

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Monday 19 September 2005

The **SPEAKER (Hon. R.B. Such)** took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

The **SPEAKER**: I draw the attention of members to the visit today by Dato Dr Teng Hock Nan, who is visiting from the Penang State Legislature. We welcome him here today.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The **Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier)**: In the absence of the Minister for Infrastructure, I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Aggravated Offences) Bill.

Motion carried.

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE

The **SPEAKER**: I make the following statement with regard to the matter of privilege raised by the Leader of the Opposition in this house on Thursday 15 September. However, before addressing that matter, I wish to outline the significance of privilege as it relates to this house and its members. Privilege is not a device by which members, or any other person, can seek to pursue matters that can be addressed by debate or settled by the vote of the house on a substantive motion. McGee in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*, in my view, makes the test for whether or not a matter is a matter of privilege by defining it as a matter that can 'genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties'.

An essential aspect of privilege is to ensure that each member can speak without fear or favour, but at the same time be able to rely on the accuracy of the statements made in the house by any member. It is not a protection from the consequences of misconduct, poor judgment or inaccurate information. I refer specifically to the matter raised by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to statements alleged to have been made by the Minister for Health at a private meeting convened at the home of the Mayor of Gawler on 28 August involving three women, the husband of one of them, the Mayor and the minister, to discuss the provision of birthing services at the Gawler Health Service.

The nature of the leader's allegation is that there is an inconsistency between the statements made at the meeting in Gawler on 28 August and those made by the minister in answer to questions in this house in relation to the use of audiovisual technology in the provision of health services to expectant mothers. The leader has provided me with copies of the statutory declarations of the women, who maintain that the minister told them—or, at least, left them with the impression—that the audiovisual link technology to be deployed at the Gawler Health Service may be used to allow a senior obstetrician located at the Women's and Children's Hospital in Adelaide to monitor and coach a junior doctor at the Gawler service presiding at the birth of a child.

The minister, in response to questions asked by the leader on 12 and 13 September, denied making such a statement and

went on to advise the house of the manner in which such audiovisual technology will be utilised at Gawler. On 14 September, in a ministerial statement, the Minister for Health again explained the use of the equipment, denying that 'births would be undertaken by video conferencing and using junior doctors', and advising again how the audiovisual technology will be utilised at the Gawler Health Service and is utilised in other hospitals. The chair cannot discount the possibility that, as the minister has suggested, the three women present at the meeting of 28 August did misunderstand the minister; neither can the chair discount the possibility that the minister did make such a statement as the leader alleges, either deliberately or in error, or at least left the women with the mistaken belief as to the use of the technology. Either way, the minister has been consistent in her statements to this house as to the use of the technology.

When raising this matter the leader cited the matter of privilege in relation to former deputy premier Hon. Graham Ingerson. I point out that the issue in that matter was the denial to the house that any contact had been made with a person about a matter in which the minister should not have been involved. In this case there has been no misleading of the house about the holding of a meeting, and the matters discussed were things in which the minister was rightly involved. What has given rise to this matter are different recollections and understandings of the detail of what was said at a private meeting. Accordingly, I do not propose to give the precedent which would enable any member to pursue this matter immediately as a matter of privilege. This decision, however, does not prevent the leader or any other member from proceeding with a motion on the specific matter by giving notice in the normal way.

In reaching this decision, I have no doubt that the three women present at the meeting are as adamant in their belief as to what they heard the minister say, as the minister is adamant in hers about what she did not say. It does not fall to me to make a judgment either way, because, in my view, the conduct complained of cannot 'genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties', which, as members would know, is the test described by McGee in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*. In the chair's view it would be regrettable if, in consideration of the matter, the house was required by way of a vote to pass judgment on the veracity of the statements of the three women, the public statement of the mayor or the statements of the minister.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The **Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition)**: I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move the following motion:

That a privileges committee be established to determine whether the Minister for Health has misled this parliament in answering questions in the parliament on 12 and 13 September; and that the privileges committee be chaired by the Speaker, with two government members and two opposition members.

The **SPEAKER**: I have counted the house and, as an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the house is present, I accept the motion. Is the motion seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, sir.

The house divided on the motion:

AYES (20)

Brindal, M. K.

Brokenshire, R. L.

AYES (cont.)

Brown, D. C. (teller)	Buckby, M. R.
Chapman, V. A.	Evans, I. F.
Goldsworthy, R. M.	Gunn, G. M.
Hall, J. L.	Hamilton-Smith, M. L. J.
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.

NOES (23)

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

Majority of 3 for the noes.

Motion thus negated.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table—
By the Premier (Hon. M.D. Rann)—

Government Board and Committee Information—Listing of
Boards and Committees (by portfolio)—
30 June 2005—Volumes 1, 2 and 3.

CRIMINAL LAW (UNDERCOVER OPERATIONS)
ACT

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: In April 1995, after the High Court decided an appeal called *Ridgeway* in favour of the accused, parliament passed the Criminal Law (Undercover Operations) Act with the support of all sides of politics. The object of the legislation was to place the law of police undercover operations on a legislative footing and to ensure certainty in the law. The High Court ruling on entrapment by police of drug dealers and other criminals had created uncertainty for the police and the courts.

As honourable members may be aware, one of the safeguards built into the legislation which significantly extended police powers was that there should be notification of authorised undercover operations to the Attorney-General and an annual report to parliament, and I am pleased to assure the house that the system is meticulously adhered to—both by police and by my office. The details of these notifications form the basis of the report that the statute requires me to give to parliament, and I now seek leave to table that report.

The legislation is working well; there have not been any South Australian court decisions in the last 12 months of which I am aware on the legislation or on this specific aspect of *Ridgeway*. I am in a position to assure honourable members that the legislation is working as it was intended to and that no difficulties have appeared in its effective operation. The law in this area appears to be well settled now.

Honourable members should be made aware that, as a result of the agreement of the Council of Australian Governments' decisions on terrorism and trans-border crime in April 2002 work has been completed on a national model for controlled operations legislation. The aim of this work is to make a nationally uniform law that would allow controlled operations across jurisdictional boundaries. When resources are available to do the considerable work required, the government intends to examine the proposed legislation and act accordingly. Serious criminals do not respect state and territory borders; nor should the law. State laws should be capable of dealing with trans-border crime. A report has been presented to the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General on this and other trans-border issues of criminal investigation, and I should be happy to provide any honourable member with a copy should he or she want one.

QUESTION TIME

GAWLER HEALTH SERVICE

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Health. Since the public meeting at Gawler on Sunday 11 September, has the minister spoken to the three expectant mothers at Gawler to verify or reconcile what was said at the meeting in the home of Labor candidate Tony Piccolo? If not, why not?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): No, sir.

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS INSPECTORS

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Can the minister update the house on progress in the recruitment and training of the new industrial relations inspectors?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I thank the member for Torrens for her question. I am pleased to report that, following an extensive recruitment process, 19 new industrial relations inspectors commenced work at Workplace Services on 1 August this year. This intake has doubled the size of the industrial relations inspectorate. The new inspectors will play a key role in supporting employers and employees, ensuring that they understand their rights and responsibilities as they relate to industrial laws and regulations. Ensuring that the law is understood and observed helps us to reduce time lost through industrial disputes. Four of the new recruits will be based across the regional centres of Port Pirie, Port Lincoln, Whyalla and Mount Gambier.

An extensive training program has been developed to ensure that the new inspectors are able to deliver the balanced range of industrial relations services required. This program includes training in industrial legislation, investigation techniques, mediation, compliance and enforcement. A key part of the new inspectors' training involves practical experience in the field. New inspectors accompany experienced practitioners who act as mentors and ensure that the inspectors have exposure to the complexities of industrial relations issues in the work place. The training program will continue until November of this year. Future training sessions include familiarising new inspectors with the operations of the Industrial Court and Commission and negotiation workshops. These new inspectors will play a crucial role in encouraging good industrial relations practices in South Australia. Funding inspectors to help employers and employ-

ees better understand and observe the law will help ensure that South Australia continues to lead the way in fair and productive workplaces.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport): I have a supplementary question. Is it the government's intention to reduce the number of state industrial relations inspectors if the proposed federal industrial relations legislation is passed?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I thank the shadow minister for his question. I thought he would have been aware, as shadow minister, that we do have a contract with the federal government to help enforce federal laws and certified agreements. So, even if the Prime Minister's proposal is successful—and that is a big 'if'—we still have the responsibility; that is under contract. I understand that we have been under contract in that arrangement for some time.

HEALTH SERVICE, GAWLER

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): Why has the Premier chosen to ignore concerns about Gawler's health services as expressed in letters to him by members of the medical profession?

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Didn't you read Alex Kennedy on the weekend?

The SPEAKER: The Attorney is out of order.

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY: General practitioner Dr Bill Lees has advised the opposition that he has corresponded with the Premier by email on numerous occasions without receiving a reply of any sort. In his most recent email, dated 18 September 2005, Dr Lees states that, while the Premier is quick to speak out about crime, punishment and the judiciary, his silence is deafening when major concerns with health are raised. Dr Lees writes:

How can you allow the disgraceful lack of quality and standards in a department such as the (Department of Human Services) without acting on your own accord, let alone hiding when their ineptitude is exposed year after year by the professional bodies they are meant to support?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Can I just say that yesterday—

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Hartley!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: —on Sunday I did not see this email, but I will reply sine die.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: When the house comes to order, the member for Giles has the call.

OUTBACK CATTLE DRIVE

Ms BREUER (Giles): My question is directed to the Minister for Tourism. Following the success of the 2005 Outback Cattle Drive, what plans are there for the 2007 event?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the member for Giles for her question. She was right in commenting on the success of the 2005 event, which was well received around the world and was used as a great marketing tool, branding Adelaide as the gateway to the Outback. After the staging of the 2005 event—which ran from 30 April to 11 June, with 39 media in attendance, most of whom were international—I am pleased today to announce the next route for 2007. This year we will be moving the international event to another route, and we will be taking up the drive along the Oodnadatta Track.

As you know, sir, the Oodnadatta Track has near mythical qualities for many people who remember the charm and the region with great affection. It goes through areas with plains and undulating countryside, and skirts along the south-eastern border of Lake Eyre. It is exquisite countryside with waterways and very beautiful landscapes. It will be particularly exciting in this new location because, having been very successful in the past location, it will move to new communities who will take up the challenge of very complex volunteering along the route. I should take the opportunity of thanking the communities along the old route who worked so hard to make this event a great success.

One of the highlights may well be that people will be able to camp on our largest cattle station, Anna Creek, which is half the size of Tasmania. We expect that this positioning of the Oodnadatta Track will allow us to access the site more easily by air, and by various four-wheel drive and camel tours. There will be post-touring options, and we will be encouraging local operators to develop extra packages.

We expect to be marketing this event within the next few months in key markets such as Germany, France, Italy, the United Kingdom, and the United States. I will particularly look forward to going to the Oodnadatta Track. The communities have been lobbying to have this event in their region because they think that they have something to offer, and the local farm owners and property leaseholders have been saying for some time that they would be happy to provide cattle and staff to help.

Along with our other marketing campaigns, we expect this to work and be effective for visitors from New Zealand as well as from Europe. We will position the Great Australian Cattle Drive as the icon event of the Outback and it will, of course, be in South Australia.

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I have a supplementary question. Can the minister advise whether any funding will be available to ensure that road trains, cars and trucks will be able to travel along the Oodnadatta Track before and during this event, or is it the minister's intention to ensure that the Oodnadatta Track from now on is suitable only for horses, cattle and aeroplanes?

The SPEAKER: I think it is more a question for the Minister for Transport, but I call on the Minister for Tourism.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I do not believe that we will be landing any aeroplanes on the road. In fact, it is not that sort of delivery. The people who will be flying in—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: So, you would make it hundreds of k's of airstrip?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney is out of order.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The Oodnadatta Track has the advantage of allowing people to fly into Coober Pedy, and it is easy to access, but they will not be flying directly onto the track.

