

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 27 September 2006

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling)** took the chair at 2 p.m. and read prayers.

CSIRO REPORT ON CLIMATE CHANGE

The **Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier)**: I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The **Hon. M.D. RANN**: Today I wish to table in the house a report prepared by the CSIRO which confirms that the impact on temperature from climate change is already occurring in South Australia. The report, entitled 'Climate Change Under Enhanced Greenhouse Conditions in South Australia', provides new information on temperature and rainfall predictions in this state.

The report finds that climate change will have significant impacts on water supply, floods, sea level and storm surges. This has serious implications for coastal ecosystems and developments such as ports, bridges and urban centres. It says that higher temperatures and lower rainfall would lead to an increase in drought and fire and could have an increasing impact on biodiversity, agriculture and forestry.

Global warming and climate change already appear to be having an impact on our rainfall and temperatures. The state is experiencing its driest winter on record with the Murray-Darling Basin entering its sixth consecutive year of drought. This report demonstrates that the dry spells we are currently experiencing may become more frequent in the future, but there may also be wet spells and an increased threat of flood and bushfire events.

In regional areas, the current dry spell is predicted to reduce the grain harvest by at least 30 per cent, tearing \$350 million off the value of our grain crop. Because of the dry winter, fire season conditions in the state are six to eight weeks ahead of time. This means that forest and scrubland areas are drier than normal and pose a greater bushfire risk. The events in Sydney on the weekend are a terrible reminder that complacency is dangerous, so today I have announced that the state's fire danger season has been brought forward to 15 October. That is in some cases six weeks ahead of time and in other cases two weeks ahead of time, but uniform now, 15 October, across the state.

Restrictions that are enforced during the fire danger season will apply across South Australia. The state is also poised to make some very hard decisions about water allocations from the River Murray, and restrictions affecting Adelaide and all townships that rely on a link to the River Murray for water supply. Now we have research that predicts that there is worse to come unless we act now on reducing CO₂ emissions and managing the impacts of climate change.

In 2003, the state government contracted the CSIRO's Atmospheric Research Climate Impact Group to produce a report on the implications of predicted changes to climate for South Australia. In early 2006, as part of the greenhouse strategy process, the CSIRO was again contracted to update the research to ensure that the state's climate change policy is informed by the most current scientific understanding of projections in temperature and rainfall patterns. The key findings reveal that:

- South Australia's annual average temperature has been increasing and our rainfall decreasing;
- these trends have strengthened during the past 55 years;
- temperature is predicted to continue to warm by 2030, with additional increases by 2070, and inland areas of the state experiencing more of an impact than coastal areas;
- rainfall is predicted to progressively decline in 2030 and 2070 in most regions, with significant changes in rainfall across the seasons.

There are specific concerns for sectors, such as:

- Agriculture, where there is a probability of the Goyder line shifting, increasing pressure on marginal cropping zones and a likelihood that regional productivity in some regions will be below current levels.
- Coastal zones: research suggests that higher sea levels and more intense storms resulting from climate change in 2050 will increase surge heights and can greatly expand the areas likely to be flooded.
- Water resources: reductions in stream flow and changes to the timing of flows are predicted. Water use efficiency and water trading were shown to have the potential to substantially reduce the costs to agriculture in the Murray-Darling Basin.

While I welcome Prime Minister Howard's announcement of a new water agency under parliamentary secretary Malcolm Turnbull to accelerate the pace of water reform, I am astonished that the federal government continues to avoid the reality of scientific evidence that clearly shows the impact of climate change on our water resources. Australia needs a comprehensive national greenhouse gas reduction strategy. As a nation, we have more to lose than most. We must therefore show international leadership on greenhouse gas emissions reductions and climate change adaptation. Here in South Australia, the research undertaken by the CSIRO will be the foundation for further research undertaken as part of the Chair of Climate Change at the University of Adelaide which is being established. The South Australian government is investing \$1 million to establish the chair.

I am pleased to inform the house today that the Chair of Climate Change will be named after a great South Australian, Sir Hubert Wilkins, who spent his life researching the weather and how it impacts on people. Sir Hubert Wilkins has been described as the greatest polar explorer of the last century, yet few South Australians have heard of him. He was born in 1888 in Mount Bryan East, 100 kilometres north of Adelaide. He witnessed his family's meagre existence on a land blighted by long drought. From this early experience, he devoted much of his life to trying to understand and conquer what we now know to be climate change and the effects of climate change. Sir Hubert Wilkins had a plan for an 'International Bureau of Meteorology' dedicated to preventing human suffering through science. It is therefore fitting that this Chair of Climate Change being established at the University of Adelaide be named in his honour.

I am advised that the Chair of Climate Change will focus on research in adaptation to climate change in natural and production ecosystems. The impacts of climate change are likely to be very large for our natural systems and, if this occurs, it will have big consequences for the wellbeing of our regional communities. This means that the new research efforts will evaluate the impact of climate change on a regional level and will be useful for many industries, such as the wine industry and a variety of other primary industries, in this state. That is why the latest report by the CSIRO will be so important. Despite the federal government's inadequate

response to the perils of climate change, the South Australian government will continue to take the lead on the most important policy area this and future generations will ever face.

As Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change, I have released for public consultation a draft bill that when enacted will mandate in legislation a target of reducing greenhouse gas emissions of 60 per cent by 2050. The bill will also mandate a renewable energy target of 20 per cent by 31 December 2014. I know some other countries are looking at doing that by 2020, and yesterday I heard from Tony Blair about his plans. This government will continue to pioneer reforms based on scientific evidence and reality in the interests of our children and the future of our state.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I bring up the 11th report of the committee.
Report received.

VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT

The SPEAKER: I draw to members' attention the presence today of students from Our Lady of the Sacred Heart College, guests of the member for Enfield, and students from Parafield High School, who are my guests.

QUESTION TIME

TRAMLINE EXTENSION

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Has the development of the light rail transit line from Glenelg to Victoria Square, including the purchase of trams, blown out by \$12 million, and is it 13 months behind schedule? In last year's budget papers this project was estimated to cost \$71.9 million and was to be completed—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: —by May 2006. The government has now informed the parliament in this budget that the total cost of the project has grown to over \$84 million and it will now not be completed until June 2007.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): Here we go!

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: There has been an increase in the cost—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No; there has been an increase in the cost of the tram extension. Why was that? It is because we made the tram extension longer! I think we actually doubled the length of the tram extension—it's 50 per cent again.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It goes further. I do not know whether the member for Waite has been reading the papers.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I have a point of order, sir. My point is on relevance. The question is about the tramline from Glenelg to Victoria Square: it is not about the extension from Victoria Square. That is a separate budget line and a separate sum.

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The minister is answering the question. If the honourable member does not believe that the minister has understood his question entirely, he can follow it up with another question. The Minister for Transport has the call.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, I am being lectured on the budget lines by the member for Waite who was out today with a media release talking about the budget; and saying that there is no new money for public transport and that we have not even met inflation. That is utterly untrue. What I will do is look at the numbers to which he has referred, but I assure him that there is no blow-out. The only increase in cost—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: They want me to stand up, they want me to sit down. I enjoyed the member for MacKillop last night saying that it is not fair. That is what he said in his speech about the fact that they lost: it is not fair—well, keep dreaming.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for MacKillop!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The interjection is: where is the \$9 million? This is the other thing the member for Waite has been saying: we have not committed \$9 million in the budget for Penola. That is right: we have not committed it in the budget because I committed it two months ago!

