not be any difference, but I do not think they have bothered to check out the reality of what will occur in Swan Reach, Geranium, Karoonda and Pinnaroo, and maybe some other places as well. I do not see that as an exhaustive list for the whole of South Australia, but I certainly draw attention to it as it relates to my electorate, and I am very anxious about that aspect.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I want to put on the record how disappointed I am that we did not re-establish the board as we had hoped. It is a really sad day when one sees St John removed from the equation almost completely. I am a country member of parliament, and we owe St John a tremendous debt of gratitude. We would not have had services in the country had it not been for the Priory of St John. I just cannot believe what has happened. We closed down the Crystal Brook St John centre, which is owned freehold by the local

volunteer St John group, only a few weeks ago. It had a membership of about 40, including four OAMs. The people involved bought their ambulance themselves many years ago—and not only did they buy the ambulance but they also manned it. They provided a service that we did not have. They built a wonderful St John centre in Crystal Brook, which my father opened as a member of parliament, and we see what has happened now, with the introduction of the SA Ambulance Service. I do not mind it in the areas where we need to be professional: we live in a different era—in a day of litigation and risk. However, it is pretty sad to see that the fantastic volunteer service is all but gone in this area.

I do not believe that people in these communities can afford to pay what these services now cost. If we had to turn around and pay all our CFS people, we certainly could not do so, and I believe this a very similar situation. Dawn Greig, OAM, was the leader of the group at Crystal Brook. They did so much work in serving the people in the community and providing their medical needs. They also served sporting groups, and took the ambulance to all sporting activities. There was also a very active auxiliary, which raised money right across the community.

That group provided a great community service, and it has all gone. It is pretty sad, and I want to pay a tribute to those people on the record. We appreciate what they have done for us in country communities. I hope that we can maintain the service they gave us through the professional SA Ambulance Service. Otherwise, we will lose it and we will have to rebirth groups such as that. I want to say thank you very much to the Priory of St John and all the volunteers for their thousands of volunteer hours. I do not know how they do it. They serve the community week after week, and they do it for nothing. It is a sad day. It is a pity that we could not in this instance keep the two St John officers on this board. We have not done so, and I regret that.

Ms BREUER (Giles): I feel compelled to clarify a point for the member for Schubert. I agree with him: St John has done an incredible job over the years, and I also thank the people involved for the work they have done. However, the separation occurred back in 1989. The member is talking about quite a considerable time in the past. The SA Ambulance Service is a slick and professional organisation. It is a paid organisation, but it is excellent. It is difficult to compare it with St John, which has always been a voluntary organisation, and I appreciate that for many years it undertook the ambulance service.

We had in Whyalla a St John service that was staffed by volunteers for many years with perhaps one, or maybe two, paid professionals. However, since 1989, the SA Ambulance Service has come in and done an incredible job. St John has not died: it is still around and is operating at fetes, football matches and fairs and all those things that happen in the country, in particular—and I am sure that it also happens in metropolitan Adelaide, although I am no expert in that respect. It still provides an excellent service to its communities and does an excellent job. But to say that it should still be with the SA Ambulance Service and that its demise has come is way off track. Both organisations need to be recognised on their own merit.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): It seems, from listening to some of the most recent comments, that some members (particularly the member for Schubert) are making comments that really would have been better for them

to make at the second reading stage. I wish to clarify something. The member for Schubert should re-read the second reading explanation. He does not seem to understand that this has happened at the request of St John. There is a long history dating right back to 1989. If the member reads the speech again, he will see what has happened. We are not taking volunteers out of the service. The volunteer service and the volunteer effort will be continued. It is okay. St John has ceased any real involvement for well on five years or so.

In relation to the comments made by the member for Hammond, the issue of the ambulance service and how an ambulance service operates, particularly in isolated areas, is constantly being examined, both here and right across the country. I think that there is now a level of professionalism in terms of clinical protocols—certainly, in terms of highly qualified paramedics—that we have never seen before, and that work continues.