HOSPITALS, MOUNT GAMBIER

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): When will the Premier reply to letters signed by 48 doctors in the South-East in June 2003? In June 2003, the Premier received a series of letters calling for the Minister for Health to be sacked over the Mount Gambier Hospital crisis. The letters were signed by 20 Mount Gambier GPs, 10 Mount Gambier surgeons and anaesthetists, nine Millicent GPs, seven Naracoorte GPs, one Naracoorte ear, nose and throat

surgeon, and one GP from Robe, and now, two years later, none of them has received a reply.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am used to the Leader's spin, but I can say that actions speak louder than words, and you would be well aware of the actions we took with regard to the Mount Gambier Hospital. That is the difference: all you did was make promises that you never delivered, and that is why, I am told, there is now 1 000 extra nurses, more than 300 extra doctors, and about 100 extra beds. So, that is the difference—

Mr BROKENSHIRE: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, regarding standing order 98 and relevance. The question was to do with why the Premier had not responded to all the doctors in Mount Gambier.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The Premier should respond to the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I have, sir.

WORK FORCE PLANNING PROJECT

Mr CAICA (Colton): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. How will the work force planning initiatives that the government is supporting in the western suburbs assist our retail and hospitality industries?

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I thank the member for Colton for his question, and I acknowledge that he and the members for Morphett and West Torrens were with me when we launched the Work Force Planning Project at the airport and surrounding businesses. This program has been developed with industry to deal with the demand of more than 350 jobs at the airport with a further 650 positions opening up in the surrounding businesses, including IKEA Home-ware, Harbour Town, Export Park and the Burbridge Business Park Developments.

The Hon. W.A. Matthew interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Bright is out of order.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: The state government is the major contributor of \$750 000 to the Western Area Industry Skills Development Project, which will look at matching work force skills with job needs. I am very pleased that industry has contributed at least \$286 000 to the total cost of this particular part of our jobs package. This work force plan involves the new industry skills boards, the state government and individual businesses. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the work done by the Services Industry Skills Board, particularly Barry Stanton and Nick Papahariakis, who have been supportive in making sure that the retail, hospitality and tourism industries get looked at with regard to this job-multiplying project.

This is a collaborative model for planning which can be used in other major developments that are occurring in South Australia. We have found that working in this way makes it easier to plan, train and make sure that we have the right number of people with skills for the state's major developments and expansions. Advertising commenced over a week ago for people interested in jobs and training in the hospitality, retail and tourism areas. Already there has been something like 1 913 internet inquiries and a further 500 telephone inquiries, whilst 440 applications have been received. The first phase of this project will provide successful applicants with up to 60 hours of subsidised, industry-specific training at TAFE campuses in retail or hospitality. This will also include training in tourism skills so that the new recruits can

be unofficial tourism ambassadors while working in the airport precinct.

I am pleased to say that the TAFE English Language Services will also train a total of 100 bilingual recruits, who will be able to welcome our visitors in an international language and also offer them retail services and tourism information in that language. The first 40 of these trainees, between them, will speak 25 major languages. As a result of this program, we believe that our new Adelaide Airport complex will not only impress visitors with its physical form, but it will also make newly arrived tourists or business people feel immediately welcome and at home. It will also emphasise something that we are very proud of in South Australia, namely, that we are a state of diverse and multicultural communities.

HEALTH SERVICE, GAWLER

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister confirm that her decision to overturn the original contract offered to and accepted by the Gawler obstetricians in June-July 2004 will now cost taxpayers nearly a quarter of a million dollars extra per year? The original contract which was offered to and accepted by the Gawler obstetricians in June last year was for a total of \$550 000 per year for three consulting obstetricians.

This draft contract was subsequently overturned by the minister. On 1 July this year a new draft contract was offered to each of the doctors, with an amount of \$255 000 per year for each of the obstetricians, making a total of \$765 000 per year for the three consulting obstetricians. I point out that I have copies of the contracts to hand. The minister has now told the parliament that a new model will be even more expensive than the \$765 000 per year offered to the doctors on 1 July this year.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): We have been through all this before in terms of what happened in relation to the original contracts being negotiated by the Gawler Health Service Board. The contracts that the department and the Gawler Health Service Board were offering earlier this year to the two obstetricians were, in fact, of greater value than the original contracts, so we were most anxious to get them signed up. As I said many times in this house, we were disappointed when one of the obstetricians chose to relocate. However, the important thing is that the government is committed to establishing safe, secure, sustainable birthing services at Gawler through the Women's and Children's Hospital, and we will put that in place.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, that doctor has already issued statements that have been read to this house to say that that statement from the minister is grossly misleading, and I therefore ask you to stop the minister trying to debate this issue, under standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: Order! If the honourable member is alleging misleading, he should move the appropriate motion.

NOWINGI WASTE DUMP

Mr RAU (Enfield): My question is to the Premier. Is the South Australian government concerned that the Victorian government is refusing to rule out the possibility of also using the Nowingi waste dump for the disposal of radioactive material?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am very pleased at the strong support from members opposite. Yes, we have been watching this one very closely. As the honourable member pointed out, the proposed dump is very close to the Murray River and also very close to the Hattah Lakes system, which is one of the six most significant ecological assets along the river, identified by the Murray-Darling Basin Commission. The South Australian government is not prepared to consider any risk to the river. The Minister for the River Murray raised this issue with the federal Minister for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (Hon. Peter McGauran), who is Chairman of the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council, and expressed the strongest concern. I am told that communities in Victoria were very concerned about this proposal, and we in South Australia are no less concerned.

The Victorian government is currently proceeding through its environmental assessment process and an Environment Effects Statement is currently being prepared. We are watching this process very closely and will ensure that South Australia's interests are protected. We will vigorously oppose any development at Nowingi or anywhere else that poses any risk to the River Murray. South Australia will not accept any risk, no matter how minuscule, to the river and I welcome the opposition's support in this.

However, members opposite must be confused because, while this government opposed the construction of a nuclear waste disposal facility in South Australia, the opposition was supportive of its development here, even though it was perilously close to the Great Artesian Basin. Now they are apparently against a waste dump in north-west Victoria but they supported one in South Australia—and that is the difference, because they are not patriots.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is just typical of the inconsistency of opposition members. It is all spin, spin, spin, from the Leader of the Opposition. They were prepared to support a radioactive waste dump in South Australia, yet they oppose a waste dump in Victoria. Perhaps it is because they care more about Victorians than they do about South Australians.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is clearly debating the question.

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Leader of the Opposition): As a supplementary question, has the Premier directly discussed this issue with Steve Bracks, the Premier of Victoria?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson will be able to discuss it directly with Mr Bracks today, if he is not careful. The member for Light.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister declined to answer the question.

HEALTH SERVICE, GAWLER

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): Is the Minister for Health aware that the Treasurer has arranged to meet with Dr Simon Stewart-Rattray this afternoon and, if so, has the Treasurer been charged with finding a resolution to the Gawler issue?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): Yes, I am meeting with Dr Stewart-Rattray today, and I look forward to having a constructive discussion with him.

Members interjecting:

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Attorney is out of order. If other members can attend this afternoon, perhaps the chair will arrange a minibus and they can all visit Dr Stewart-Rattray.

ORAL HEALTH AND THE AGED

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): My question is to the Minister for Health. What is being done by this government to better address the oral health needs of older people, particularly those in aged care facilities?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): Older people need regular dental health care and yet, for one reason or another, many older people do not access it. I am pleased to advise the house that this government has provided an additional \$360 000 to extend a successful program that is seeing positive results in addressing the oral health needs of older South Australians. The funding will provide for the continuation of a two-year—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. L. STEVENS: The member should listen; one day his constituents may even benefit—that is, if he is still here. The funding will provide for the continuation of a two-year pilot program that has been operating in the inner southern suburbs of Adelaide. In the last two years, the program has enabled more than 2 000 older people aged 75 and over who are living in independently in the community to have their oral health assessed. Interim results indicate that older people have reported far less dental pain, and increased comfort and pleasure in eating. They also reported significant improvements in their ability to go about their normal day-to-day activities at home and in the community. It is a really important issue for older people. As part of a general health assessment by their own GP, each older person is given a simple oral health assessment to see whether they are experiencing oral pain or dental health problems. More than 600 people have received priority treatment through a public dental clinic, as holders of a pensioner concession card, while others were given help to receive their care from private dental clinics.

The program also has a second component, which funds private dental teams to attend residential aged care facilities and provide dental care for more than 300 residents. The South Australian Dental Service and the South Australian branch of the Australian Dental Service have coordinated dental teams with portable equipment so that they can attend aged care facilities and give residents dental care in familiar and comfortable surroundings. Feedback from this part of the program has also shown a good improvement in the oral care of residents. We know that people in residential aged care facilities can be especially vulnerable to oral diseases as their ability to maintain their dental hygiene lessens. As well as improving oral health for older people, the extension of this program is providing important linkages between residential care facilities, older people living independently in the community, GPs and dental providers.

PARTY POLITICAL ADVERTISING

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): Will the Premier explain why his government has not introduced legislation to eliminate taxpayer-funded party political advertisements, as was promised before the last election? Before the election the Premier promised that Labor would 'place legislation before the parliament to restore accountability in government spending on promotions'. Recently, the Premier has appeared in various advertising campaigns, promoting everything from the budget to taking credit for the federal government's announcement regarding the air warfare destroyer contract.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Deputy Premier): One feature of this government, particularly the Premier and me, is that when we are wrong—when we realise we are wrong in statements we have made previously in our career—we acknowledge it. We are not like members opposite, who would go to the barriers holding a policy position that was clearly wrong. The Premier and I are big enough and of such character that when we are wrong we admit it. On the issue of government—

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Hartley!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:—ensuring that a community is well informed about important public policy initiatives, it is appropriate for government to advise the community. On behalf of the Premier, I apologise for anything we have said to former premiers Olsen and Brown when we were critical. We were wrong. I think it takes a special politician to say they were wrong.

For ultimate guidance on this issue, the Premier and I look to John Howard, who has felt it important that he promote the federal government's policy initiatives. We look to Mr Howard for guidance on this issue, and we think it is an appropriate way to ensure that the community understands the good policy being implemented by this government.

The Hon. Dean Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader is out of order.

RESPITE SERVICES

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): My question is to the Minister for Disability. How is the government working with agencies in the non-government sector to improve respite services for families with children with disabilities?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Disability): We are acting to create a range of new respite centres across the length and breadth of South Australia in order to relieve some of the extraordinary burden that exists on families who care for young people—not even so young—with disabilities in their families. I had great pleasure in going to the electorate of the honourable member in August, together on Archbishop Phillip Wilson, to open a new purpose-built respite centre at Elizabeth North. Auricht House is named in honour of the late Mark Auricht, who dedicated his fatal 2001 Mount Everest summit attempt to assist Centacare in the gathering of resources, in particular to establish this respite centre. Auricht House will provide quality respite services for more than 100 families in the north and north-east regions of the city.

We are also very pleased to announce another respite facility in the southern hills region. Some \$300 000 will establish a new respite service for people with disabilities in Strathalbyn and surrounding areas. This respite centre is a joint initiative between the state government and the non-

government agencies CARA (Community Accommodation and Respite Agency) and CLASS (Community Living and Support Services). Julia Farr Services will buy a building and establish a five-bed facility to provide a service for up to 70 adults with a range of disabilities.

I was also pleased in August to announce a new respite service in Clare. The new service, which will be up and running by the end of next month, will provide overnight respite for adults and a social and recreational program for young people aged 13 and over. In addition, we have provided \$400 000 funding to the Autism Association including the northern respite house in Craigmore. This brings it—if my maths is correct—to something like over 200 new places in respite services since we have come to government, much of it in more recent times. We are working hard to overcome eight years of neglect in our disability services in this state and we will continue to work hard. This is a massive task. We will continue to work hard on this most valuable and important public policy.