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! I suppose your point of order is relevance, but I point out to members of the opposition that they should not interject. They cannot expect the minister to put up with a cacophony of interjections from the opposition benches and then expect me to pull him up when he responds to them. I suggest that they not interject. If they want me to keep the minister strictly to the substance of the question and do not want him to engage in debate, I suggest, particularly with respect to certain members on the opposition benches, that they not interject. The Minister for Transport has the call.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: What I was saying, in short, is that the reason I have said those things is to demonstrate that, either through stupidity or wilfulness, the opposition has failed to understand what is in the budget and has simply misrepresented it—like the \$9 million that was committed on 25 August comes out of our programs, all the money is there; and like the member for Waite running around this morning saying that there is no new money for buses. There is new money for 5 000 extra boardings. I will have a careful look at the question that the member has framed and provide him with a proper answer. However, I suggest that his track record indicates that he has no idea what he is talking about.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Sir, I have a supplementary question—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: —on the same subject for the Minister for Transport. Is the \$10.6 million for tram-related infrastructure assets linked to the same project, which appears for the first time in this budget, yet another blow-out in the project?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I say also to the member for Waite that he should not expect me to pull up the minister for debating when the member throws lines into his questions like he just did.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am not at all sure that I understand what the member is driving at. Because I always

like to present the best possible information to this place, I will have a careful look at the matter and provide him with an answer. However, I can indicate that we will give him a lot of time during estimates if he wants to go up and down both sides of it, and I am sure that it will be instructive for him.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para): Can the Premier inform the house of a new appointment to the Economic Development Board?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I am very pleased to be able to announce today that we will be appointing Michael Hickinbotham to the Economic Development Board. I think all of us are aware that Michael Hickinbotham is making an outstanding contribution to policy development in this state. Michael is, of course, the Managing Director of the home building company, the Hickinbotham Group, and has now been appointed as a member of South Australia's EDB. The EDB is the government's principal adviser on the economic development of South Australia. Mr Hickinbotham currently chairs the Australian Population Institute and is also a member of the state's—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I cannot believe that, in talking about one of the most senior businessmen in this state, a member opposite referred to lowering the gene pool. That is an outrageous slur. The member for Kavel talked about lowering the gene pool. I will put Michael Hickinbotham, Caroline Hewson and Robert de Crespigny and all the rest of the Economic Development Board against the member for Kavel any day of the week.

Mr Hickinbotham currently chairs the Australian Population Institute and is also a member of the state's Population Advisory Group. He is a member of the executive of the Urban Development Institute of Australia, and has been admitted as a fellow of that institute in recognition of his exemplary contribution to industry. Mr Hickinbotham is also a barrister and solicitor and a member of the Housing Industry Association. He has been awarded a Centenary Medal for his service to industry and the community. I believe that Mr Hickinbotham's extensive experience in housing, population and planning matters will strengthen the board's insight into these critical areas. Mr Hickinbotham has demonstrated keen interest in wider community perspectives on housing and population and, very importantly, planning matters and has demonstrated his administrative and management capabilities as Managing Director of the Hickinbotham Group. South Australia today is a vastly different place from just over four years ago. Today we have a record number of people in jobs, and more of them in full-time jobs than ever before, record low unemployment, and more than \$26 billion worth of major projects in the pipeline.

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader has a point of order; the Premier will take his seat.

Ms CHAPMAN: The question was about the appointment of Mr Hickinbotham and we have received that information. To go on and debate alleged unemployment figures is completely irrelevant to the question.

The SPEAKER: I do not think so. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: We have just heard the member for MacKillop—who, as we can see, has now risen in stature,

being fourth on the front bench—saying that the budget is totally out of control. That must be five surpluses in a row compared to their eight deficits in a row. I mean, what a difference 4½ years makes!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: What a lot of duds.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: He is the shadow minister—

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop will cease interjecting and the Premier will return to the substance of the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: They are absolutely financial vandals.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Economic Development Board's Competitiveness Council is working on making South Australia the most competitive jurisdiction in Australia and New Zealand, and some of the most critical areas of attention will be improving our planning and development approvals processes and sharpening our focus on skills and the population. The latest figures from the ABS show that we have just achieved the largest net inflow into South Australia of overseas migrants since 1972.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: She is criticising that, just like the shadow minister for mining, but I will compare our record on mining exploration against that of the opposition any day of the week. The deputy leader criticised us last year for not doing enough to get more overseas migrants into South Australia and now we have the highest number since 1972 and she says it is not enough! You people really present no alternative, because you do nothing except whinge.

Mr Speaker, I have no doubt that Michael Hickinbotham will make a most valuable and robust contribution to these and other critical issues for South Australia. I would like to see people like David Simmons, people who put their time into the Economic Development Board (as I know Michael Hickinbotham will), people who are prepared to put state before party, being shown some respect rather than idiotic insults being called out across the house.

TRAMLINE EXTENSION

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister for Transport—if he will hop off the phone. Did the minister decide to scrap the \$30 million light rail extension to North Adelaide to absorb the combined \$22.6 million blow-out in the Glenelg to Victoria Square light rail project and the tram-related infrastructure assets acquisition that I mentioned in my earlier question?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I was thrown off because I think the honourable member was referring to the result last year, not the forecast budget. Is that what you were referring to, or is that too hard for you? He can't remember.

On the record, before we get any more absolutely fraudulent claims, there is no blow-out on that tramline, none whatsoever. What I strongly suspect he is referring to in the extra, I think, \$10 million is that we bought two extra trams. Regrettably, when I said to Bombardier, 'Look, since we have bought so many could you throw in another two for free?', they would not agree: they made me pay for them. They drive a hard bargain, don't they?

You cannot come into this place and make it up. You can go out to the media and make it up and get away with it, and that is what you have done. You are out there telling porkies about bus money today, and it is not true; but in here it has to be true, mate. Now, if you can get me trams for free we will give you a job; regrettably, I have to pay for them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

BUILDING COSTS, CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): My question is to the Minister for Consumer Affairs. Will the minister inform the house of problems that members of the public could experience in paying fees up-front for building work?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Consumer Affairs.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for Consumer Affairs): I thank the member for Torrens for her question. I know that she is very interested in consumer matters. This is an issue that can hurt the most vulnerable in our community. Householders need to be very wary when dealing with builders who demand large deposits up-front for work to be carried out on their homes. The law in relation to this in South Australia is very clear. For jobs costing \$12 000 or more, I am advised by the Office of Business and Consumer Affairs that a builder can only ask for up-front payments for three things: the cost of any payment to a third party—for example, for soil tests; council fees to reimburse the cost of building indemnity insurance; or a deposit maximum of \$1 000. For jobs costing less than \$12 000, consumers are advised as a general guide to pay only a small deposit of, say, 10 to 15 per cent of the full value of the contract.

Today, I am strongly recommending that consumers not pay large amounts up-front for building work, and I am also issuing a warning against dealing with builder Steve Preston, who has come to the attention of authorities because of his very poor behaviour. Many Western Australian consumers have been left stranded and out-of-pocket with unfinished building projects by Preston, who reportedly demanded large deposits for these projects. Steve Preston is an unregistered builder, he is bankrupt, and he has been a menace to consumers in the west. The consumer protection authority in Western Australia has received numerous complaints about Preston leaving consumers tens of thousands of dollars out of pocket.