Certainly, the sophisticated arrangements of the call centres, the intensive care paramedics and the linkages and communications with the retrieval teams have made a significant difference to the capacity to respond in the circumstances that the member for Hammond outlined. If he is interested in receiving further briefings, I am very happy to provide them. That being said, I close the debate.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): I move:

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

Motion carried.

CITRUS INDUSTRY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 24 May. Page 2642.)

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): I indicate from the outset that the opposition will support the bill and will not be seek to go into committee. Having said that, I would like to make a few comments and, hopefully, I will not keep the house for very long. The opposition has had representations on the bill from the citrus industry in relation to its position. I was a little disturbed that it was suggested that the opposition was possibly intent on holding up this bill. I put firmly on the record that the opposition, neither in this place nor in the other place, has ever intended to slow down the process of this bill. I do not know where that suggestion came from, but there has certainly been no hint from the opposition that we want to slow up this bill in any way, shape or form.

I must admit, even after reading the minister's second reading explanation, that I am still at a bit of a loss as to why this bill is before us. The minister said at one stage that the original intention was to amend the Citrus Act 1991 by removing anti-competitive marketing elements and ultimately repealing the act in July 2005—which is a bit over a month away. According to the minister's second reading explan-

ation, the industry indicated that it wanted to retain some of the basic legislation.

We are debating this bill because of competition principles, and the Citrus Industry Act, which will be repealed by this bill, has been largely a marketing tool. The citrus industry has worked for a long time under a regulated marketing system. The world has moved on and, by and large, industries have benefited from competition policy. I do not subscribe to the view that every industry will always benefit from competition policy. I have serious questions about some of our large industries, particularly our grains industries and the single desk issues, but I do not want to canvass those matters today. Obviously, the citrus industry is moving away from a regulated marketing situation and, I must admit that I find it rather strange that we are developing a new act for the citrus industry: I cannot understand why the citrus industry has not stuck with the original intention, that is, to go for total deregulation.

The minister has suggested that the industry wants to retain a board, principally for developing the citrus industry. I can understand that and, being a primary producer myself and having spent most of my life involved in primary production enterprises, I know that you do not need to have a board of this nature to develop any particular industry sector. We have a couple of acts on the statute book of South Australia which, I think, would be available and, I understand, will be used for some of the purposes that the board will require under this act. Certainly, the Primary Industry Funding Schemes Act would allow an association formed by the citrus industry to collect funds and to set up an association to do the sorts of things that I believe it wants to do under this legislation.

The original intention of the legislation was to administer food safety aspects. The briefing that I received indicated that a small number of players within the citrus industry operate as growers and small packers and fall outside the existing food safety requirements. My understanding is that, as recently as last Friday, the Citrus Industry Board took action so that all the industry would come under the Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes) Act 2004. I hope that my information is correct. I would suggest that that is the way in which food safety should be handled by this or any other primary industries food production system within the primary industries sector.

I will make a couple of comments about the bill itself. One of the functions of the board is to collect information, and I question some of the data that the board wants us to believe it requires. In a competitive world, the people involved in the citrus industry have to realise at some stage that not only are they in competition with the rest of the world but also, quite often, they are in competition with each other; yet, they are seeking to have a board which will have the power to collect from individual growers the most intimate data of their businesses. I know that, within the wine grape industry, some of that information is very closely held by grape growers, and I have had discussions with vignerons about how important it is for them to hold closely some the information about their own business. They believe that the divulgence of that information would be akin to them taking away their power in the marketplace.