HOSPITALS, MOUNT GAMBIER

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): My question is to the Minister for Health.

Mr Venning: Good luck!

Mr WILLIAMS: I'll keep trying. Will the minister advise whether she, or anyone from her office, has investigated matters regarding the inadequate treatment of a nine year old girl at the Mount Gambier hospital that were raised in question time last week; and, if so, what information can she now provide to the house concerning this case?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): My office is in the process of looking into this issue. When we have that information, we will get back to the house. In the meantime, things are going very well overall at Mount Gambier. I put on the record, for instance, that in the year 2001-02 its budget was \$19.5 million. It is now \$30 million—more staff, more nurses, more services—

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. The question was about the results of an investigation into the treatment of a nine year old girl, not the annual report of the Mount Gambier Hospital.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

MULTICULTURAL GRANT SCHEME

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is to the Attorney-General. Given that many of our ethnic community organisations provide a wide range of services and support to their members, will the minister detail what steps the government has taken to assist these organisations?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I can, sir. The government provides assistance to ethnic and multicultural community organisations to help them do their important work. Indeed, the government—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I thank the member for Mawson for his careful attention to our advertisements. The government has recently advertised the first round of the multicultural grant scheme for 2005-06. I am pleased to tell the house that this year we have again doubled the funding for the multicultural grant scheme. When we came to government, we immediately doubled the funding available from \$75 000 to \$150 000 a year.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, it is a fact. In view of the important work being done to promote community harmony and to ensure access and equity, I have been pleased to again double the funding from \$150 000 to \$300 000. There is no spin there, but there was a bit of spin last week from the member for Hartley, who said that the Minister for Multicultural Affairs had done nothing for Citizenship Day. In fact, the honourable member had not taken any steps to check. I went all the way out to Gawler to speak at a citizenship ceremony presided over by Tony Piccolo, the Labor candidate for Light—and I am pleased to say that the member for Light was there, too.

Mr BROKENSHERE: Mr Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I refer to standing order 98. The Attorney is wide off the track. He is supposed to be answering a specific question.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Attorney is debating the question now. The question was about multicultural grants.

Mr Scalzi interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is out of order, too.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: This increase in funding will further help communities do the work they do best, that is, providing community services, assisting new migrants, supporting and celebrating cultural diversity—

Ms Chapman: Unless they're pregnant.

The SPEAKER: If the member for Bragg wants to ask a question, she can.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:—and managing festivals. Grants were made in two rounds each financial year towards projects in four categories: festivals, projects and events, community development and using the media to promote multiculturalism. In the past, there has been an upper limit of \$5 000 for multicultural grants. I am pleased to be able to tell the house that the maximum amounts in each category have been increased, with up to \$20 000 now available for major festivals and up to \$15 000 available for major projects and events or community development.

Last financial year, the government provided multicultural grants to more than 100 community organisations. Some of the groups that received funding were the Afghan Women's Federation for the Afghan new year cultural celebration; the Australian Refugee Association for the African youth development project; Chinese welfare services for the cultural diversity showcase in Chinatown; and the Eritrean community of South Australia for traditional craft materials and information sessions.

Sir, as a local member of parliament I send out a letter in English welcoming my new constituents and new citizens to citizenship, but I also include on the back a photocopy in their language. I have photocopied in Tegrinya and Arabic and, when I was doorknocking yesterday, I introduced a new language, Dinka. That would not be familiar to the member for Hartley because he disapproves of translations.

Other groups that received funding were the Riverland Multicultural Forum for the Cross-cultural Awareness Training Workshop, the Sierra Leonean community of South Australia for the West African Women's Workshop (I think most members opposite could not point to Sierra Leone on a map), and the Vietnam Farmers Association for the Full Moon Festival for Children. The full list of grants provided under the 2004-05 multicultural grants scheme is available on the Multicultural SA web site. I encourage organisations to apply for a grant through the scheme so that participation in public life by South Australians of all backgrounds continues to increase.

Mr Meier interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: The member for Goyder is right; I did write to every member of parliament telling them what I am doing in my portfolio.

Mr Meier: In the Tamil language!

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, I did not write to the member for Goyder in the Tamil language. Mr Speaker, guidelines and application forms are available from Multicultural SA.

Mr BRINDAL (Unley): I have a supplementary question. Given the quadrupling of grants to multicultural South Australia, can the Attorney-General inform the house of what prudential auditing procedures he has put in place and whether there have been instances in the past of misuse of those funds?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: If community organisations do not acquit their grants correctly they certainly will not be in receipt of any more.

HEALTH SERVICE, NOARLUNGA

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): My question is to the Minister for Health. Following the memo that surgeons at the Noarlunga Health Services have received advising of reduced elective surgery, how can the minister justify the employment of three extra administrative officers at that hospital at a recurrent cost of \$290 000 per annum? I am advised that they are not required.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): It is interesting that the member for Mawson persists in this misunderstanding that I have already explained to the house. There has been no cut in budget at Noarlunga Health Services. I would like to put on record a letter that I have received from the chief executive of the Southern Adelaide Health Services, and I think it may be wise for the honourable member to listen this time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the members for Unley and Morialta!

The Hon. L. STEVENS: The letter reads:

I wish to confirm that:

- The Noarlunga Health Services has not received a budget cut in 05/06; Noarlunga's initial 04/05 budget was \$30.453 million and the initial 05/06 budget is \$33.240 million. This represents an increase on the initial annual allocation of \$2.787 million.
- In relation to the volume of surgery undertaken by Noarlunga Health Services, it is likely that there will be a similar volume of surgery in 05/06 to that of 04/05. The 05/06 surgical activity will be made up of a base workload together with Noarlunga Health Services providing surgical procedures as part of the regions' elective surgery strategy.

Perhaps the honourable member might now understand the situation.

Mr BROKENSHERE: I have a supplementary question. That did not actually answer the question about the three administrative officers, but can the minister then confirm to the house that the memo from Mr Schoemaker, who is in charge of elective surgery at the Noarlunga Health Services, was in fact inaccurate and untrue?

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Sir, I can confirm that I have just read out a memo that I have received today from the chief executive of the Southern Adelaide Health Services. Now, that is the big boss, and that is whose information I have just put on the record.

GM CANOLA

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. What steps did the minister take to test South Australian GM canola crops after I wrote to him in July referring to trace amounts of GM canola in commercial canola in Victoria and he referred this issue to the GM Crop Advisory Committee for advice? This morning, *The Advertiser* reported on contamination of canola crops in South Australia with GM canola.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN (Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries): The event reported in *The Advertiser* today is not in any way related to the correspondence from the member—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I do not think this is funny; I think this is actually quite serious matter.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: If you're amused by this, perhaps you should talk to the shadow minister or the shadow minister's rep in this house.

Mr Hanna: What has to be done?

The Hon. R.J. McEWEN: I am getting to that. The Topaz event, which is also known as the 19-2 event, is an event where there is low-level contamination of that GM gene right through the canola crop across the whole of southern Australia—New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and Western Australia. All states have conducted some examination of the seed. We are aware that there is a low-level contamination event. Discussions are being held this week in Canberra, leading to a full discussion at a ministerial council meeting in Launceston at the end of October. At that time, decisions will need to be made about the treatment of that crop this year, because at that stage it will obviously be ready for harvest. I can certainly report back to the house on the national approach to this Australia-wide contamination event once we have discussed it at length and made a decision at the ministerial level in Launceston at the end of October. I am happy to bring that back to the house and, obviously, to the member.

TOURISM, DOMESTIC VISITORS

Mrs HALL (Morialta): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. What action will the minister take to reverse the dramatic slump in domestic visitor numbers and nights to South Australia? The latest figures released from the national visitor survey show domestic visitor numbers to South Australia have fallen by more than 500 000 from 5.8 million in June 2004 to just 5.3 million in June 2005. The NVS has also recorded a 10 per cent drop in domestic visitor nights, and this equates to a drop of more than 2 million visitor nights to South Australia.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Tourism): I thank the member for Morialta for the question. She rightly highlights a problem that has affected the tourism industry across the whole country, in fact. In the past quarter particularly and the past 12 months, there has been a very significant rise in international travel. The rising Australian dollar has really lured that pent-up demand for overseas trips away from the domestic market. There has been a dramatic rise across the country because of the dollar. I think that the impact on domestic tourism has affected every state. It has particularly affected states where there has been an efflux of

tourists from their own domestic market because of cheap domestic travel. Cheap domestic air travel has really increased the number of day trips, short trips and all holidays, because it is very hard for domestic travel within the state to compete with low-cost interstate trips.

There has also been an aberration in the quarterly figures related to the positioning of Easter in the first quarter of the year instead of the second quarter. Of course, for South Australia this has been a non-festival year as well, and non-festival years are always lower than festival years. They are the figures that we expect to occur. But, South Australia has been very active in looking at ways to increase domestic tourism by putting almost \$500 000 into our Must See Must Do campaign, which is to counteract those people in South Australia who do not know what opportunities are available. We are really pushing the more than 200 destinations that are accessible and exciting in South Australia. On top of that, we have been working with the regions.

I would like the member for Morialta to remember one of the facts that I raised last week; that is, the federal government's industrial relations strategies will prevent ordinary workers accessing holidays, because it will potentially make it easier for people to trade out their holidays. It stands to reason that, if Australian workers only have two weeks holiday in a year instead of the current allowance, they will not be taking domestic holidays.

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

TALKING REALITIES PROGRAM

Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Will the Minister for Health tell the house about initiatives that have been put in place by this government to support young families in South Australia?

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the member for West Torrens for his very important question and for his interest in the challenges facing young parents. Talking Realities is an innovative South Australian program that trains young mothers and fathers to become peer educators so that they can talk to other young people about the realities of being a young parent. Talking Realities aims to provide a realistic view of the possible short and long-term consequences of pregnancy and parenthood for secondary school aged young people across South Australia.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is out of order.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: The program began in the western suburbs of Adelaide and has since been established in the Riverland, Whyalla, and the Para-West adult campus in the northern electorate of Napier. I am pleased to be able to inform the house that extra funding has recently been provided for this program to be expanded. Talking Realities will receive \$450 000 through Parenting SA over the next five years to help further develop and expand this successful program. The expansion—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Over five years—that's one staffer.

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Davenport!

The Hon. I.F. Evans: I was just pointing out that it was one staffer, sir.

The SPEAKER: You do not have to point anything out.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I am pointing out, member for Davenport, that it is a very good program. Perhaps you should listen. The expansion will see the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service work in partnership with the

Children, Youth and Women's Health Service. This partnership will provide opportunities for young parents residing in the northern suburbs to become involved in the Talking Realities young parenting program. They will also be offered further training to work as peer educators with nurses involved with the family home visiting program as part of Every Chance for Every Child. Members will already be aware that our family home visiting program provides families with regular home visits from a community health nurse for the first two years of a child's life. This program helps identify parents who can benefit from further support from a child health nurse.

By working with those families, young parents who are part of Talking Realities get the opportunity to talk with other young parents about their experiences and the skills they have gained since becoming a peer educator. The Additional Funding for Talking Realities is, in part, aimed at reconnecting young parents to education, training and employment and at helping reduce their sense of social isolation. One thing that we have already learned from Talking Realities is that young parents identify with others who have similar experiences and can develop a relationship with them. This means that practical support is available in the home at a time when it is most needed, and it can make the most difference for both young parents and their new babies.

KINDERGARTENS, HECTORVILLE

The SPEAKER: I call the member for Hartley.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The lion.