His flouting of the law in the west has resulted in the Building Registration Board prosecuting him for contraventions to Western Australian legislation. Our Office of Consumer and Business Affairs suspects that he is now heading for South Australia. He currently operates the business Preston Developments and is associated with a company named Building Enterprises Group Proprietary Limited. The behaviour of Steve Preston in Western Australia is a warning to all consumers to think very carefully about how they deal with builders and how much they should safely place as a deposit.

The simple fact is that the more a consumer pays as a deposit the less bargaining power they have, especially when it comes to delays. South Australian licensing laws aim to protect South Australian consumers by ensuring that tradespeople are adequately qualified, and it also aims to protect consumers from builders like Preston. Preston has shown total disregard for licensing requirements interstate, and poses a serious risk to consumers in any part of Australia. My

warning to consumers is simple: do not deal with builders like Preston who are unlikely to be able to produce appropriate building licences and, also, be very wary of any builder who demands a large deposit for work to be done.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Why did the government tell a media conference this morning that it would be hiding cuts to public transport routes and schedules until Friday before the AFL footy final, and has he since changed his mind?

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the minister, I point out to the member for Waite that the words I think he used were: 'Why is the government hiding something until Friday?' I point out to the member for Waite that, when he inserts what is essentially argument into his question, the opposition cannot then expect the chair to strictly pull up the minister if the minister decides to engage in debate. Doing that is effectively issuing an invitation to the minister to debate whatever proposition the member asking the question is putting. I could just rule the question out of order, but the problem is that the question has now been asked and cannot be unasked. The Minister for Transport.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): Thank you. I have to say that the member for Waite on this issue should be embarrassed. He has put out a press release today—and I think you want to go away and read the last line of your press release again. It has caught my interest. I will be discussing it with some other people. It is a very interesting little last line. The member for Waite was out there today saying that we had cut services and cut funding to public transport. That is what he said; that is what he has gone out and been prepared to tell people. The simple truth is that not only have we not cut public transport, but it cost us, I think from memory, an extra \$6 million for additional fuel costs and, in addition to that, we have put in \$10 million over four years of additional money, money that he said today was not additional money and that we had in fact cut it. It is just a plain bald-faced porky. It is not true. So, when you ask a question whether—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am not hiding anything. What is happening on Friday is we will be announcing service changes. Not only has not one dollar been cut from public transport, we are actually paying a lot extra for fuel costs, and as of early next year, extra—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes, we increased fares—by less than the additional fuel cost. That is the simple fact. Can I say it is one thing to come in here and dress it up and gild the lily; it is another thing to go out in the media and tell porkies, tell things that are not true, and that is what he has been doing, and I've got to say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Waite, sir, wants to dress up. Rather than being embarrassed by being caught out telling lies he also wants to add clowning and buffoonery. That is fine. If he wants to get into clowning and mockery let's talk about his single-handed assault on the leadership. They don't give VCs in politics! He only had one vote, sir. I should run; I would get at least as many votes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader has a point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: If the minister cannot keep to the relevance of the subject then he should be sat down.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If the cap fits wear it! The truth is that the member for Waite has been caught out not once, not twice but three times, simply not telling the truth about what is in the budget and, ultimately, he can clown around, he can be a buffoon, he can put on caps, he can dress up in his Army camouflage, he can give out his videos to the media about what a great leader he is, but ultimately the truth catches up with him, and it is going to catch up with him, and I have got to say that I think he has made it as far along the front bench as he is going to.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Ashford.

HEALTH BUDGET

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): My question is to the Minister for Health.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I apologise to the member for Ashford. Really, members of the ministry should show some courtesy to members on their own side when they are asking a question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! And I don't need the assistance of members opposite, thank you.

The Hon. S.W. KEY: Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister clarify whether or not future wage increases will be absorbed in the recently announced increase of \$640 million for health?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the member for Ashford for her question. It gives me a good opportunity to settle an issue that has been in the media over the last couple of days. Can I start by saying that during the lead up to the budget the opposition was determined that this was going to be a bad news budget with lots of cuts, particularly in the health area, and they went out and promoted that view. Unfortunately, wishing does not make it so. The reality is that this has been a very good budget generally, and a particularly good budget for health. There is an amount of \$640 million extra for health over the next four years. The opposition has said that much of this additional \$640 million will have to be spent on the nurses' enterprise bargaining agreement. That is what the Leader of the Opposition told the house yesterday. This was presumably on the advice of his deputy, who said in a press release that up to \$400 million of the \$640 million will be swallowed up by scheduled pay increases in the health sector. Well, Mr Speaker, Tricky Vickie has got it wrong again, years.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: How does that politician get it so wrong? Practice, lots of practice!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: As my friend says, how does she get it so wrong? Practice, lots of practice. Funding for current enterprise bargaining agreements is already reflected in the budget, and I would encourage the opposition to read the section titled 'Employee Benefits and Costs' on page 7.5 of the Health budget statement. The 2006-07 budget fully funds the recently agreed EBAs for the salaried medical officers, visiting medical specialists and nurses. The \$640 million is new money into health and will not be used for current or

future EB outcomes. It will fund our election commitments for GP Plus healthcare services, more elective surgery, dental care, improved emergency departments, and greater capacity in our hospitals to meet rising demand. The opposition should correct the record and stop misleading the public.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is again to the Minister for Transport. As the government already has new public transport routes and timetables printed, why were those printed schedules not released today?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): Can I just come back to an earlier question about the alleged blow-out on the Glenelg line. I will help him out here. Not only was there absolutely no blow-out on that line, but I recall now we actually got it in under budget. As a consequence of that, if the honourable member goes down to a lot of tram stations, he will find a lot of extra lighting which has made it safer at night, because the money we saved by coming in under budget—I didn't tell the Treasurer about this—the money we saved coming in under budget—apparently he is opposed to that too—they asked me what we should do, and I said, 'Don't give it to Kevin. We'll spend it on extra lighting for passengers.' So not only was it no blow-out, we actually got it in under budget and improved the standard of safety for people travelling. I am very happy to put that on the record.

In regard to his question today: why haven't we released it today? Why not yesterday? Why not the day before? It was always forecast to release these on Friday. Can I assure the member for Waite, the service changes do not actually start on Friday: they start on 15 October. People will have the information available on Friday. They start on 15 October. This issue really shows the distinction between this government and members opposite when they were in government. These are the first major service changes since 1993; in some cases since 1970. Service changes are difficult. It is what a good government does; it is what a brave government does. It is something that weak governments like they were never do. When we did this in the northern suburbs, there were, of course, difficulties, but patronage increased by up to 12 per cent on those routes. By making these changes, patronage is forecast to increase by up to 10 per cent. That is more people being carried—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Don't forget the taxpayers heavily subsidise it—more people being carried; it is a good thing to do. God forbid that the member for Waite ever adds to the five minutes he was a minister; God forbid that should happen. You were a minister for about five minutes, as I recall. Just enough to get a little taste and then miss it. What it means is, if he were here, he wouldn't be making these changes. Is that right? You would just let it roll along. You wouldn't do anything to maximise the public's investment. You wouldn't do anything to decrease the emissions per person carried. You wouldn't be doing any of that. Well, that is why I am proud to be on this side and that is why you will be staying there a very long time.