Having taken a look at the Phylloxera and Grape Industry Act, I put on the record that the information that the phylloxera board is able to collect under that act includes the person's name and address, location of vineyard, varieties of vines planted, the area of each variety planted, the age of the

vines, the source of the vines and any other information relevant to the board's functions under this act. That information is quite important because the main function of that board is to control the introduction and spread of phylloxera or to ensure that it does not occur. However, under this act, the board has the power to know, again, people's names and addresses, particulars of citrus trees planted or removed or otherwise lost or destroyed, the area planted with citrus trees by reference to age, type and variety—not unlike the phylloxera act. Then it goes on to talk about the fruit, the type, variety, size, grade, quality and quantity of the fruit that is actually produced and delivered for sale. It fascinates me that the industry would be imposing or giving powers to a board to collect that sort of data because I should have thought that that was data that individual growers would like to keep to themselves.

Again, in general comments on the way the act is drafted, I must say that I have made these comments previously in this house in regard to the modern trend of governments bringing to the house bills which are drafted principally just to give a series of very general, sweeping head powers, with the actual meat which drives the way the act is administered being held in the regulations. Notwithstanding that the regulations are a disallowable instrument, it is very difficult, and indeed rare, to disallow regulations. I have tried to do it myself. Rarely do regulations get disallowed by this parliament. I think the parliament is somewhat negligent in its duty in allowing this trend to occur and to proliferate.

Again, if you go to the phylloxera act, which is very similar to this one (or it is designed to do very similar things to this act), a number of the powers which will be in the regulations under this act are actually within the Phylloxera and Grape Act itself. I draw that to the attention of members. I think it is something of which members should be aware and, hopefully, at some stage, the parliament might address the way that governments draft the bills that are brought before this place. I think that I have covered most of the points that I wanted to raise.

As I said, the opposition is quite happy to support the bill. Obviously, the industry has told us that they are happy with the bill. My personal thoughts are that I cannot understand why the industry wants to impose this particular regime on itself. I think that the citrus industry would be better served by a general citrus industry association set up under existing powers rather than continuing with a citrus board, but the future will tell. One feature of the bill is that there will need to be an in-depth review of the whole act and the way that it is being administered within a period of six years. The six-year period is probably longer than would be desirable. I should have thought that within two or three years we would have a very good indication of how this act was going and, hopefully, at that stage, the industry and the parliament would come to the common conclusion that it was time to repeal this sort of legislation. Having said that, I conclude my remarks.

Mr RAU (Enfield): I will be brief on this. As a person who has often come in here and made remarks about national competition policy, none of which I regret, I am happy to say that in this one isolated instance, national competition policy has accidentally got it right. It is one isolated example of the old adage that even a stopclock is right twice a day. That is exactly what has happened here. National competition policy, presumably by sheer accident or serendipity, has got it right. So, in support of that, I will tell the house a very brief story.

When I was a very junior legal practitioner, I was asked to defend a Mr Scavensos who was charged with the heinous crime of having sold an orange at O'Halloran Hill whilst not being in possession of a spray residue and fungicide certificate in the prescribed form. Mr Scavensos had made the inexcusable error of having purchased his oranges in Victoria, probably in Mildura, where the method by which oranges were treated for fungus and so forth was an immersion method, whereas I believe that our oranges were, at the time, dealt with by a spray mechanism or vice-versa. It was not possible to get a spray residue and fungicide certificate from the Victorian packing house because they did not know of the animal; they had never heard of it. Therefore, anyone who sold a Victorian orange could not possibly defend themselves against the charge and would be subject to the rigours of the act.

The case, which was heard before a magistrate, dealt with very high and lofty matters—section 92 of the Constitution and so forth—and in the end I remember saying to the magistrate as my closing remarks, 'Your Honour, it would be easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than it would be for Mr Scavensos to sell a Victorian orange at O'Halloran Hill.' He just nodded and said, 'Yes, Mr Rau,' and went ahead and potted us—which he had to do, of course, because we did not have the certificate.

I think it is excellent, as I said, that national competition policy has accidentally alighted upon a subject that is worthy of reform. This subject is a classic one where, instead of the national competition policy seeking to defend Saudi feed-lotters from Australian barley growers or defend Japanese or Chinese malters from Australian barley growers, it is actually saying to other Australians who want to produce oranges or lemons, or whatever it is, 'You can sell them in the common market of Australia,' which is, of course, perfectly reasonable.