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): It is better to be called the lion than a liar. Does the Minister for Education and Children's Services stand by the government's decision to close Hectorville Kindergarten due to low enrolments? Within two years there has been a sufficient number of kindergarten aged children in the area to warrant a new private kindergarten. In May 2003 the government closed Hectorville Kindergarten. The minister cited low enrolments and a lack of local need for the service as the reasons for the closure. Now, however, the private Montessori pre-school is flourishing on the same site.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I would love to answer this question, because I think it is rather coy of the member to discuss school closures. Has he forgotten? Has he, somehow, a very short memory? Was it 65 schools that were closed during the term of the previous government?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister is debating the question. The minister should answer the question, which related to the closure of the kindergarten.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I think that—

Mr Brokenshire interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Mawson!

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH:—the member would understand that a Montessori school is a very specific animal. It is quite different from the normal child care or kindergarten facilities that we might run in DECS. If there is a market for a Montessori school, it is very much like the independent schools sector where people exercise choice and come from a larger catchment area.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! One hopes that there is no-one here from that kindergarten because they might be influenced the wrong way. I call the member for Bragg.

TEACHERS' STRIKE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Can the minister advise the house of the cost to the South Australian taxpayer of the failed action taken by the government in the Industrial Relations Commission to attempt to stop the teachers' strike on 5 July this year?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I thank the member for her question. She may not realise that a package has been put to the teachers. That has been accepted in principle by the teachers' union. It is my understanding that the vote closed at 12 o'clock today. The government remains confident that what was put to the union will be accepted.

Ms CHAPMAN: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, the question was specifically related to the cost to the taxpayer of the failed application to stop the strike. It had nothing to do with the—

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The minister was asked about the cost.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT: I need to set the scene, because this was a part of the ongoing negotiations. This was not a failure at all: this was a package that we put to the union. The union has accepted the package, and we remain confident that the teachers will vote for the package.

The SPEAKER: That was not the question. I call the member for Mawson.

WORKCOVER

Mr BROKENSHERE (Mawson): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier advise the house when he will introduce legislation to address the anomaly whereby workers over the age of 65 are not entitled to the same WorkCover benefits as workers under 65?

Members interjecting:

Mr BROKENSHERE: Just wait for the explanation.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Attorney is out of order.

Mr BROKENSHERE: One of my constituents has advised me that in a discussion that he had with the Premier in August the Premier stated that it was not acceptable for this to occur and that he would address and fix the issue.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): As the minister responsible, I am happy to answer that question. This is an important issue, which the government is looking at. I have raised this with WorkCover, and I await advice from WorkCover.

SCHOOLS, SMITHFIELD PLAINS HIGH

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. Will the minister ensure that the attendance records of students at the Smithfield Plains High School will again be made available to staff members? On 23 June this year, I asked the minister why teachers were being instructed to grade students who were never in attendance at school. I am still waiting for a response but, in the meantime, I am advised that attendance figures are now being kept a secret from staff members after a demand was made on the person who contacted my office about the phantom gradings.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): The member for Bragg loves

to do everything she can to talk down public education, and here she goes again. She wants to undermine and—

Mr WILLIAMS: On a point of order, sir, the minister continues not to answer the question and to debate a different matter. Mr Speaker, you already called her to order once only a few minutes ago.

The SPEAKER: I made the point to all ministers not to engage in debate when answering a question.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: It really is sad that the member for Bragg should imply that teachers grade students who are not in the classroom. Clearly, situations exist where students stay at home for various reasons, but if they are not there they cannot be graded and they cannot get a pass. There is just no argument about that. If they are excluded or have been suspended, there are of course occasions on which they need to receive a grade. To suggest that students are erroneously being given grades when they do not attend a school is really scurrilous and I reject that suggestion.

Ms CHAPMAN: As a supplementary question, will the minister then give an assurance that those student attendance records that are currently being hidden will be made available to the staff members?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: The member for Bragg has made an assertion and I have learned from experience not to accept assertions on face value. We will look into the matter, but I do not believe that one should accept what one is told in this chamber, because it is very often unsubstantiated.

EMPLOYMENT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Is the Premier concerned that South Australia is losing young professionals interstate because South Australia still has the lowest average take-home wages in the nation? ABS statistics on 18 August 2005 yet again confirmed that the average weekly earnings for all employees in SA at just \$697 are the lowest in the nation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer is out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The house will come to order first, and then I will call the Premier.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am not quite clear what the honourable member is on about here. I think he wants us to get on the phone and tell South Australian employers to pay more for the workers. We are certainly happy to pass on the Liberal Party's policy. That is their economic policy. Meanwhile, what we are doing is pointing out to people in other states and overseas that not only—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Very interesting: let us compare the unemployment rate under us compared to that under members opposite.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens will be named if he does that, banging the desk. That is the sort of thing you would not expect even in a kindergarten.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: On a point of order, standing orders do not allow debate. We all know that—

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point. The Premier is debating it now. I think the Premier should answer the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: It is interesting to hear that the people opposite are proud of the fact that unemployment during their term was double what it is now, but now they also want to make sure that South Australia is—

The SPEAKER: Order! I uphold the point of order. The Premier is debating now. I call the member for Stuart.

An honourable member: That's you, Gunny.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: For a few more months, anyway.

SCHOOLS, EUDUNDA AREA

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): I will be here as long as I want and there is nothing you can do about it, even with a paid government candidate against me. My question is directed to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: You asked for it. My question is directed to the Minister for Education. Will she explain to the house why her department has taken away \$7 000 from the Eudunda Area School without proper consultation and will the minister take immediate action to ensure that the school has this money for the proper use of improvement of education in that area? It has been brought to my attention by the chairman of the school council that the minister's department arbitrarily removed this money for no reason at all. Is the minister aware that this is a small community that was giving excellent education facilities and requires this money so that this can be continued?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): The honourable member, as always, is a great advocate for his local public schools and I commend him for that. I will be very happy to look into this matter, because the issues he brings to me always have substance.

The SPEAKER: Order! I point out, for the information of members, that the behaviour today was significantly better and, as a result 21 questions were asked by the opposition, eight by the government and one by the member for Mitchell.

EYRE PENINSULA BUSHFIRES

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I lay on the table the report of the Independent Review of Circumstances Surrounding the Wangary Eyre Peninsula Bushfires of 10 and 11 January 2005 prepared by Dr Bob Smith in September 2005. In accordance with section 12 of the Civil Liability Act, I move:

That the report be published.

Motion carried.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement on behalf of the Hon. Carmel Zollo, Minister for Emergency Services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: This report concerns the government commissioned Independent Review into the Lower Eyre Peninsula Bushfires of 10 and 11 January. Members may recall that, on 3 May 2005, I announced an independent review into the tragic circumstances surrounding

the Eyre Peninsula bushfires of 10 and 11 January 2005. The government decided upon an independent review in the light of the immense impact that these fires had on the community and to take the opportunity to learn from the issues that only an event of this magnitude could bring to light. This is a view that is obviously shared by the community as a whole and their representatives in the parliament, in particular, the Hon. Mr Gilfillan, who made several representations to me on the matter.

The government chose Dr Bob Smith to conduct the review. Dr Smith has had more than 30 years' experience in the Victorian and New South Wales forest industries. He is currently a director of the board of VicForests and is an international consultant on forestry issues. In accordance with a contract between Dr Smith and me, as Minister for Emergency Services, the review was commenced on 11 May 2005. The completed report recently has been delivered to me, giving me the opportunity to table it here today.

Dr Smith was asked to conduct research into and make recommendations on several matters. These matters formed the terms of reference and included: prevention and mitigation activities; preparedness and response by individuals, the community, organisations and statutory authorities; the use of firefighting aircraft; the impact of roadside vegetation in relation to the fire; the role of police during the fire, including their capacity to control access to affected areas during the fire; and issues arising from the behaviour and progression of the fire originating at Wangary.

I have noted with interest that Dr Smith met with people throughout the Eyre Peninsula, spoke on talkback radio and made himself available in whatever forum the local community required, whether that be formal or informal, to hear their concerns. The minister responsible for the West Coast bushfire recovery (Hon. Patrick Conlon) has today travelled to Port Lincoln to release the report to local councils, the Lower Eyre Peninsula community and other stakeholders.

I note, having had an opportunity to read Dr Smith's report, that many of the findings contained within it are consistent with issues raised in the CFS commissioned report, Project Phoenix, and the report of the COAG Inquiry into Bushfire Mitigation and Management. In his report, Dr Smith makes many considered recommendations about community education and awareness, utilisation of available resources, team work and leadership and the strengthening of links between the CFS and local communities. The recommendations contained within this report will give an opportunity to the government to consider any changes to policy, legislation and resourcing that could aid the further protection of South Australians.

At a more operational level it should be noted that, following the release of Project Phoenix, the Country Fire Service has been proactive in identifying and implementing change, in line with recommendations contained within the various reviews undertaken into the fires. The CFS is on schedule to implement key changes before the forthcoming fire season, including:

- a delivery of operations update program to all CFS officers;
- a new bushfire information and warning system;
- a new policy on the use of CFS sirens for the community warnings;
- all CFS operations management plans are under review;
- planning is under way for a major (whole state) bushfire exercise pre fire season; and

- an upgrade of technology and work space at the CFS Waymouth Street Bushfire Coordination Centre is under way.

This is on top of the government's already committing an extra \$2.4 million towards aerial fire fighting over the following four years, including having extra capacity in the West Coast and South-East regions.

I place on record the government's appreciation for the efforts of police and emergency service workers during this devastating event. Our emergency services staff and volunteers do a wonderful job of protecting the community on a daily basis. South Australians should feel confident that government at all levels will take the opportunity presented by the commissioning of a report such as this to learn important lessons and prepare for any future emergencies of this scale.

The Hon. I.P. LEWIS: I rise on a point of order, sir. I had no wish to interrupt the minister's statement at the time. Sir, do I have your assurance that you will remind ministers and members that we all are here in our respective capacities representing our electorates, not in our right? The minister in the statement refers to the minister involved by his name rather than by his title or the electorate he represents.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is correct. The tradition and practice in this house is to use a member's title or the electorate. The rationale for using the electorate as a title is that we are here to represent electors, not ourselves. The member is quite right in pointing out that matter. There has been some transgression in recent times of members using names when they should be using a title or electorate.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

SCHOOLS, EAST TORRENS PRIMARY

Mr SCALZI (Hartley): Today I wish to continue my comments on Hectorville kindergarten, following the question I asked of the minister. Negotiations were commenced as part of the amalgamation (end 2000) of Hectorville Primary School and Newton Primary School to form a new East Torrens Primary School. This has been a success story, and I thank the former principal Frank Mittiga and Franz Wegner, the chairman of the school governing body. I also welcome the new principal, Ms Sandra Maugher.

Hectorville kindergarten was located directly adjacent to the former Hectorville Primary School. The former Liberal government began negotiations for the kindergarten to be relocated to the East Torrens Primary School campus. The Hectorville Primary School site continued to be owned by DECS until other tenants were relocated. The Harrow Road Behaviour Management Unit was relocated to Paradise school in 2001, and the Down Syndrome Society was relocated to Hampstead Primary School in mid 2004. The kindy closed at the end of 2003.

On closure, the property reverted to the ownership of Campbelltown council. Thus, for the final years of the kindergarten (2002-03) it was run adjacent to a disused and derelict site, the subject of numerous complaints by neighbouring residents—who still complain. I raised the issue of vandalism in this place several times. It also continued to operate in great uncertainty.

While the former minister for education and children's services had given positive indications and acknowledged the

overwhelming support of the community for the relocation of the kindergarten to the nearby East Torrens Primary School campus (in a letter of 9 May 2003), a few months later the closure of the kindy was presented as a *fait accompli*.

The present minister stated in reply to my question that \$200 000 worth of federal money for the amalgamation had been expended and that none had been dedicated to the kindergarten relocation. I am pleased that following community consultation and analysis of demand it was decided that Hectorville kindergarten would not be relocated. At the time there were only nine enrolments, with as many as 79 vacancies in nearby centres. Clearly, the government chose to ignore the overwhelming support of the community and the wish of East Torrens Primary School community to establish an early learning centre and preserve continuity of public preschool services for many families transitioning from Hectorville kindergarten to the new school. It cited the final enrolments—children finishing their kindergarten schooling at Hectorville kindy—to justify the backflip.