SCHOOL TO WORK PROGRAM

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): My question is directed to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. What is the

state government doing to support students moving from school to work?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Napier for his question. He has been unremitting in his interest in issues to do with the retention of youth engagement and career paths, because he knows that the better chance children have in the last years of their education at school the better hope they have of being employed and housed, being well and not suffering mental health diseases, and avoiding the juvenile justice system. We, as a government, have given a commitment to ease these transitions and give every child an opportunity in life.

We particularly know that teachers play a vital role in advising young people about the skills and knowledge needed to make those successful transitions. But we also know that it is very difficult for teachers in the work force to keep up with opportunities, career paths and new industry developments. So this year we have begun upgrading the training of our teachers in this area and we have delivered a program to government secondary schools to train teachers to help students plan and progress their career.

A total of 185 teachers across 17 regions attended an accredited training course which forms part of a certificate 4 in career development and, by the end of next year, we will have 350 teachers trained to specifically help young people in career development training. The training is part of our Futures Connect program, and it is an initiative that we have developed across our sectors with the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. This initiative, which is part of Futures Connect, is one of the strategies of our South Australian Youth Engagement Strategy, which is itself a cross-agency strategy designed to have all departments work on good educational and transitional outcomes for young people between the ages of 15 and 19.

These newly trained teachers go through two four-hour workshops and 28 hours of professional course reading. They are trained specifically to help young people explore opportunities in the workplace, career building and flexibility. It is about giving young people personal management skills to build and maintain a positive self-image, to interact more effectively with others, and to understand the relationship between work, society and the economy. They will also learn how to get and keep a job, be truly employable and to make career enhancing decisions.

I commend the work of our teachers to this house. They do a stellar job and we should praise their efforts. We are right behind them in developing good career paths for young people, because we want every South Australian youth to be in work, in school or in training for their own good, the good of their families and the good of our community.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): My question is to the Minister for Transport. How many bus routes and services will be cancelled, cut back or reduced in the new timetable?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Transport): I will make sure that an entire set of the services to apply from 15 October is delivered to the member for Waite and he can peruse them at his leisure. The truth is, this is a difficult thing to do and a very good thing to do. If you do not agree with it, simply do not agree. But if you want me to tell you today what every route is going to be and what the timetable is going to be, I regret to inform you that you may consider me

a failure as a minister because I do not know them all. I do not know them all off the top of my head. I can tell you this though, that the department has consulted and consulted, and I am sure that you would have been offered a briefing in your electorate office. Were you offered a briefing, Marty? You got one? Everyone else got their briefing, did they?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Good.

An honourable member: It wasn't very adequate, though.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It wasn't very adequate. It is a difficult thing to do. It will attract criticism, but it is the right thing to do. This government has done the right thing from the day it came into office and it will continue to do the right thing.

OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH, SAFETY AND WELFARE

Mr KENYON (Newland): My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Newland.

Mr KENYON: Will the minister report on the progress of the updated edition of the Workplace Health and Safety Handbook?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Minister for Industrial Relations): I am pleased to inform the house that a comprehensive guide to South Australia's upgraded occupational health and safety welfare laws is now available to workers and businesses. The updated edition of the Workplace Health and Safety Handbook is available through SafeWork SA, and it can also be downloaded through SafeWork SA's web site.

We all shoulder the responsibility of trying to prevent workplace death and injury. This easy reference document is exactly the kind of accessible, user-friendly information needed in all workplaces to help ensure that safety becomes a part of core business. It provides practical advice and information in plain English, as well as encouraging employers, employees, and others with workplace responsibilities to work together toward a healthier and safer workplace. The guide better defines the duties of workers, employers and the self-employed since we upgraded the laws last year. It details our inspectors' powers under those amendments, including what is involved when they impose prohibition and improvement notices. The handbook also carries contact details for other useful resources, such as unions, employer associations, libraries, and health and safety consultants. My office will be providing copies to all members of parliament for their offices; it will probably be in pigeonholes when members leave the chamber after question time.

CAPITAL WORKS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer explain why the provision for capital works slippages increased from \$40 million in 2003-04 to \$60 million in 2004-05 and \$90 million in 2005-06?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I will get a considered answer and come back to the house.

SCHOOLS, WORKERS COMPENSATION

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's

Services. What extra costs will be incurred by schools when the government seeks nearly \$17 million in savings by getting schools to manage their workers compensation claims? As part of the budget, the government is seeking nearly \$17 million in saving by making schools 'manage their workers compensation claims'.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): The Leader of the Opposition's question relates to the press release that went out last Thursday afternoon. It reflects the way in which we wish to manage local schools, in giving them the power to manage staff and be responsible for their management processes. We recognise that, of course, many schools have a heavy burden of workers compensation, particularly those schools that are special schools, where, traditionally, there has been a large number of injuries just because of the heavy lifting; it is what you would expect in any situation where there is particular stress from physical activity. But we do want local areas to have an incentive to manage their staffing issues and, over the next year, we will be working out a program that will include incentives and ways of returning the responsibility to the managers in an area, because with responsibility does come the capacity to manage local staffing issues.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Further to the minister's answer: if the government is going to offer incentives to the school, which would indicate a payment, how then does the government intend to save \$17 million, and can the minister clarify whether there will be any extra cost to the school?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I thought it was quite clear that this is a way of devolving responsibility to local sites or schools, and this is a way of a policy change being put in place that will allow us to manage our workers compensation responsibilities. In fact, whichever way you look at it, we own the schools; they are part of the government.

CHILDREN, OUT-OF-HOME CARE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): Will the Minister for Families and Communities inform the house about work that is taking place to improve the system of out-of-home care for children and young people?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Families and Communities): This weekend at the National Foster Carers Conference I will launch a consultation draft on a vision for a revitalised—

The SPEAKER: Order! The man in the middle of the gallery is only allowed to film members on their feet. He is not allowed to roam around the chamber filming whomever he wants. I apologise to the minister for interrupting him.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: As I was saying, on the weekend I will launch a consultation draft on a vision for out-of-home care for our most vulnerable children. This draft vision document recognises that early intervention is the first key to ensuring that we do not have as many children in our care. We are pleased to note that, against national trends and for the first time in recorded history, there is a decrease in the number of notifications and renotifications of child abuse in South Australia. Credit must go to the former minister for health for the introduction of the first home visiting program. The sustained home visiting program (Stronger Families Safer Babies), children's centres—an initiative of the

Minister for Education and Children's Services—and a general whole-of-government effort to support families and communities have led to this impressive effort. Of course, the best way to deal with out-of-home care is to have fewer children in that situation.

The vision document is about providing a 'child first' approach and building packages of care around each individual child. We know that about 15 to 20 per cent of our children experience high levels of placement instability. They are the ones who are causing 80 per cent of the work in the system and contributing to an enormous amount of the cost. If we can focus on the causes of this instability, then we will be able to achieve something very important. We know that children who come into care at an early age tend to have very stable placements—children who come in between the ages of zero and two have something like a 90 per cent stability rate—but where children come in as a consequence of multiple failed attempts at reunification with their family, this involves an enormous amount of bouncing backwards and forwards through different foster carer families and can be very damaging to the child's ability to form an attachment with an adult. It is those children who cause an enormous amount of difficulty in the system. Their behaviour deteriorates, they become very difficult children to manage, and they put a lot of pressure on our system, and, indeed, on foster parents themselves.