So I have great pleasure, for the first time I think, in supporting a bill which is in accordance with the wishes of the national competition policy, and I congratulate the minister for having had land in his lap one of the rare jewels, namely, commonsense emanating from that quarter.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS secured the adjournment of the debate.

EDUCATION (EXTENSION) AMENDMENT BILL

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

Clause 3, page 2, line 11—
Delete '1 September 2006' and substitute:
1 December 2005

CHIROPRACTIC AND OSTEOPATHY PRACTICE BILL

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

Clause 25, page 17, line 1—
Clause 25(1)(e)—after 'removed from the' insert:
chiropractic student register, osteopathy student register,

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

A quorum having been formed:

PHYSIOTHERAPY PRACTICE BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 31 May. Page 2881.)

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I support the amendments moved by the other place. They largely reflect what the opposition has put forward in this house, including the change in composition of the board and taking up the issue of how to deal with visiting physiotherapists here as part of a visiting sporting team or theatre group, performing artists or on a lecture tour. This is putting the responsibility to cover that situation into regulations. I would have preferred to see it in the act but I am happy to accept the fact that it is going to be in regulations. My main concern in the amendment I originally moved was to make sure that we dealt with that issue. Although it is not quite what I would like to see, it is dealing with that issue so I am happy to accept the amendments.

I am delighted to see that amendments that I moved here on behalf of the Liberal Party, to change the composition of the board, have in fact now been accepted by the government. What amazes me is why the government votes for them here and then rolls over when it knows that the numbers are against it in the upper house. Why does it not have the wisdom and civility to accept the amendments that I put forward here? I support the amendments.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: The government is always happy to work cooperatively with anyone towards getting the best solution. As members will recall, when we had the debate in the lower house I said that I would consult with the board and the Physiotherapy Association, and I did that. The government moved these amendments in the upper house. We want the best solution and that is the way we would always work.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: We have a basic difference in approach, the Deputy Leader and I. I say that it is not a matter of win/lose in the house but of talking with the people concerned, and that is what we have done. I am very pleased to support all these amendments and to see the bill finished, and we will get on with doing the regulations as soon as we possibly can.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC SECTOR MANAGEMENT (CHIEF EXECUTIVE ACCOUNTABILITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendment.

(Continued from 23 May. Page 2615.)

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

As members know, the Rann Labor government values the contribution of the Hon. T.G. Cameron in another place, and the amendment is his.

Motion carried.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL
(AGGRAVATED OFFENCES) BILL**

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 5 May. Page 2562.)

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Amendments to this bill by the other place came before this house in committee on 5 May. I moved that amendments Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 be agreed to be and that amendment No. 5 be disagreed to. Amendment No. 5 is one that was introduced by the opposition. It would remove the offence of causing serious harm by criminal negligence from the bill. I have explained in great detail why this amendment is necessary and I will not repeat that explanation save to respond to some of the comments of the member for Bragg. I say some of her comments because most of them have already been answered by the government in both houses and those answers do not need to be repeated. I notice that the member has not referred to those answers. She cannot because she knows that they are complete answers. The member knows that, if she acknowledges them, she must concede that the inclusion of this offence is necessary and sensible. The member cannot bring herself to do that. Instead of admitting she got it wrong, she would rather scuttle this important proposed law and leave a gap in our criminal law that will let people who would be convicted of a criminal negligence offence in every other state and territory in Australia go free in South Australia.

It is extraordinary that the member can deny that the Criminal Law Consolidation (Criminal Neglect) Amendment Act 2005 and the Criminal Law (Intoxication) Amendment Act 2004 contain offences of causing serious harm by criminal negligence and that she can continue to assert that our law does not already contain such offences. These offences were enacted with the support of the opposition as recently as April this year. No wonder the member is at such a loss for words.