Clearly, in 2002 and 2003 the kindergarten was operating in great uncertainty and was impacted by the state of the adjacent property—and clearly enrolments will not rise if the community has been informed that a kindy is to be closed. It is a sad irony that a private Montessori kindergarten has now been established at the site, clearly demonstrating that there was a need for kindergarten and pre-school services in the area, contrary to the government's 'analysis of demand'.

Meanwhile, this government is investing millions of dollars in Sturt Street—clearly a pet project 'analysis of demand' can be bent. It is just another example of this government's *modus operandi*. It does not matter what the community really wants and what it knows: it will tell us what it will do and justify its decision with propaganda and spin.

The reality is to ask how, if there were not sufficient numbers for a kindergarten on the present site, can there be numbers sufficient for a private kindergarten? Surely, the minister should have done everything possible to honour its promise to have a kindergarten for the community (as the former minister did) on the East Torrens Primary School site.

Furthermore, the minister talked about the closure of schools. This was an amalgamation, a success story, and the numbers have increased. It followed an independent inquiry and the community was happy with the outcome, that is, the newly amalgamated school, which has been a success story. Why not support the kindergarten which it said it would support?

Time expired.

AUSTRALIAN INTERNATIONAL PEDAL PRIX

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): The Australian International Pedal Prix is the largest event of its kind in the world, where teams design and construct a human-powered vehicle and the driver sits in a recumbent position using pedals to propel the vehicle forward. It is more than a race: it is an example of across curriculum and community learning in action. Schools are encouraged to include aspects of the AIPP into their programs and maintain the educational focus on design, technical studies, IT and fitness, wellbeing and nutrition. It includes the whole family of the team members.

Schools plan fundraising and training over a 12-month period, climaxing in the Murray Bridge event. That 2.1 kilometre circuit sees a top speed of around 70 km/h, with

an average time of seven minutes per lap. However, some set staggering records this year, the fastest lap being just under three minutes.

Over 632 wheels and 214 entrants were well looked after by the TAFE SA repair and maintenance facility. TAFE SA again played a major role. Last year, they assisted over half the entrants with on-site emergency vehicle repairs in their workshops, with extensive welding and metal work facilities.

The event commenced in 1985 and was established by the Technology Teachers Association of South Australia. Entrants compete in different categories, including primary school, junior high, senior high and the open division. The 2005 event was held in Murray Bridge for the ninth time on Ngarrindjeri land between 15 and 18 September. This was the 24-hour event, following the two six-hour events that had been held at Victoria Park earlier in the year and sponsored by the Adelaide City Council.

It is estimated that over 25 000 people attended the event over the four days. An economic impact survey conducted during last year's event estimated the economic contribution to Murray Bridge by the event to be around \$3 million. This year, the economic activity was estimated at over \$3.5 million. The AIPP is a current SA Great regional award holder. Other sponsors of the 2005 event include the RAA, ADEC, Webcraft, Channel 7, Red Rooster, A.V. Jennings, Signclass, Telstra and, last but not least, the rural city of Murray Bridge, whose contribution in cash and kind is significant. Mayor Allan Arbon and Mrs Arbon, along with several councillors and representatives from the Victorian city of Casey, were present at the opening ceremony with me.

It was my pleasure to represent the Premier and Minister for Education and Children's Services and Tourism. Both have had a long interest in this exciting and important event, and it was a pleasure to attend to support not only my schools—Modbury High and The Heights schools—but also neighbouring schools in my electorate—Ardtornish in the primary section, St Paul's, Pedare and Gleeson. I also acknowledge the member for Hammond, who attended the start, and I saw the member for Morialta on the course just prior to the finish.

The South Australian Tourism Commission, through its regional events and festivals program, contributes funding to the Australian International Pedal Prix. In addition, the South Australian Tourism Commission had earlier provided \$50 000 for a track extension and \$30 000 for a gantry over the track. This year DECS contributed \$15 000.

There were 214 teams competing this year, not only against each other but rather against the clock. Each vehicle has a team of eight riders and a support team of parents and students dealing with design and construction, fitness, catering, accommodation, presentation and transport. It was very cold at the track overnight, so I am not quite sure how they managed, but when I arrived the following morning they were all still pedalling with great gusto. This year's winners were the Burning Hubcaps from Aberfoyle Park Primary School in the primary section, a joint venture from Flora Hill High in the junior secondary category, and team number 30 in the senior secondary category—unfortunately, I cannot locate them in the program but I have a sneaking suspicion that they were from Victoria. The open section was won by entrant number 34, Hamilton Secondary School, which scooped the awards across all levels of its category and which boasted the oldest competitor, who was 48 years old.

The AIPP board is ably chaired by Andrew McLachlan and, while my time today will not allow me to mention each

member, many of them have contributed years of voluntary service to the event. Sadly, Denise Clark, who has been an integral part of the event over the past seven years, will not be with us next year and we wish her and her husband Alistair well. Marcus Plowman again handled the marketing assisted by Alison Rathjen and Kirsty Bennett, a Murray Bridge girl who is enrolled in communications at the University of South Australia's Magill campus. Our course announcer was Paul Richards, who spoke almost non-stop for the entire event, and our start and finish were enhanced by Glen Dix of Formula 1 Grand Prix flag-waving fame. The entire event celebrates innovation and achievement. It is a test of endurance, and I congratulate everyone involved.

Time expired.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The Hon. M.R. BUCKBY (Light): Last Thursday I raised a question with the Premier in regard to communications with ministers and the confidentiality of those communications. I did so because it is very important that any member of this house can raise a matter with the minister and know that it will remain confidential. The question was raised because of a press release from the Mayor of Gawler about two issues; those of the Ryde Street and Jack Cooper Drive intersection and car parking at the Gawler Central station.

These were two issues that I had raised with the minister, and I was surprised to see a press release issued by the mayor on the matters. However, the mayor contacted my office on Friday and advised that he did, in fact, have two genuine letters that were written to him, one on each issue. These letters were from local constituents, and that was the reason for his taking up the issue and writing to the local press on the constituents' behalf. I accept the mayor's explanation on this and take his word that he does have the two letters, and that confidentiality has been retained within the office of the minister—and I am very pleased that that is the case. The Premier did undertake to investigate the issue, but I can advise him that, given that I accept the word of the Mayor of Gawler, there is no reason to continue with that investigation.

THE LATHAM DIARIES

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): Today I stand to make some comments and, perhaps, verification in respect of a book which has just been published called the *Latham Diaries* by Mark Latham, former leader of the parliamentary Labor Party at the federal level. Latham, of course, is known to all of us as a public figure. He was elected to lead the federal Labor Party when in opposition in, I think, late 2003, and he then led the Labor Party to a disastrous defeat in 2004.

There are many stories contained in the *Latham Diaries*, and I cannot comment on any individual story. I am not about to refer to corresponding examples of the sort of behaviour described by Latham at the South Australian level. Members will have to wait for the publication of the Hanna Diaries for that. But I do want to verify the overall picture painted by Mark Latham in respect of the Labor Party. I do not for a moment pretend that the Liberal Party is any different. On the contrary, it runs on very much the same lines. I think it is reasonable to call it a mafia-like organisation. Certainly, the characteristic means of communication within the party are gossip, smear, intimidation and humiliation, and these are the matters that Mark Latham writes about in respect to the federal caucus.

On a lighter note, I recite a couple of dinner party jokes that I had a good response from when I was in the Labor Party. One is a definition of paranoid; that is a person who is in full possession of the facts. I also used to tell a story at dinner parties, that, when I was a Labor Party member, the most difficult part of that job as an MP was dealing with malice and deception every day. And then, of course, I would add that there is the Liberal party to worry about as well. That always used to get a laugh, I think because it had an element of truth about it.

In the parliamentary arena, and particularly in the major parties, you can look at it on a couple of different levels. One is the psychological, where you are dealing with some of the most rabid egos in the country. You have to have an ego to get into the place. You have to want to have power to get into the place. But it seems that the ones who do best in the practice of politics are the egos which exemplify callousness, cunning, dissimulation and persistence in the face of an unhealthy lifestyle. After all, it is not a great lifestyle if you do want to spend time with family and friends.

You can also look at this whole phenomenon on an organisational level. I call the Labor Party mafia-like in terms of its organisational dynamics because of a number of characteristics. There is a very strict hierarchy. There is more or less a warlord system operating, exemplified by the various factions and factional chiefs. Of course, every so often, one of the factions or individuals becomes less popular and prey to the others, and so you have the extinction of the Centre Left and the fate of Murray Delaine and Ralph Clarke, for example.

Just like the organised crime families, there is also a practice of bleeding new members so that you have to go out and stack branches or get delegates selected one way or another in order to get on. It is also extremely male dominated both inside and outside the party. Just like the organised crime families, the leaders usually keep their hands clean; they are usually not the ones firing the bullets, but it does happen. In summary then, because I have only a limited time, it seems to me that both the Labor and Liberal political parties are finished in terms of delivering social justice and the economic benefits that the average Australian needs. Corporations run both the Liberal and Labor parties today.

Mr MEIER (Goyder): I move:

That an extension of time be granted to the member if he so desires.

Motion negatived.

PORT GERMEIN GARAGE

The Hon. G.M. GUNN (Stuart): Today I want to raise the difficulties that a small community in my electorate is facing because of the actions of one disgruntled malcontent who has—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: A public servant?

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: No. You are clear. You are right—on this occasion. It is one who, by his actions, is going to deprive the community of Port Germein of having its garage operating. Some months ago, a constituent established a service to that community and the surrounding rural community, and he bought a house with a shed, which had previously been used by a transport operator for some time. After he got the business going, another person took it upon themselves to complain. The person who set up the business had permission from the local council, which agreed it was

a good thing and approved it. The complainant then got the assistance of a publicly funded legal operation out of Port Pirie, and went to the environment court.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: It is publicly funded, and I am not sure who funds it.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Barry Wakelin funds it. Good old Barry.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: Don't worry; I'll be onto Nick Minchin. He is the finance minister. However, this went to the environment court, and the magistrate ruled in favour of the complainant, so there is now a situation which is likely to deprive that community of a mechanic in the town. So, if an elderly constituent has a flat tyre or a flat battery, they will have to get someone from Port Pirie. What will the cost be? It is an absolute nonsense. The person in question, I understand, drives around town on a tractor and, of course, that would not cause any noise. There are other things I could say about that.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Let it all out. Say it all. Tell it like it is.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: All good things come to those who wait. However, I have approached the minister in relation to this matter, because I believe it is quite wrong that one individual, without any support, can deprive that community.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: According to law.

The Hon. G.M. GUNN: That's correct, but that does not always make it right. In a democracy, people do have rights but, in a democracy, surely you also have to get more than one objector, because the person who runs the garage went and defended himself because he thought it was a reasonable thing to do. Of course, you are in no-win situation: if you employ a lawyer, it costs thousands of dollars, and you are at a double disadvantage where someone has free legal advice. So, this is an unfortunate situation. I support the council in its decision, I support the proprietor, and we will continue to pursue this matter until commonsense prevails. All we want is commonsense.

The second matter I would like to raise is how hypocritical is the organisation called People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA)—a group of people that is trying to stop farmers from mulesing sheep. It has been brought to my attention that in the United States employees of PETA are facing 31 felony animal cruelty charges for killing and dumping dogs. An internet article states:

One month after the launch of their website, two employees of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) were arrested on 31 felony animal-cruelty charges for killing and disposing of dogs and puppies in a dumpster. Today the Center for Consumer Freedom is calling on Americans to stop making donations to support PETA and its grim-reaper program.

When police arrested PETA employees. . . last night, they found 18 dead dogs in a nearby shopping-center dumpster (including a bag containing seven dead puppies), and 13 more dead dogs in the PETA owned van the two were driving. Police observed them throwing dark coloured bags into dumpsters before the arrests were made.