Recent legislative changes will assist us in this regard. We now require the Youth Court to consider, in preference to a series of short-term orders, an approach where longer term orders are made, so that we can get past the revolving door of placements and placement breakdowns. We are also looking at acknowledging that traditional foster care may not be appropriate for some of our most troubled kids, so we are increasing the therapeutic component of the care we provide. We are looking at the way in which we provide accommodation. We are also looking at young people leaving the care system. We realise that 18 is often an arbitrary point at which to say that we will no longer provide assistance. Further, we are looking at the pivotal role that foster parents play in our system, and a range of initiatives to acknowledge their invaluable contribution to the system. Foster parents are our partners in the care system. We need to make it absolutely clear that we respect their role and provide the necessary support for them.

We are proposing to introduce competency-based training for foster parents linked to remuneration and giving them petrol money to transport children. Families SA is accrediting specific hire car companies to meet extra demands for transportation. We are establishing a 24-hour, seven day a week service so that foster carers can have access to advice and counselling; providing a program similar to the successful program in Milwaukee in the United States called Keep Safe, which includes regular telephone contact and visits on a proactive basis to foster carers; and giving foster carers the chance to participate in relevant training with staff at district centres. So, we will have a hub around our district centres that is more closely connected to the foster carers in that district.

The system of out-of-home care, of course, will never be perfect. Obviously, the first objective is to keep children in their birth families. However, I think that, with the measures that are contained in the consultation draft document (and we are looking forward to feedback on them) we can build a foster care system of which we can be truly proud.

SCHOOLS, CROYDON HIGH

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Education and Children's Services.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Once more with passion!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Has the government accepted (and this will be of interest to the Attorney-General) an offer to close Croydon High School by the end of this year?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thought it was appropriate that, before announcing this matter publicly, the information should go back to the school community, because we have been involved in significant negotiations—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: —over the course of the last year, which have involved district directors, school communities and parents. Interestingly—and this may come as a surprise to the leader—those communications were led by the school community. We, of course, have not been closing schools the way the former Liberal government did, at the rate of 65 schools—

An honourable member: It's 63.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Only 63; I am sorry. The member said 63, not 65; I thought it was 65.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I am sorry—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: Unlike members opposite, we believe in communicating and consulting with our schools—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I am sorry, sir; I am a little bemused, because the member for Croydon is the member for Croydon, and Croydon is in the member's electorate.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I am sorry; I am confused about the problem. I think it is important to note that the member for Croydon was aware of it and was consulted by the school's officers. When the school's numbers declined to a projected enrolment of 120 students for the next year, the school community made a decision. They wrote to the minister and requested agreement in progressing their decision which was that they wanted their school to close. Even the member for Bragg cannot keep a school open and force children to attend if the parents have decided to send them somewhere else. The reality is that it certainly irks members opposite—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I warn the deputy leader.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: —to know that the Rann/Foley government is one that invests in education.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I have warned the deputy leader, in case she did not hear.

SCHOOLS, WORKERS COMPENSATION

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is again to the Minister for Education and Children's Services. How much extra money, if any, will be given to schools to resource the increased workload for schools that

take on greater management of workers compensation claims?

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I think it is important that we support schools in leadership and management control. However, clearly, there are educational opportunities, and we will seek to improve the skills of those involved. I think it is interesting that very often teachers undertake extra courses (including leadership management courses) that help them to manage their skills, but I agree that we can always improve those training opportunities.

LEGAL PROFESSION LEGISLATION

Mr RAU (Enfield): Will the Attorney tell the house what steps the South Australian government is taking to help in the creation of a truly national legal profession?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I have released the draft Legal Profession Bill 2006 for consultation with the legal profession and the public. The draft bill is based on national model laws that have been adopted by the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General. The national model emerges from a long and useful collaboration between commonwealth, state and territory attorneys-general as well as the Law Council of Australia to harmonise the regulation of the legal profession across Australia.

The model laws seek to remove barriers to national practice and to bring about a truly national profession. The model provisions will bring benefits to both legal practitioners and consumers by:

- encouraging national competition, leading to greater choice for consumers;
- enabling integrated delivery of legal services Australia-wide which, we hope, matches existing and future market demand for legal services;
- providing for the recognition of law degrees and practical legal training across jurisdictions;
- allowing legal practitioners to practise interstate with one practising certificate;
- providing for uniform rules dealing with trust accounts;
- preventing practitioners struck off or penalised in one jurisdiction from moving to practise law in another jurisdiction;
- standardising the requirements for disclosing information on legal costs to clients, and thereby ensuring that both clients and legal practitioners will have the same understanding of their rights and obligations regardless of where they live; and
- creating a nationally uniform system governing the entitlements of foreign lawyers to practise the law of their home countries in Australia.

The implementation of the model laws places Australia at the forefront of legal profession regulation internationally. The national model does not require jurisdictions to change many of their regulatory structures or official processes and, therefore, many local regulatory structures, which have been tailored to the specific needs of this jurisdiction over the years, have been retained in the draft bill. The draft bill also retains, in its substance, provisions of the current Legal Practitioners Act 1981 South Australia that deal with matters not covered in the model.

The Law Society has requested a consultation period of four months in light of the length of, and detail contained within, the draft bill, and I am happy to accede to this request.

The draft bill is now available on the justice portfolio web site at www.justice.sa.gov.au.

SCHOOLS, AQUATICS PROGRAMS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier decided to make the funding of programs such as the Thinkers in Residence program a higher priority than the needs of South Australian children in government schools by withdrawing or reducing their funding for swimming lessons or aquatic programs? School communities, angered by suggestions that the government is going to cut funding to swimming and aquatic programs, have contacted the opposition.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): The interesting and important question is whether governments should fund some activities at the expense of others. If that is the criterion, I am happy to consider a whole range of government funding initiatives that perhaps are not as high a priority as our kids, schools and hospitals may be—and I think the Leader of the Opposition knows exactly to what I am referring.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier have any concerns that children from low socioeconomic areas will be at greater risk through the government's reduction in funding to school aquatic programs? School leaders have contacted the opposition and are concerned that the increased cost of swimming lessons from about \$1.35 to \$8 would increase the total cost to families to between \$60 and \$100 per child. School leaders fear that this will lead to some children being withdrawn from swimming lessons, thus putting them at risk.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I am not sure whether the member for Morphett is talking about Vacswim, school classes, or what is talking about, because his question is rather nebulous. Whatever he is talking about, I must say that, from time to time, there are clearly changes in direction in government, and that is what government is about.

SCHOOL VANDALISM

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Will the Minister for Education and Children's Services review the processes and methods used in DECS to record and report school vandalism, arson and security matters? Traditionally, the Auditor-General has reported on school vandalism, arson and outstanding fire claims. In 2000-01 it amounted to \$14.7 million; in 2001-02 it amounted to \$18.8 million; and in 2002-03 it amounted to \$12.7 million. I checked the more recent reports from the Auditor-General to find that there is no reference to this matter, so I wrote to the Auditor-General on 18 July, asking why he has ceased to report vandalism, arson and security-related expenses incurred by DECS. I received a letter today which states:

Following receipt of this letter, I requested my officers to review the issues raised by you. As a result of the review, I have been advised that due to:

- the various funding arrangements between Central Office and government schools; and
 - depending upon the security of the incident, the various methods employed by schools to account for such expenditure e.g. minor maintenance, repairs, replacement, etc;
- it is not possible to readily determine the total expenditure associated with school vandalism, arson and security.