Ms Chapman: Didn't you read my contribution? I said all that.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Read it? I was in the chamber when you said it! What identifies each of these offences as one of criminal negligence is that it requires proof of such a great falling short of the standard of care that a reasonable person would exercise in the circumstances and such a high risk that the physical element of the offence exists or will exist that the conduct merits criminal punishment. Those are precisely the elements of the proposed offence of causing serious harm by criminal negligence in the clause the opposition wants to delete from the bill.

Another suggestion of the honourable member is that, in introducing this offence, the government is saying that 'Dame Roma was wrong.' Strike me pink! The best argument the member for Bragg can come up with is that this amendment might indicate that the government thinks Dame Roma was wrong. The honourable member would 'prefer to rely on her', that is Dame Roma's, 'judgment way above that of this government'. That is a lot different from the Hon. R.D. Lawson who argued against Ted Mullighan being the commissioner for the inquiry because Mullighan shared chambers with Dame Roma Mitchell, and members of the Liberal opposition would not wear someone who was like that.

Dame Roma Mitchell chaired a committee called the Criminal Law and Penal Methods Reform Committee of

South Australia, familiarly known as the Mitchell committee. In its fourth report in July 1977, the committee recommended that negligence be retained as a basis for criminal responsibility in summary offences only and that 'manslaughter by negligence be abolished'. Does the member for Bragg support that recommendation? She is exercising her right to silence. It is very unusual for the member for Bragg to exercise her right to silence in the chamber. She will perk up in a minute.

Later in the report the committee recommended the retention of an existing offence of manslaughter by criminal negligence, namely the offence of causing death by dangerous driving. In other words, the committee thought that manslaughter by criminal negligence should be abolished except where it occurred through the driving of a motor vehicle because driving a motor vehicle is itself inherently dangerous to life. I have some sympathy with that view, Mr Chairman. I have never driven a motor vehicle myself. Despite that recommendation, the offence of manslaughter by criminal negligence remains in every Australian jurisdiction, including South Australia. In retaining it in South Australia, successive governments have chosen not to accept the recommendations of the Mitchell committee on criminal negligence. I ask the member for Bragg again: were successive governments including the Tonkin government, the Brown government, the Olsen government and the Kerin government saying that Dame Roma was wrong? The member for Bragg has lost her voice.

Not only does every Australian jurisdiction, including South Australia, have an offence of causing bodily harm by dangerous driving, as well as one of causing death by dangerous driving, but also every Australian jurisdiction except South Australia has an offence of causing serious harm by criminal negligence. They have it because they think that someone who causes serious harm to another by grossly negligent conduct should be criminally liable for it, whether or not it involves the use of a motor vehicle. The conduct is the same. In each case, it involves such a great falling short of the standard of care that a reasonable man would have exercised and involves such a high risk that serious harm would follow that the doing of the act merits criminal punishment. Yet, another example may demonstrate how, without this defence, a person may escape criminal liability.

On Thursday 19 May this year, six children were injured when a man lost control of his car and crashed into the fence of a primary school in Dandenong. One of the victims, a six-year-old boy, had his leg partially severed, and another, an 11 year old girl, had multiple leg fractures and head injuries. The driver allegedly was unlicensed and had over twice the legal limit of alcohol in his blood at the time. Police say that he will be charged not only with drink driving, dangerous driving and conduct endangering life but also with negligently causing serious injury.

The Hon. I.P. Lewis: So he should.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Hammond says, 'So he should,' and we agree. That is the equivalent of the offence of causing serious harm by criminal negligence that the opposition wants to remove from the bill. If this charge were not available in Victoria, the driver in the Dandenong tragedy could escape liability for serious injury that resulted from his driving if that driving could not be shown to have been dangerous in itself. As we know, proof that the driving itself was dangerous can be hard to come by, especially if there were no witnesses or the evidence of blood alcohol content was inadmissible for some reason.