This is not the first public mention of PETA's large-scale euthanasia program. In May 2005, the Center for Consumer Freedom (CCF) unveiled a giant Times Square billboard and a new website (www.PetaKillsAnimals.com). CCF had obtained official records from the state of Virginia showing the militant animal-rights group had put over 10 000 dogs and cats to death since 1998.

This band of hypocrites is trying to stop responsible action by graziers to protect sheep against blow-fly strike. If anyone knows anything about sheep, and if anyone knows anything about—

Time expired.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Ms RANKINE (Wright): A couple of weeks ago out in the north-eastern suburbs, we had the largest shake-up of our public transport services certainly in my time as a local member, and I thought that I would take the opportunity today to talk about how we have managed those changes out in the community. Certainly, a lot of the new services that have been implemented have been warmly welcomed by the community and, as I understand it, they are very heavily patronised. However, some complaints have come in and, as a result of those complaints, I have established a local Golden Grove public transport advisory group so that we can actually work through a number of those issues.

The complaints came in generally in three categories. There were complaints about a lack of consultation, the removal of some services in low patronised areas and, in some instances, people argued very strongly that the wrong decisions had been made. A group of people met last week—a meeting which I chaired and which included people from the Passenger Transport Division, Torrens Transit, the Village Shopping Centre management and a range of residents who came from areas that had raised specific issues. The aims of this group are to review the changed bus routes in the Golden Grove area, to make recommendations about possible alterations and to provide an opportunity for members of the community to communicate their views to those making the decisions.

It is my intention to ask the Tea Tree Gully Council, once my group has worked through its issues, to establish a council-wide public transport advisory group so that we do not have this sort of disruption again and so that we create a broader and more formal approach to address local transport issues into the future.

The reasons for the change were outlined to my group, and they were that there were high volume needs in areas that did not have services, that we needed to provide better access through to the O-Bahn and to reassign low usage areas. We have set a high target for the use of public transport in the State Strategic Plan, aiming for the use of public transport to double, and that means something like a 4 per cent increase each year. There have been no changes to the services in our area for 10 years.

I was advised by the Passenger Transport Division that over the recent 10-day period there had been a 6.5 per cent increase in patronage compared to the same 10-day period last year. We worked through a range of issues the other night about the provision of information and consultation. The Passenger Transport Division undertook to be more specific and direct in the future in providing advice.

We have been able to negotiate an increased number of services to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. There were problems in relation to services to Pedare and Gleeson colleges, and they have been resolved. There were some problems in relation to the Golden Grove High School, with some students getting to school too early, and they have undertaken to ensure that that situation is fixed. There are some problems with the bus leaving Greenwith Primary School too early, and that is being worked on.

However, other issues relate to the suburban links services coming out of the Spring Hill Road area and up at Greenwith. In looking at the map and in discussions with local residents, the Passenger Transport Division agreed to go away and have

a look at how it could realign some of the routes that they had running up Golden Grove Road, where people could not access the bus. One issue that has been prominent in the community is the removal of a bus stop on John Road. I surveyed that area, and only three survey forms came back saying that people used that bus stop on a daily basis. That was confirmed by the Passenger Transport Division's figures, which showed that 12 people used that service on a daily basis. That issue is being reviewed with the possible provision of the realignment of the GG2 service. We look forward to a positive outcome.

GUARDIANSHIP AND ADMINISTRATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Guardianship and Administration Act 1993. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

The President of the Guardianship Board has requested minor amendments to the Guardianship and Administration Act 1993 to enable the board to operate more effectively. These amendments are not controversial and should improve the efficiency of the board. The amendments are supported by the recent review into the interaction between the mental health and justice systems conducted by Mr Ian Bidmeade. The Guardianship Board currently hears applications for guardianship and administration orders under the act and continuing detention orders under the Mental Health Act 1993.

Guardianship orders are concerned with the care and welfare of a person and administration orders are about a person's estate, in particular her financial and legal affairs. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Single-member Boards

Currently, the Act allows for a single-member Board to be constituted to deal with matters as specified in the Regulations. Section 13 of the Act allows for the Board to appoint assistants. It has been the practice of the Board to sit as a quasi two-member Board with one of the members being designated an assistant to the Board. This is seen as offering improved decision making, giving the Board the opportunity on occasion to sit as two members rather than one.

Given this practice, the President has suggested that the Board should be able to be constituted with two members. To achieve this, the Act will be amended to allow for a two-member Board to be constituted where the Board is currently authorised to be constituted as a single-member Board. This would allow for a greater flexibility in the combination of members who could be appointed to the Board, thus improving decision-making.

If a two-member Board is unable to reach a unanimous decision, then the presiding member will have the casting vote. If the decision is a question of law, then the matter must be referred to the President or a Deputy President for a decision.

Consecutive terms of appointment to panels

The Act contemplates the creation of two panels from which Board members are drawn. One panel consists of professionals, the other is made up of persons interested in promoting the rights of the mentally incapacitated or with other relevant expertise.

The Act currently allows a person to be a member of a panel for two consecutive terms only. This has led to the Board's being deprived of valuable and experienced members when selecting persons from the panel to constitute the Board in its various forms. The Bill removes this restriction on re-appointing members to a

panel. It does not mean that all members will be re-appointed for longer terms but offers greater flexibility.

Interim orders

Currently the Act gives the Board authority to issue interim orders for up to seven days, if the Board is satisfied that urgent action is required. This is problematic because the matter must then be listed for a substantive hearing and reasonable notice given to all interested parties within the seven days. This is often not enough time for recipients of the notice to view evidence and seek legal advice before the hearing. Procedural fairness is not afforded to the parties to the hearing.

The Bill will allow for interim orders to have effect for up to 21 days, except for orders issued under section 32(1).

Section 32 (1) allows for a direction that a protected person reside in a specified place, or that the protected person be detained for medical reasons. These types of orders are issued as interim orders when a protected person's health and safety are seriously at risk; usually the person requires immediate medical treatment or hospitalisation and is unwilling to attend a hospital. The section specifically excludes detaining or treating a protected person for mental health reasons.

Under the Bill, interim orders issued under section 32(1) will have effect for a maximum of 14 days. A balance has been struck between the detaining a protected person to receive urgent medical treatment, and the public interest in providing procedural fairness to the subject of the order and other interested parties who may be participating in the hearing.

Adjourning proceedings

There are times when the Board may have to adjourn a proceeding for a particular reason, such as obtaining a report to be used in the proceeding, or requiring the Public Advocate to interview the potential protected person or her relatives. Currently the Act is silent on whether the Board can adjourn proceedings and what orders the Board can make if there is an adjournment. The Bill will allow the Board to make such orders as are necessary or appropriate in the circumstances. It may be that the Board wishes to make an order to stop the potential protected person's assets being dealt until the hearing is completed.

Enduring guardians

Section 25 is intended to prevent hospital or medical staff being appointed as enduring guardians of persons in their care. The section incorrectly refers to "appointee" rather than "appointor". The Bill corrects this anomaly.

Special powers to authorise protected persons to undergo medical treatment etc

Section 32 provides the Board with power to make particular orders in respect of a protected person on the application by the guardian of the protected person. These powers relate to where the protected person should reside, the detention of the protected person and the use of such force as may be reasonably necessary for the purpose of ensuring the proper medical treatment, day-to-day care and well-being of the protected person. The section currently does not refer to ensuring proper dental treatment and the Bill will include this.

Constitution of the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court

The Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court allows for a panel to operate as assessors. To provide consistency with other amendments in the Bill, the appointments to the panel will no longer be limited to two consecutive terms of three years. Again, the Governor retains her complete discretion in re-appointments to the panel.

I commend the Bill to Members.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Guardianship and Administration Act 1993*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

It is proposed to expand the definition of *health professional* to include—

- chiropractic or osteopathy;
- nursing;
- occupational therapy;
- optometry;
- pharmacy;

- physiotherapy;
- podiatry;

It is also proposed to change the definitions of dentist and medical practitioner to reflect current drafting practice which avoids referring to an Act that will, or may, be superceded at some time in the future.

5—Amendment of section 6—Establishment and constitution of Board

This amendment proposes to substitute current subsection (5) which provides that the regulations may provide that the Board may be constituted of a single person sitting alone in relation to matters specified by the regulations. The substituted subsection will allow for the regulations to provide that, in relation to the exercise of specified functions or matters of a specified class, the Board may be constituted of a member sitting alone, or any 2 members sitting together as listed in the subsection.

6—Amendment of section 8—Panels

The proposed amendments to this section will allow for members of panels to be reappointed at the end of a term of appointment without limiting the number of consecutive terms of appointment that a member may serve. The current position is that persons cannot be appointed for more than 2 consecutive terms.

7—Amendment of section 12—Decisions of Board

This section makes provision for how decisions of law, procedure and fact are to be determined by the Board when variously constituted. Any question of law or procedure must always be determined by the President or a Deputy President (however the Board is constituted in a particular matter) and any other question is to be determined by unanimous or majority decision. In the event that the Board is unable to reach a decision on a question (apart from a question of law or procedure) before the Board, the decision of the presiding member will prevail as the decision of the Board.

8—Amendment of section 14—Powers and procedures of Board

Current subsections (7) and (8) allow the Board, if satisfied that urgent action is required in proceedings, to make an interim order with effect for a period not exceeding 7 days, without complying with subsections (4) and (6) (which provide for notice, etc). The proposed amendment will allow for interim orders to have effect for up to 21 days, except for orders issued under section 32(1) which will have effect for a period not exceeding 14 days.

Section 32(1) allows for a direction that a protected person reside in a specified place, or that the protected person be detained for medical reasons.

9—Amendment of section 25—Appointment of enduring guardian

This proposed amendment corrects a drafting anomaly.

10—Amendment of section 32—Special powers to place and detain, etc, protected persons

This proposed amendment to section 32(1)(c) will allow the Board to make an order on application by a protected person's guardian in relation to any proper dental treatment for the protected person as necessary. The paragraph currently only refers to medical treatment.

11—Amendment of section 66—Constitution of ADD

The proposed amendments to this section will allow for members of panels of assessors to sit with the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court to be reappointed at the end of a term of appointment without limiting the number of consecutive terms of appointment that a person may serve. The current position is that persons cannot be appointed for more than 2 consecutive terms.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN secured the adjournment of the debate.

OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY PRACTICE BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 25 May. Page 2711.)

The Hon. DEAN BROWN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): This is yet another health professional area where the legislation is being amended. This has now been well and truly debated in this house. We have had nurses introduced by the former government and medical practitioners introduced by the former government. We have had a number of others introduced and dealt with, including podiatrists and physiotherapists, and now occupational therapists. The opposition has raised a number of points during these debates.

Perhaps one of the most significant is the composition of the board itself. It would appear that, at long last, the minister has got the message, because the method of selecting the board has now been changed in comparison with previous legislation that she has introduced into this house with respect to other health occupational areas. I think the opposition has won each of the points that we have raised with those. The final bill as passed by this house has reflected the point raised by the opposition in each case—certainly, the medical practitioners act, the podiatrists act and the physiotherapists act all have been amended according to the opposition's position. I am delighted to see that the minister ran up the white flag this time and accepted the opposition's position with respect to the previous bills. She is slow at learning, but she finally did learn regarding this issue.

However, I wish to comment on one point on the composition of the bill. It states that the board consists of nine members appointed by the Governor, of whom five must be occupational therapists (and that is the point that the opposition has made throughout; that a majority of the profession should be on the board: previously the minister has tried not to do that), and four others. On this occasion there will be five occupational therapists, and that will be a clear majority of the board, without their having to rely on the casting vote of the chair. Four of the five occupational therapists will be chosen at election and one must be a person who gives instruction at a university in South Australia nominated by the Council of the University of South Australia.