Accordingly, I am not able to include any commentary in my Annual Report to Parliament with respect to this issue.

Yours sincerely
K. I. MacPherson
AUDITOR-GENERAL

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I thank the member for Fisher for his question. He has indeed shown me the trail of letters to and from the Auditor-General. One will of course understand that the Auditor-General is independent. He does not take instructions from me or anybody else on these benches, and that is the way that we would want it. I am very happy to look into the matter for the member for Fisher, because I think his inquiry is valid, and I will go about seeing if we can answer it.

MARION SWIMMING POOL

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome): Will the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing advise the house of the current status of the Marion swimming pool project and when this long-awaited facility will commence? This project was announced by the Liberal government five years ago, and there is no money in the capital works budget papers for this project. The federal government has committed \$15 million, I believe, contingent on a matching state contribution.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Minister for Infrastructure): Sometimes they just have so much gall. Yes; five years ago they announced a swimming centre at Marion. Do you know what they did not do, sir? They did not include any money. They said it was going to be a PPP, and the private sector was going to build it. Just like they announced bridges over the Port River that the private sector would build and would not cost any money. The truth is, they announced a fraud. They announced a swimming pool with no money to build it. What this government did was commit \$15 million of our money, and it was us that put up money first, not the commonwealth—us that put up the money, us that talked to Marion, and us that put the pressure on the commonwealth to match that contribution. The truth is, it still requires a private sector contribution, and we will be going to the market at some point.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We will be going to the market for the private sector, but he is critical of that. I must tell you, since we put in the \$15 million, since we got the \$15 million from the commonwealth, we are a lot closer than we were under the absolute fraud you people announced five years ago.

NATURAL DISASTER RELIEF

The Hon. R.G. KERIN (Frome): My question is to the Treasurer. Why has the South Australian government never submitted a claim for natural disaster relief payments as offered by the federal government following the disastrous West Coast bushfires? The federal government responded quickly to the needs of victims of the fires. Shortly after the fire the Commonwealth Department of Transport and Regional Services sent two officers over to advise the state government on how to make a claim for the federal assistance. Whilst the state is able to progressively claim—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R.G. KERIN: Whilst the state is able to progressively claim the federal funds no application has been made.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): I will get some advice on that. One thing I can advise the house is that I would be very surprised if my Treasury officers would not have alerted me to an opportunity to get some money from somebody else to assist the state's financial position. I would be very, very surprised if that is the case. But I think it is unfortunate that the former leader of the opposition, the member for Frome, would in some way try and politicise the state government's response to a tragedy on Eyre Peninsula.

The Hon. R.G. Kerin: Oh come on! That's insulting.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, the Leader of the Opposition, the passionless Leader of the Opposition, said—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The state government's response to the Eyre Peninsula bushfire was outstanding in terms of a public sector responding to the needs and the tragedy to people on Eyre Peninsula. We worked with the commonwealth government. We worked with local government. My colleague the Minister for Infrastructure did an outstanding job in leading much of that, as did the member for Mount Gambier, the member for Mawson, and many others. I am a frequent visitor to Port Lincoln, and there are many things that the community of Port Lincoln may have disagreements with the Labor government about, but I can say one thing, that they are extremely appreciative of, almost to a person, the response that this government took to the Eyre Peninsula bushfires.

I have been in a public forum on a number of occasions with the mayor of Port Lincoln, Peter Davis, not known as a rabid Labor person, but a nice guy, I have to say. I have got to quite like Peter Davis. It probably says more about me than him. But Peter Davis has been highly complimentary about the state government's response to the needs of the Eyre Peninsula community. But I will take the element of that question that dealt with whether or not there was money there that we can get from the commonwealth. As I said, I would have assumed if there was we would have had that. But there was an overtone in the question of criticism of the government. I think that is unfortunate.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel): Mr Speaker, I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: The Premier earlier in his reply asserted that I said that in appointing Mr Michael Hickinbotham to the Economic Development Board it was 'lowering the gene pool'. Sir, I want to correct the record by advising the house that I actually said, 'The Labor government was low in their own gene pool.' I welcome the appointment of Mr Hickinbotham as a young, successful businessman and a leader in our community, who has much to offer in this role. I am disappointed. The Premier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Now you have gone too far.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY:—has played silly political games.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kavel will take his seat. The purpose of a personal explanation is to correct the record, not to offer any other commentary.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

CHILDREN, GUARDIANSHIP

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): The Minister for Families and Communities is going to go to the east on the weekend, it appears, as is published in *The Advertiser* today, to present to other foster care conference delegates a new package for foster carers, and well may they laugh when he arrives with his package. What has been announced in this package is absolutely incredible, in response to what we have seen, even over the last few days, where we have had confirmed that we have had children under his guardianship, who have been placed in foster care and who, for various reasons, have met a fatal death; we have had coronial inquiries; and we have had children who have run away.

The parliament has heard about a morphine baby, as it has been described, the young baby who was placed with a foster carer without adequate notice or provision of assistance. We have heard about a young child being placed under the guardianship of the minister. This child, following diagnosis by the foster carer, was found to have a brain tumour. We have heard a litany of complaints by foster carers in South Australia, starting way back under this government with the Layton Report. We have had published information from the Mullighan Inquiry and we have heard about a litany of occasions when children have either died or been at risk as a result of what is claimed to be mismanagement by the government's own department—in particular, their lack of support for foster carers and the provision of assistance to them.

Well, here is the minister's great new list of what he is going to provide. First, he is going to give a petrol allowance to foster carers for when they are transporting foster children. Well, coming from a minister who gets free petrol, coming from members of parliament who have free petrol, coming from a Public Service when they are provided with a car to have travel allowance, coming from tax deductible expenses from many other people in the community for when they are undertaking their work we have an admission from the minister that his foster carers don't even have a petrol allowance. Can you believe that he is going to go and tell all those people in the west about how fantastic he is because he is going to give a petrol voucher to the carers. Well, let me say, of the carers that I have spoken to this morning—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN:—they know how pathetic is that response. And do you know what? He doesn't even actually say he is going to do it. He says he is going to go over to the Eastern States and talk about it, so he can't even agree on the spot. Why? Because Families and Communities have not received any mention in the Treasurer's budget speech—not a word. When we look for just one program in Families and Communities that might support them, what do we find? We find a program to rebuild, refurbish and refurbish the offices of Families SA. Not one extra resource for foster carers in

this state. That is the way the Treasurer, the government and the minister have treated foster carers.

Here is another one. This is an absolute winner. The minister is going to propose that foster-carer support groups be established. Well, hello, minister. We have actually got foster-care support groups—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: —and they don't agree with the minister. They are writing to him; they are taking these issues to the parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: They are writing to the minister.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Bragg might like to consider Hansard and speak into the microphone and address the chair.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. They might well ask, 'Well, why is the minister going to set up these support groups and put them in his Families SA offices?' There is a very simple answer: he wants to keep control of them; he wants to be able to keep an eye on them. These are the people who are speaking out for foster carers in this state and whom the minister has completely ignored. The Treasurer has not even heard their voice, and the minister wants to put them in his office, because by doing so he can keep an eye on them. If you make some provision for them it will always keep them under control. Well, they won't be silenced.

Time expired.