In the absence of such proof, the fall-back charge in Victoria is one of causing serious injury by criminal negligence. It is not that there is no appropriate offence for this kind of driving under South Australian law: there is. Our law about dangerous driving is slightly different from Victoria's. The drivers would be charged under section 19A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 with dangerous, reckless or culpably negligent driving causing serious harm. However, under our law, criminally negligent conduct that results in serious harm to another does not constitute an offence unless it involves the driving of a motor vehicle.

So, I ask the member again: why should conduct of the same quality and the same culpability not attract criminal penalties if it is not done with a motor vehicle, whereas it would if it were committed with a motor vehicle? Answer us that. Mr Chairman, I have never heard the member for Bragg so quiet and polite during a parliamentary debate. That is the anomaly that the government is trying to overcome in this bill.

To show why it is necessary to have an offence of causing serious harm by criminal negligence, other than by criminal legal negligent driving, let us change the Dandenong example to make the same harm result from something other than driving, and I hope the member for Goyder listens carefully to my example. Let us say that landscaping is being done at a primary school. A workman is unloading a tip truck of boulders. He is in a bit of a hurry. He gets out of the truck to see whether children are nearby before unloading the tip, but he does not go right around the truck. When he gets back in the cabin, he does not check in the rear vision mirror. Some children whom he did not see because they were on the other side of the truck have moved into the line of the tip while he was getting back into the truck. They are crushed by the falling boulders, sustaining similar injuries to those sustained in the Dandenong case.

Although the workman's conduct was not intentional and may not have been reckless, it may well have been criminally negligent. His conduct might be thought to constitute such a great falling short of the standard of care that a reasonable person would exercise in the circumstances and there to have been such a high risk that serious harm might result from it that it merits criminal punishment. It is not an assault occasioning harm and will constitute an offence of an act creating a risk of grievous bodily harm only if the workman can be proved to have intended to be recklessly indifferent as to whether such harm was caused. This is a matter of legal principle, not, as the member for Bragg suggests, a case of the government 'trying to introduce a new concept to the criminal law which is ill thought out, which would be a welter for lawyers and which will probably result in more people getting off.'

This is not a new concept, as I have pointed out. It is not ill thought out. It precisely mirrors the common law in the same way as has been done everywhere in Australia, England and Canada. In these places the offence has not caused a welter for lawyers, whatever that is. It is preposterous to suggest this, but not quite as preposterous as to suggest that the result of creating a new offence of causing serious harm by criminal negligence will be that 'more people get off,' as the member for Bragg said. That has not been the experience anywhere else in the world.

As I have said, the opposition is asking this parliament to reject a clear proposal to bring South Australia into line with other Australian jurisdictions on a matter of basic criminal liability. I ask honourable members not to follow the

opposition's misguided desire to shield people whose grossly negligent conduct results in others getting seriously hurt. I urge honourable members to disagree with amendment number 5.

Ms CHAPMAN: This matter has been traversed in the debates and at the historic Mount Gambier sitting. We outlined the opposition's position in relation to this, and covered the important aspects that were traversed in another place. They, of course, had the wisdom to appreciate and understand them, and they presented these amendments, all of which we support. I note the Attorney-General's contribution which just repeats what essentially was said in Mount Gambier. In relation to that, he again, of course, fails to present his case to support it, and to even deal with the matters that were carefully traversed in another place. The opposition remains in support of all of the amendments from the other place.

Amendments Nos 1 to 4 agreed to.

The committee divided on the question that amendment No. 5 be disagreed to:

AYES (21)

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

NOES (17)

Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Chapman, V. A.	Evans, I. F.
Goldsworthy, R. M.	Hanna, K.
Kerin, R. G.	Kotz, D. C.
Matthew, W. A.	McFetridge, D.
Meier, E. J.	Redmond, I. M.
Scalzi, G.	Venning, I. H.
Williams, M. R.	

PAIR(S)

Rann, M. D.	Hall, J. L.
Conlon, P. F.	Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.
White, P. L.	Gunn, G. M.
McEwen, R. J.	Penfold, E. M.