When the occupational therapists came and talked to me about this bill they highlighted how inappropriate the wording of that part was and said that it should, instead, be one person who gives instruction in occupational therapy at the university in South Australia. Otherwise, someone giving instruction in any other area—not necessarily even in the health area—could have been the person so nominated. I am delighted to see that the minister now has an amendment to deal with this matter. If she had not done so, I would have. Although we cannot discuss the amendment in detail at this stage, I certainly will accept the principle of that amendment. It was a point that I would have raised during the debate.

The second issue with which I want to deal relates to the ability of the board to be constituted by the sitting of only the presiding member. I refer, in particular, to clause 46(6) of the bill, which provides:

The board constituted of the member presiding over the proceedings may, sitting alone—

- (a) deal with—
- ... (ii) questions of costs;

I question whether that is appropriate. We have a legal practitioner on the board, and that legal practitioner may not, in fact, be the chair of the board in this case. But even if that was the case, I believe that, when it came to costs, the lawyer probably would be a member of this board, because it is 'the legal practitioner'. I will clarify that point. It will be chaired by the legal practitioner but I do not believe that the legal

practitioner, by themselves, ought to decide questions of costs, and other issues also are involved.

I ask the minister to look at that point and to perhaps seek further advice, because I think it is an issue that ought to be given further consideration. If significant costs potentially are involved, I think it should be the committee of three that decides the allocation of costs. Certainly, we will look at the bill between the two houses, depending on what answer the government comes up with. I am happy to give the minister some time to look at that issue between the two houses, but I would appreciate her comments in this house.

The other issue that I wish to raise relates to clause 69(1), which involves a ministerial review of decisions relating to courses and which provides:

- (1) If the board—
 (a) refuses to approve a course of education or training for the purposes of this act; or
 (b) revokes an approval of a course of education or training under this act,
 the provider of the course may apply to the minister for a review of that decision.
 (2) The minister may determine the application as the minister thinks fit and, if the minister finds in favour of the applicant, grant or preserve the approval (as appropriate).

I believe that there needs to be a requirement for the minister to consult with relevant bodies before making that determination. I think the minister can see why I am making that point. This proposal does not fundamentally change the operation of that section: it would simply be that the minister, after consultation with relevant groups or individuals, may determine the application as the minister thinks fit. The ultimate power would still be with the minister, but there would be an obligation, rather than the option, for the minister to go out and consult with relevant bodies. I raise that because we are talking about various courses, and I believe that is one area that needs to be looked at.

Perhaps if the minister agrees we could put up an amendment today: that the minister, after consultation, may determine the application as the minister thinks fit or after consultation with the relevant bodies or individuals. It is a fairly simple amendment. I wanted to give the minister a chance to comment on it before I moved it, but I am happy to move it today. Otherwise, the legislation is similar to what we have dealt with and debated at great length in this house previously. I will not go into the detail because it would be repetitive. I highlight the fact that this picks up 'students', as have the other pieces of legislation. I think it is very important that we are able to say that we maintain a very high standard in terms of the professional standards of operation of the health professions here in South Australia. I support the bill.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Minister for Health): I thank the deputy leader for his comments. As I said in my second reading explanation, this health professional regulation bill follows the template established with the Medical Practice Act 2005. I thank the deputy leader for his comments. We will support an amendment of the clause to which he was referring. The government has its own amendment in relation to clause 6(1)(a)(ii). That matter was raised with us by the Occupational Therapy Association. We have agreed and the board has concurred. We are pleased that the opposition will support this amendment as well. I think that is all I need to say.

In relation to clause 46(6), we will take the honourable member's comments on board during the bill's passage

between this house and the other place. I will have something to say about that during the committee process. I am pleased to bring this bill to the parliament, and hopefully it will have a speedy passage.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 5 passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I move:

Page 8, lines 13 and 14—

Delete 'instructions at a university in South Australia nominated by' and substitute:

instruction in occupational therapy at a university in South Australia selected from a panel of three persons nominated by

This amendment is to ensure that the subclause requiring a university nominated position is in fact an occupational therapist who gives instruction in occupational therapy. It also ensures that a panel of three will be nominated by the Council of the University of South Australia and will be selected by the minister of the day. This amendment strengthens the policy intention of the clause to ensure that a university occupational therapist is selected to the board. The university has a crucial role in the education of occupational therapists, and this appointment ensures that the university's views are represented. This matter was raised by the Occupational Therapy Association during consultation and is supported by the board.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I support the amendment. It is a matter which I raised in the second reading debate. The association drew this matter to my attention when its representatives came to see me. I promised to move the amendment if the government had not done so at the time the bill was debated.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 7 to 45 passed.

Clause 46.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I remind the minister of my comment that I think it is inappropriate to have the board consisting of just the presiding member deciding questions of costs. It provides:

and may, for that purpose or as a consequence, while sitting alone, make any determination or order (including a final order) that the member considers appropriate.

I do not think the issue of costs is an appropriate issue when it comes to a board sitting with only one member present. Significant financial issues could be involved. I do not object to clause 46(6)(a)(i) and (iii). I do object, however, to subparagraph (ii) because significant financial penalties may be imposed.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: My advice is that it provides as it does in order to expedite matters, in particular straightforward matters. If the appellant is not satisfied, there is an appeal process through the District Court as well. I am happy to look at it between the houses and talk with the deputy leader before the matter is debated in the other place.

Clause passed.

Clauses 47 to 68 passed.

Clause 69.

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I have not prepared an amendment but I ask to insert after the words 'the minister may' the words 'after consultation with the appropriate parties'.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: We support the amendment.

The Acting Chairperson (Ms Bedford): Does the deputy leader have that in writing?

The Hon. Dean Brown: No.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: I am advised I need that at the table. The amendment is to insert in clause 69(2), after 'the minister' the words 'after consultation with the appropriate parties' may determine the application as the minister thinks fit', etc. Is that acceptable to the minister? I am advised that the minister can defer consideration of that clause just to get the drafting right; then we can come back to it.

Consideration of clause 69 deferred.

Clauses 70 to 73 passed.

Schedule 1 passed.

Schedule 2.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I move:

Page 41, line 30 to page 43, line 7—

Schedule 2—delete the schedule.

This amendment provides for the deletion from the bill of schedule 2, which provides for section 6H of the Public Sector Management Act, as inserted by the Statutes Amendment (Honesty and Accountability in Government) Act 2003. The amending act came into operation on 31 July 2005 under the Acts Interpretation Act, so schedule 2 is redundant as of 31 July 2005.

Amendment carried; schedule negated.

Clause 69—reconsidered.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The amendment to clause 69(2) reads:

Page 37, line 35—

After 'may' insert:

'after consultation with authorities considered appropriate by the minister'

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: That will then read?

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: 'The minister may, after consultation with authorities considered appropriate by the minister, determine the application as the minister thinks fit, and if the minister finds in favour of the applicant grant or preserve the approval (as appropriate).'

The Hon. DEAN BROWN: I accept the principle of what the amendment says. The only trouble, I think, is that it involves a split infinitive. Perhaps the split infinitive should be removed. I highlight to the committee that the Hon. Hugh Hudson always picked me up on the split infinitive, and I must admit that I have split plenty of them during my life. Perhaps it should provide, 'The minister, after consulting the relevant parties, may determine.'

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The chair is in the hands of the committee.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I agree with the deputy leader.

The ACTING CHAIRMAN: The chair is assured that this is normal drafting style, notwithstanding the splitting of the infinitive.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendments.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ELECTRICAL PRODUCTS (EXPIATION FEES) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 October. Page 460.)

The Hon. W.A. MATTHEW (Bright): I rise as opposition lead speaker to support this bill and, in so doing, to speak very briefly to it. This bill, in fact, amends one that I introduced to the parliament on 11 October 2000 and relates to a

matter of some concern that arose after the act had been in operation for a couple of years. Essentially, the bill amends the sections of the Electrical Products (Expiation Fees) Act that relate to offences against subsections under the legislation.

Currently, under the Expiation of Offences Act 1996 offences under the act can only be prosecuted in the Magistrates Court. The sections of the act concerned are those covering energy safety, efficient labelling and energy performance of electrical products. Under the act as it stands there are maximum penalties of \$5 000 for breaches of any of these three sections. This series of amendments provides officers with the option of simply issuing a \$315 expiation fee instead of prosecuting the matter in the Magistrates Court. It is my understanding that this has become necessary because, as of today's date, no prosecutions have been mounted under the original bill, essentially because the cost of mounting those prosecutions is prohibitive. In these circumstances it make sense to bring forward the expiation option because at the moment an offending trader can feel reasonably safe that no prosecution will be initiated. With an expiation offence, the cost of prosecuting will no longer be prohibitive and we should see a situation where offenders are finally brought to account without any additional cost.

The opposition is pleased to support this bill. We do not see any need to go to the committee stage and would like to see it passed fairly speedily.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): The shadow minister has described it well; that is precisely what is being brought forward, and they are the reasons why the bill has been introduced. We would like to acknowledge and thank the opposition for its support, and wish the bill a speedy passage through both houses.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (TRANSPORT PORTFOLIO) BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 March. Page 1990.)

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mr BROKENSHIRE (Mawson): I rise to speak on the matter of this bill that I have been working on with one of the three ministers of transport this government has had. It is nice to have the minister write back as Acting Minister for Transport. Though I thought we might see some improvements, we have not so far. However, to get to the nitty-gritty of this bill, as the Deputy Speaker would know, the opposition is always bipartisan whenever it can be. It is only when the interests of the state count that sometimes we have to point out objectively to the government where it is going wrong, and that happens quite a lot, given some of the bizarre legislation that it brings through. However, notwithstanding that, I am delighted to tell the house that on this occasion the Opposition will be supporting this bill. The reason is that, every now and again, when you are in government, there are a number of what we call nuts and bolts—amendments that have to come through the house. They occur often because agencies have realised that a particular clause in a bill is no

longer relevant, or there may have been some modernisation of an element of that piece of legislation that needs to be addressed.

When I look through this, I see that these are all minor amendments. There are amendments to the Road Traffic Act, the Motor Vehicles Act, some transitional provisions to the Harbors and Navigation Act and some other amendments to the Road Traffic Act. Also, the transitional provisions will ensure that any appointments of inspectors made by Governor under the Motor Vehicles Act before the commencement of amendments to section 7 continue as if the person had been appointed under the amended section, that is, by the minister. As I said, we do not want to hold up the house on minor bills when there is so much important broad-based legislation that must get through this parliament before the next election, or at least have the opportunity of being thoroughly debated. Therefore, it is with pleasure that I advise the acting minister that we will be supporting these amendments. We will not be going into committee, and I have nothing further to say about this bill.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): I appreciate the comments made by the shadow minister. He is correct in his definition of these amendments. They are minor amendments largely of an administrative nature overcoming anomalies that exist. We appreciate the support of the opposition, and I wish the bill a speedy resolution through both houses.

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

MARITIME SERVICES (ACCESS) (FUNCTIONS OF COMMISSION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 December. Page 1241)

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): We seem to be having a day of cooperation and constructive business, so I rise to indicate that the opposition will be supporting the bill that the minister has brought before the house. The Minister for Infrastructure introduced the bill in November 2004 and, as opposition spokesperson for infrastructure, I will be leading for the opposition on it. It is a bill to amend the Maritime Services (Access) Act 2000 which established a South Australian ports access regime and which regulates essential maritime industries. The amending bill will confer compliance responsibilities onto the Essential Services Commission of South Australia. In the way of background, the opposition understands that the purpose of the amending bill is to confer authority on the Essential Services Commission to resolve access disputes.

In preparation—and could I thank the minister for arranging a briefing—the opposition was assured that the government had consulted the key users, in particular, ABB Grain, the South Australian Farmers Federation, Flinders Ports, the South Australian Freight Corporation, Shipping Australia Ltd and, of course, the operator of the ports. The opposition made its own inquiries with the key parties, in particular, back in May we wrote to the Regional Manager of P&O, the General Manager of DPI Terminals, the Managing Director of ABB Grain and, of course, the CEO of Flinders Ports, the Manager of Patrick General Stevedoring and a number of other users. Either my office or I have had

telephone or email contact with those people. Generally, it would seem that the bill is supported.