APY LANDS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): To begin my remarks, I would like to acknowledge that we are meeting today, as we do every day, on the traditional lands of the Kurna people. I mention that because next month between 27 and 29 October a very special anniversary will take place. Celebrations are being planned and an invitation has been issued to everyone to attend. The event has been named Nganampa Manta Iritinguru Kuwari-kutu—Our Land From Yesterday And Into Tomorrow. This festival will mark the 25th anniversary of the granting of freehold title to the APY lands.

On 4 November 1981, the South Australian government presented to the Pitjantjatjara/Yankunytjatjara/Anangu (APY) people inalienable freehold title to the lands on which they live. At that time, the ownership, management and control of the lands was handed over to the traditional owners. This festival gives us the opportunity to honour the achievement of the settlement of native title and the elders who fought for the rights to the lands, and also to celebrate the lands themselves.

I have been informed that the festival will be held at Umuwa in the APY lands and, as well as celebrating this significant milestone and what has been achieved in the past 25 years, it will also focus on the next 25 years and all the challenges facing the people on the lands. In accordance with their generosity of spirit, they have extended an invitation to everyone to be part of the festival which will celebrate a major turning point for the region, their culture and these unique people who have been much challenged by contemporary issues on the lands.

It will also give us all a chance to gain an insight into the life and culture of the remote traditional lands. It will provide us with an opportunity to travel through a beautiful part of the South Australian Outback and, on the invitation of the APY people, to visit their homelands, meet Anangu, and witness

their unique culture and life through traditional inma (stories in dance and song), traditional skills (such as spear-making, bush tucker and weaving) and the contemporary art that has made the region famous.

The festival will also highlight how the traditional has melded with the contemporary with performances by the legendary Pitjantjatjara Choir, local community bands and children's dance performances. A detailed program will soon be confirmed and made available for people on the web. It will include cinemas showing documentaries and historical footage, as well as a special church service to honour the elders.

Attendance at the festival will require advanced planning for those wanting to be part of this wonderful cultural experience. Accommodation will consist of camping under the stars—and they are very big stars in the outback—in the shadows of the majestic Musgrave Ranges at camp sites that are being prepared within 2 kilometres of the festival grounds. It is beginning to sound very attractive but, unfortunately, I will not be able to go. The journey to the festival will be unique in itself, as this part of South Australia is rarely seen by people. A range of tours is being organised via tour operators to assist people to make their way to the festival, and the opportunity will be provided to drive yourself or join in on a tag-along tour. Whilst entry to the APY lands is by permit, the festival pass will include entry permission as part of the reasonable ticket price. A camping fee will also be applicable and catering will be available at the site, hopefully allowing all who attend to sample the bush tucker that we hear so much about.

Umuwa is located just under 200 kilometres west along the Stuart Highway from the town of Marla. Four wheel drive vehicles are recommended as wet weather can make roads impassable. Whilst travelling to or from the festival, people will be encouraged to make side visits to other art centres in the APY lands, as visiting the lands is not something you would do every day.

Protocols are in place on the lands and visitors are encouraged to observe these protocols because they not only ensure the safety of everyone involved but respect the traditional owners and their connection to the land. The permit system has been in place for decades and has worked well, not to exclude people—this has rarely happened—but as a way of ensuring that people do not perish or meet with harm in the harsh landscape. Native title has existed for a long time, and it has again been in the news, this time in Western Australia, where a decision has granted a land claim over Perth. Whilst this will have little or no impact on residents, it has raised unwarranted concerns that need to be addressed so that individual people do not raise irrational fears.

Time expired.

TRANSPORT SA, PRIME MOVER PERMIT

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Today I want to raise with the house a matter which has been before the department of transport for some months now and which is causing incredible concern for one of my constituents. It demonstrates the intransigence of the department. In May 2005 (over 12 months ago), my constituent purchased a new prime mover to operate with his fleet of trucks. His fleet of trucks all operate B-double combinations, carting freight in and out of the South-East of the state. When he was purchasing this truck, he found it was a little bit different from the average

prime mover and certainly from all the prime movers he had operated to that point. There are not a lot of this particular model of this truck in Australia; it is only a single drive, rather than a bogey drive or a double axle drive as on most prime movers, particularly most prime movers towing B-doubles.

As a result of being convinced that this was a good option to buy (and I will come back to that in a few minutes), he and the manufacturer went specifically to Transport SA to ensure that they had the specific B-double permit before my constituent shelled out the \$380 000-odd to purchase this truck. He got the permit and went on the road with the truck, and it has been operated happily for 12 months. When he came to renew the permit after 12 months, as you do with a B-double, the department of transport said, 'No, we cannot issue a permit for this particular truck, because it is only a single drive and has a lazy axle.' The claim from Transport SA was that, with just a single drive (that is, just one drive on the bogey combination) being connected to the engine, it would put too much pressure on the road pavement and tear up the road. That was the department's excuse.

I approached the minister's office and told him what was going on, and he approached Transport SA and, lo and behold, the answer came back to me through the minister's office that, when the applicant put in his original application, it was deficient and did not tell Transport SA that it was only a single drive. When I went back to my constituent and told him of this situation, he said, 'But, Mitch, I took the truck in there, and they inspected it.' In fact, he faxed me a copy of the inspection document, which has the model number of the truck on it, and says that it is a 6 by 2 (that is, a six-wheel/two-wheel drive). They had it over the pit; they climbed all of it. They checked the brake linings, and they put the ticks in the boxes and gave him a B-double permit, label No. 122093.

Transport SA did all that after inspecting the truck, but, now that it has done this once, it is sticking to its digs and saying to my constituent, 'Sorry, we're not moving.' In fact, I have copies of internal emails from Transport SA where the department's technical people are obviously saying, 'According to the formula we're using, this truck should not be on the road towing a gross vehicle combination of more than 25 tonnes.' That is what Transport SA is saying. My constituent tells me that he has a friend operating the exact same model truck in New South Wales (he has seven on the road) with no problem. In fact, the formula used in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia would rate this truck to tow a gross combination of up to 98 tonnes.

If Transport SA reckons that you can only tow up to 25 tonnes per axle, I do not know how it is allowing triple-trailer road trains to come down the Stuart Highway, because those trucks are only double-axle drives, bogey drive, but they are rated up to 115 tonnes. By my calculations, I think that is about 67½ tonnes per driving axle. So, to my constituent Transport SA says, 'You can only run 25 tonnes per driving axle,' but it will allow trucks to come down the Stuart Highway at 67½ tonnes per driving axle—three times what Transport SA is telling my constituent.

There are two issues here. One is that, if Transport SA is not going to give the permit to allow this truck to get back on the road, it should compensate my constituent for the money he spent on purchasing this truck after it had inspected it and given him the initial permit. The other point is that my constituent tells me that this truck returns a fuel consumption that gives him about 2.2 kilometres per litre of diesel,

whereas a normal B-double truck gives a fuel consumption return of about 1.7 or 1.8 kilometres per litre. That is an 18 per cent saving in fuel.

Time expired.

SCHOOLS, LIGHT COMMUNITY MONTESSORI

Mr PICCOLO (Light): I rise today to speak about a school in my electorate that will shut its doors forever to its children on Friday. It is a non-government school, and its closure is not because of any current education policy of either the state or federal government. The Light Community Montessori School is based currently at the Roseworthy Campus of Adelaide University. The school was established in February 1997 by a group of parents in the region who wanted to provide their children with an alternative education program. At its peak the school had about 60 students, but this number has diminished over recent times to 29 students, and has a projected enrolment of four for the commencement of term 4 this year.