Majority of 4 for the ayes.

Amendment No. 5 thus disagreed to.

Amendments Nos 6 to 10 agreed to.

**CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (PAROLE)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's message.

(Continued from 4 May. Page 2520.)

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I move:

That the House of Assembly insist on its amendments.

These matters were canvassed during debate on the bill. The government continues to support the amendments made by this house.

Mr BROKENSHERE: Quite frankly, it is extremely disappointing that the government will try to use its numbers

in this house to go against the good work of the members of the Legislative Council, who are only trying to improve a piece of legislation for the betterment of the South Australian community. The Legislative Council wanted to be really tough about this and show a genuine intent to address paedophilia and the like. What we have seen here is the government again exposed for being all talk and no action—for talking the talk but never walking the walk. We have a situation here where, for once, the government could have shown that it was tough on law and order. The Liberal Party and the other parties agreed to assist the government for once to show that it is not just talking, that it has a chance to really exert some authority, and here we see the Labor government, with the assistance of the so-called independent Labor ministers, using their numbers, I suggest, to probably roll this out. I ask that the Labor government—and, in particular, the Attorney-General—do the decent and honourable thing and assist the parliament to be very tough on these offenders. We do not agree with what the Attorney-General is saying.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Because of the member for Mawson's remarks, I think I have to put some flesh on the government's opposition to these amendments. The government maintains its position about the form of amendment to section 66. It does not support the removal of automatic parole completely at this time. The government prefers the position adopted in the amendments passed by this place to retain section 66 but to allow the Parole Board to deal with prisoners imprisoned for sexual offences who would otherwise be automatically released on parole and the extension by regulation to classes of prisoners with a nonparole period serving sentences of more than three years' imprisonment.

Amendment No. 3 passed by this place deletes clause 15 of the bill. Clause 15 inserts a new section 78 into the act, requiring the minister to table reports of recommendations of the board, conditions of release and government reasons for refusing to approve Parole Board recommendations. It was most interesting the night before last to hear on the Bob Francis program the Leader of the Opposition criticising the government for refusing to release McBride, Watson and Ellis from prison—for refusing to rubber stamp the Parole Board's recommendation to release those convicted murderers. Mr Chairman, make no mistake about it: if the Liberal Party were in office, all those convicted murderers would now be walking the streets. They would be free, and the Leader of the Opposition said as much on the Bob Francis program last night.

Ms CHAPMAN: Sir, I rise on a point of order. These amendments have nothing to do with murder parolees. This is to do with amendments in relation to—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: It is. You moved an amendment on that.

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, to the five years.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, the member has missed it. I am afraid the member for Bragg does not quite understand the bill, because her side, unbeknownst to her, has moved an amendment demanding that the government—that is, cabinet—give reasons for refusing to approve Parole Board recommendations.

Ms CHAPMAN: I am sorry. I did not appreciate that the Attorney has moved onto that next section. I apologise.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The government continues to oppose new section 78. It believes that the section has the potential to prejudice the parole process. New section 78 could result in the release of highly personal and sensitive information into the public domain if it forms part of the

board's reason for making a recommendation. This could be of concern to both victims and parolees. The section also would require the minister to table the reasons why a recommendation of the Parole Board has not been approved. If reasons are to be given, it would be necessary for cabinet to, in effect, formulate and provide a reason for its decision. This is not a usual requirement of the cabinet process where it has always been held that cabinet deliberations are secret and ministers are bound by decisions of cabinet. The government urges the house to insist on its amendments to the bill.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Unless I am mistaken, by insisting, as the Attorney seeks to insist, and seeks the support of the house to insist on his amendments, he is not only making it possible for automatic release of prisoners with sentences under five years—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: We have that now.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: Yes; but we should not have. They should have to demonstrate rehabilitation. If they do not make an effort to renovate their mindset, to fix their brains, then they spend time at great expense, and it achieves nothing. That kind of retribution only antagonises the pathologically ill-equipped mind to live in a responsible, civilised society. I am strongly of the view that the focus and principal purpose of incarceration should be rehabilitation, so much so that I do not even believe that parole ought to be contemplated short of a head sentence, and that the prisoner should stay there until they can demonstrate that they have rehabilitated their mind. If that means that they are there until the day they die, so be it. At least we are saved the risk of recidivism from idiots who cannot, and will not, take themselves seriously, and take the world that they live in seriously in a civilised manner.