At present, there is not a party—if we can call it that—to resolve an access dispute. Therefore, an aggrieved party would have to go the Supreme Court of South Australia in order to resolve such a dispute, which may be costly and time consuming. The government has advised that, as yet, there have not been any access disputes of a significant nature, and our own inquiries have confirmed that. However, such a dispute could arise potentially between a customer and a ports authority. For example, ABB Grain could have a dispute with Flinders Ports over some matter. The opposition understands, and the government has confirmed, that it was the Essential Services Commission that identified the need for the amendment of the act in the first place. Indeed, during the opposition's inquiries, I found that a number of the users thought that the Essential Services Commission had this power anyway, even though it had not been tested. So, I think it came as a surprise to no-one that the t's were being crossed and the i's dotted in the form of this bill.

As I mentioned, the government has also advised that Flinders Ports is happy with the bill and the opposition has separately confirmed that by distributing the bill and seeking their confirmation. Members will be aware that the Essential Services Commission already performs a central role in reviewing and monitoring matters under the act, and this amendment will expand its role with the function of enforcing compliance of the act. I know that the government is of the view that the benefits of this will be to avoid potential delays in dispute resolution and it will, in particular, enable procedural disagreements arising before a formal access dispute to be dealt with by the commission rather than through the courts.

When considering this matter, the opposition discussed the concern expressed by some that at least with the court process there was a process of appeal, and that the court process in some instances provides a satisfactory and, at times, superior avenue for dispute resolution. Therefore, we were concerned that this involvement of the Essential Services Commission in this role should not preclude an appeal to the court. Our subsequent briefings from the government, and a checking of both the parent bill and the amendment seemed to satisfy our concern that if the matter cannot be thrashed out in essence with the Essential Services Commission and the parties then there is a process for it to be referred to the courts. So, I would flag that as an issue of concern for the government. I see heads nodding. If the government could undertake to come back to the opposition and just 100 per cent confirm that, or if the minister could do so when he closes the debate, that would put us at rest between now and when the matter is considered in another place, so that we do not have to raise it again up there.

I think all members should note, and certainly it is our understanding, that should responsibility for the ports at some future time be taken over by the federal government, and I note that that has flagged that that might be its intention, then the provisions of this act would be superseded. Of course, we would have to wait and see what exactly the federal government came up with, but my understanding would be that if that process was drawn under the ambit of the federal government, for some reason or another, then this whole process would be, I imagine, overrun by that federal initiative, but we will have to wait and see. For all of those reasons, I indicate the opposition's support for the initiative, and congratulate the government for tidying up the loose

ends, so to speak, in bringing it forward. We see no need to go into committee.

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): I thank the shadow minister for his comments. He has described it well. It is about conferring compliance responsibility on the Essential Services Commission to resolve access disputes. He is correct that those parties that he has described have been fully consulted and do support the bill. He is correct in saying why it has come about in regard to the difficulties that currently exist with access through the Supreme Court. I can confirm his question—which, in fairness to the opposition, was raised with us previously, which we appreciate: the appeal process is intact for anyone to undertake an appeal should there be a need to do so. That was a legitimate question raised by the opposition during the briefing stage and, yes, we have checked that for the opposition and can confirm the accuracy of what has been put forward. Once again, I thank the opposition for their support. The shadow minister has described it well. They are the reasons why this bill is being brought forward and, once again, I wish this a speedy resolution between the houses.

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

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Administrative Services): I move:

That the house do now adjourn.

DOMESTIC TOURISM

Mrs HALL (Morialta): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. Earlier today during question time, the Minister for Tourism acknowledged that there has been a significant slump in domestic tourism figures, so I thought I would take the opportunity to talk about some of the concerns of the tourism industry as a result of the release of those latest figures called the national visitors survey. In my view, it provides a very frightening snapshot of the result of the ongoing neglect of the tourism industry by a government that seems to be content to look for excuses rather than bring about results and prosperity.

The minister is quoted as saying in a release today that it is a trend that has taken place in most of the states and that the reasons are varied, including cheap airfares within Australia, the strength of the Australian dollar and record levels of Australians taking holidays overseas. It is well and fine to say that and to use them as reasons; however, the reality is that other states and territories in this country are experiencing record levels of tourism. One in particular is a great competitor of ours, namely, the Northern Territory. They are very angry with South Australia for having taken away, many years ago, the slogan and definition of the Gateway to the Outback.

The national visitor survey figures for the June 2005 quarter and the previous 12 months show this dramatic slide in domestic tourism numbers and tourism nights to our state, given that we have lost more than 500 000 visitors and more than 2 million visitor nights in that 12-month period. Clearly, those statistics are going to send a very cold chill through the industry, which has been struggling over the past few years and, in particular, over the past few months. I contend that we are now seeing the results of four slashed budgets and four

years of missed opportunities in a tourism portfolio that is very important to this state. As I am sure members have heard, both the minister and I say that, over a number of years, the tourism industry generates more than \$3.4 billion of economic development in this state, and it employs more than 37 000 people across the state, not just in the capital cities but across the regions. It is very obvious that it is a very important industry sector.

I think that the saddest part is that this government does not appear to have a plan to halt the slump. We hear lots of rhetoric and spin, but I assure you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that it will not rescue the industry from the mess. The reasons that were given earlier—cheap airfares, the strength of the Australian dollar, etc.—have not deterred Queensland, Western Australia, Tasmania and the Northern Territory, in particular. We cannot afford to lose visitor nights and visitor numbers to those competitive states in Australia. Where are the ideas that demonstrate that the government is serious about rectifying this problem? Where are the marketing support and the marketing dollars that our hard-working tourism industry needs to ensure that the quality product is enjoyed and to ensure that those visitors who come to South Australia and our many unique destinations enjoy a return visit in the future? Action needs to be taken immediately to confront the challenges faced by the tourism industry in this state.

Our current domestic campaign—the very successful, award-winning Secrets campaign—is nearly eight years old. Originally, the commitment was given to the industry to stick with the Secrets campaign for five years, but it is now tired and weary, and we desperately and urgently need to put a spark back into the domestic marketing campaigns across Australia and across our own state. We need to focus on a new place in tourism with a new priority. We need innovation and, in particular, we need marketing dollars.

I digress to say that not only does our domestic marketing need a serious facelift and a seriously researched new campaign, but also we desperately and urgently need to double our international marketing programs, because those figures, I have to say, should make us hang our head in shame. We know that petrol prices will continue to hit the tourism industry hard and, in particular, that issue will hit those operators that are outside approximately a 200-kilometre distance or those operators that are more than a two-hour drive from the radius of Adelaide. It is a very serious issue, because we all know and acknowledge that regional tourism is important to the health and prosperity of the economy of our state, particularly in our regions. What has this government done to ease the strain? Whilst I know that members opposite would not agree with me, I would have to say that the government has done nothing.

The Premier has followed the New South Wales Premier's lead and has called for an inquiry into petrol prices, and he says that he wants to know what the oil companies are doing. Whether or not he likes to acknowledge it, the figures that are generated in this state from GST collections are many and varied in their tallies from the Treasurer, ranging from \$16 million to \$26 million. That does not provide any comfort to our regional tourism centres or our operators and accommodation providers, particularly in our regions, when they hear the state Treasurer arguing about how much revenue we get from the GST and how it should or should not be used and then trying to blame the feds or now, as the Premier does, the oil companies. I contend that the public is

sick and tired of the talk and sick of the spin—they want substance. The tourism industry desperately needs dollars.

The rising phenomenon of city hopping is another issue that is adding to the strain on our tourism regions. More accessible air travel provides an extra element to tourism competition around the country, but the Northern Territory, Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania get it right by heavily supported investment by their governments into extra marketing dollars, which shows that it can give results. The reality is that the community has welcomed discount tickets and extra flights, as has this government, when it means bringing people into our state. It is a bit rich now to ride the wave of air travel in one breath and apportion the blame as a reason for the struggles of our domestic tourism in the next. I do urge the government to cease looking for excuses and reasons to explain its poor tourism performance. After all, if the figures improve on the back of the hard work of our tourism industry sector, I am sure that the government will happily assume all the credit. Since 2002 the tourism industry has endured some troubled times, but in that time the domestic market has proved to be relatively resilient.

Despite four years of budget cuts, despite four years of neglect and missed opportunities, and despite a tired and weary Secrets campaign that did the job it was supposed to do to turn around the dismal numbers and nights of the previous Labor government, we are now looking with some envy at the other states and territories in Australia that are reaping the benefits, in a tourism sense, of numbers and nights. These latest figures, then, are serious cause for concern, and the industry operators themselves have every right to be very angry. I say it is a serious black mark against this government. We have all known from anecdotal evidence over the past few years that the figures that are on the official web sites are probably going to show the trend downward.

I do not like the way the graph lines are going. In my view, Labor in office should give priority to the tourism industry which, as I have said, is so important in an economic sense not only to the capital city but also to our regions. As it employs over 37 000 people and generates more than \$3.4 billion each year, that figure should be going up and not down, and I seriously urge the government to reconsider the Secrets campaign and the international marketing campaigns.

GOLDEN GROVE BUS SERVICES

Ms RANKINE (Wright): I want to complete some remarks that I was making earlier today in the grievance debate about the changes to bus services at Golden Grove. I was going through some of the issues that we have been dealing with and getting some successful outcomes to as a result of working with the Passenger Transport Division and Torrens Transit. I concluded my remarks by talking about the removal of a bus stop on John Road that has given some members in the community some concern. I wrote to people in that area and asked them to fill out a survey form to give

us some real indication of their usage of the bus service in that area. I did say that only three people indicated that they used it on a daily basis, but the Passenger Transport Division figures indicated that 12 people a day use that bus stop.

It is important for public transport services to get people to and from work very quickly and efficiently, but it is also important to provide social services within our community, and the indications to me from this survey were that, in the main, older people were using that service on a fairly infrequent basis. Nevertheless, the service is very important to them. So, the Passenger Transport Division undertook to look at how we could accommodate that area and those older people in the area who are using that service. I am looking forward to a positive outcome that provides the opportunity to increase patronage of workers but also provides those social services within our community.

There is also a problem with the removal of a service along Surrey Farm Drive. Again, following discussions the Passenger Transport Division has undertaken to look at that. There are some safety issues. Again, it was a lack of knowledge of the layout of the area where they rerouted a service. I am hopeful that we will have a remedy for that situation as well as a form of service up through Spring Hill. Some residents have indicated some concern about the layover of buses on the Golden Way as the GG buses come through and wait to connect.

Mr Goldsworthy: What a shambles!

Ms RANKINE: The member for Kavel sits over there and makes smart remarks. We have actually taken action to resolve issues as opposed to just sitting there carping and whingeing. He laughs like a hyena, sir: it is very sad. We have found that, when we sit down and talk to these people, they are willing to listen to the community, and we have been able to bring about some very good resolutions with respect to a number of issues that were raised.

I understand that tomorrow night there will be a meeting at Tea Tree Gully council that will be open to the public, and I encourage people to attend it. I understand that representatives of the council were briefed on these changes early in July, and hopefully they will be able to relay a lot of this information directly to residents and allay a lot of their concerns.

Whilst the changes caused some confusion in the beginning, in fact, the residents who were at this meeting last week with me and who have willingly come on board my Golden Grove Public Transport Advisory Group went away pleasantly surprised by the very positive attitude that was taken by both Torrens Transit and the Passenger Transport Division, and we are happy to continue to listen to any concerns of residents and work through those issues in a very constructive way.

Motion carried.

At 5.02 p.m. the house adjourned until Tuesday 20 September 2005 at 2 p.m.