Moving on from that, the next point, as I understand it, is that the government of the day, however well meaning or otherwise, wishes to be able to say, 'We disagree with the Parole Board,' and simply lock someone up for longer, preventing them from going on parole even if the Parole Board has said, 'They are okay for parole. They have renovated their brain. They are now capable of being responsible, effective citizens in a way that they were never so before the time that they committed the crime.' Whilst we may make mistakes as a society, and in the fashion in which we professionally assess that, it does not mean that we should not try. If we have it right in the main, then we will be doing ourselves a service.

It strikes me—not that this government would dream of doing it, unless I was the prisoner—that the government should not have the prerogative of refusing parole just because it wants to, no reason given. It may secretly have a reason but it does not have to disclose it under the present provisions. What the other place is telling us, as I understand it, is that, if the executive decides to override the Parole Board, it must give reasons, and that is the law. I do not see that as a bad thing. If the minister and his colleagues in executive council cannot give reasons, then they should not jolly well keep someone locked up if the Parole Board has said that they are okay to go.

I conclude by saying that I do hope that the Parole Board in future applies itself not only to the determination that a prisoner has rehabilitated their brain and their attitude but also whether they are required to do it in law and they do it nonetheless—and they are not always required to do it. I sincerely believe that they have to be required to do it. The

days of saying, 'You've done enough time, you can go' are over. You stay there until you are fixed.

The committee divided on the motion:

AYES (19)

Atkinson, M. J. (teller)	Bedford, F. E.
Breuer, L. R.	Caica, P.
Ciccarello, V.	Geraghty, R. K.
Hill, J. D.	Key, S. W.
Koutsantonis, T.	Maywald, K. A.
O'Brien, M. F.	Rankine, J. M.
Rau, J. R.	Stevens, L.
Such, R. B.	Thompson, M. G.
Weatherill, J. W.	White, P. L.
Wright, M. J.	

NOES (18)

Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L. (teller)
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Chapman, V. A.	Evans, I. F.
Goldsworthy, R. M.	Hanna, K.
Kerin, R. G.	Kotz, D. C.
Lewis, I. P.	Matthew, W. A.
McFetridge, D.	Meier, E. J.
Redmond, I. M.	Scalzi, G.
Venning, I. H.	Williams, M. R.

PAIR(S)

Rann, M. D.	Hall, J. L.
Conlon, P. F.	Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.
Foley, K. O.	Penfold, E. M.
McEwen, R. J.	Gunn, G. M.

Majority of 1 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried.

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

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

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (21)

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

NOES (17)

Brindal, M. K.	Brokenshire, R. L.
Brown, D. C.	Buckby, M. R.
Chapman, V. A.	Evans, I. F.
Goldsworthy, R. M.	Kerin, R. G.
Kotz, D. C.	Lewis, I. P. (teller)
Matthew, W. A.	McFetridge, D.
Meier, E. J.	Redmond, I. M.
Scalzi, G.	Venning, I. H.
Williams, M. R.	

PAIR(S)

Rann, M. D.	Hall, J. L.
Conlon, P. F.	Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.
Foley, K. O.	Gunn, G. M.
McEwen, R. J.	Penfold, E. M.

Majority of 4 for the ayes.

Motion thus carried.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIRMAN: Order! Members will please take their seats.

ADJOURNMENT

At 6.11 p.m. the house adjourned until Thursday 23 June at 10.30 a.m.