Why is a school that had so much promise—it had a vision of an enrolment of 160 students in its early days—set for such an undignified ending? Liquidators were appointed last week to wind up the incorporated body. I first learnt of problems at the school some three months ago when I was approached by a group of parents who had formerly been associated with the school. They had a series of grievances about the way in which they or their children were being treated by the school management. For some four years, their complaints had fallen on deaf ears. The allegations were extremely serious, ranging from financial mismanagement to allegations of bullying of parents and students, the harassment of employees and ex-association members, and failure of the school to deliver on education programs promised in the school's prospectus. I understand that a number of the more serious incidents have been reported to the police for action.

I wrote to the school's administration expressing my concern about the allegations. If these allegations were true, there is sufficient evidence to suggest a fundamental failure in the governance of the school. I alerted both the Non-Government Schools Registration Board and the Association of Independent Schools of SA of my concerns. At that point I made the conscious decision not to make my concerns public as I wanted to afford the school an opportunity to respond to the allegations and, if necessary, take remedial action. In short, I wanted to afford the school natural justice. In addition, I did not want to solve one injustice by creating another. The group of concerned parents respected that decision and to this day have placed their trust in the process to deliver a just outcome to them. I thank them for placing their trust in me and for dealing with their concerns with a high level of integrity. While not responsible for their suffering, I am sorry that they have had to experience such injustice.

My actions did spur the school to act. It appointed an independent education consultant to undertake an investigation into the long-term viability of the school and other operational options available to it. I understand that the consultant recommended to the school board that the school close down at the end of the 2006 scholastic year. The board accepted the recommendation, which was endorsed subsequently by a special meeting of members of the association on Tuesday 29 August.

Over the past few months I have tried to have the grievances of the parents heard by the school board, but to no

avail. The Supreme Court appointed liquidator will now hear their grievances and resolve them to the extent the law permits. I am a little disappointed that the faith I placed in the Association of Independent Schools of SA to help deliver a fair outcome has been somewhat misplaced. Certainly I have learnt from that experience. The closure of the school is a sad day. There are no winners. The closure has partially closed the door on ex-parents to have their concerns addressed, and current parents have had their children's education severely disrupted.

Why did this failure of governance occur? The failure of this non-government school, and others in recent years, clearly demonstrates that some non-systemic, non-government schools do not always have the expertise required to provide governance for contemporary educational institutions. While I have no doubt that the governing bodies have good intentions, sometimes they lack the skill and ability required to properly govern or provide the proper oversight. This appears to be the case at Light Community Montessori School. Accordingly, I have raised my concerns with the Minister for Education and Children's Services. She has advised that she will consider the matters I have raised in the context of an examination of the Education Act, which covers governance issues in government and non-government schools. It appears to me that members of the school board failed to deal with the governance issues in an effective manner. They were either poorly advised—which is the allegation I hear most—or failed to turn their minds to some apparent serious shortcomings in the management of the school. Hopefully, all of us, particularly those involved in the non-systemic independent sector, have learnt from this experience.

INTERNATIONAL HORSE TRIALS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): On 3 and 5 November this year, and quite possibly for the last time in South Australia, the Adelaide International Horse Trials will be held. If this is the last time that the event is held (because government funding has been cut, and there is nothing in the budget that I can find; the people involved with the horse trials have been told to get out of their office in December, which is an indication that there is no future funding and there is no future for the International Horse Trials), it will be an absolute travesty not only for the horse industry in South Australia but also for the tourism industry and for South Australia generally.

The International Horse Trials have been held in South Australia for a number of years. They have been the training and selection ground for Olympians such as Gill Rolton and Wendy Schaeffer. The horse trials are attended by thousands of kids with their mums and dads after the world renowned, traditional Christmas Pageant that is held in Adelaide—as are the Adelaide International Horse Trials, which are the only four star (the highest level) international horse trials in the southern hemisphere. The funding should not be cut. We will guarantee that, if the funding has been cut (and funding sponsorship for these sorts of events is becoming harder), this event will go to Sydney. It will be gone, and we will never get it back.

Ours is the best venue for spectators of horse trials anywhere in Australia—and, I would say, in the world. It is better than Badminton and Kentucky and the other four star horse trials in the northern hemisphere. We have a unique opportunity to foster this event and the horse industry. The

horse industry in South Australia employs about 3 500 full-time equivalent employees. It is a huge industry. Per capita, it is one of the best performers of all the horse industries in Australia. In South Australia we have a strong history, not only in the gallops, but also in harness racing and eventing.

I hope that I am wrong. I would like the minister to come in here and say, 'You are wrong, Duncan. The funding will be there. We will support this fabulous event for many years to come.' However, I do not believe that that is the case. I believe that the office will be closed in December and that the people involved in the horse trials will pack up their bags, clear the jumps out of the East Parklands, and that will be the last we see of it. I guarantee that it will go to Sydney, and that will be a terrible shame for South Australia.

The International Horse Trials are so desperate, because they cannot obtain funding from the government or sponsorship, that they are reduced to selling chocolates. I was given some chocolates the other day for the 2006 Adelaide International Horse Trials. Members can buy them for \$2 each, which will go towards the event. The flyer on the box reads as follows:

Money raised will go directly towards the event and will help ensure that the Adelaide International Horse Trials remains in Adelaide for many years to come, and is the only inner city equestrian event in the world and the only four star event in the southern hemisphere.

The International Horse Trials is at a crossroads here. It is a unique event that should not be lost to South Australia. They are the only four star international horse trials in the southern hemisphere. Anyone who has watched the event would realise that this is not just a pony club event. These are the best horse riders in the world; the best eventers in the world. As I said, two Olympic gold medallists who are residents of South Australia have gone through this process: Gill Rolton and Wendy Schaeffer. To let them down and also the whole of the horse industry in South Australia, particularly the eventing world, would be an absolute travesty.

This government should not be cutting tourism funding, and major events in South Australia should be promoted. Some \$2 million is being spent on a guitar festival. It may be a very worthy event: I do not know much about it. However, we are not getting any surety on the funding for the Adelaide International Horse Trials. If we are getting it, I would like the minister to come down and tell me now and put the horse trials people out of their misery, or give them some confidence, because it should not be lost. They are the only four star international horse trials in the southern hemisphere, and we must not lose this event.

HALLETT COVE TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECT

Ms FOX (Bright): I rise today to speak in support of a transport and infrastructure project at Hallett Cove which, much to the opposition's probable distress, has been achieved early, and 10 per cent under budget. The bridge on Grand Central Avenue at Hallett Cove was built some 40 years ago when this beautiful coastal suburb was first being established. It was built in a difficult topographical situation, with the sudden descent to the coast being steep and frequently used by cars and pedestrians alike. The old bridge crossed the Noarlunga rail line and was beginning to look somewhat the worse for wear. During the last election campaign I spoke to the relevant minister (Mr Patrick Conlon) about the site and

he assured me that he was aware of the issue and was dealing with it—and indeed he was.

In April the bridge was closed and local residents were informed that the new bridge would be opened in October. TransAdelaide general manager Bill Watson worked closely with both the community and the bridge-building company, and I would like to commend him on his real commitment to this project. He informed me at the opening of the bridge last week that the weight restriction on the bridge has now been lifted, which also increases its capacity.

As I said before, local residents were informed that the new bridge would open in October but, because of outstanding work by local firm Bardavcol, the bridge was actually finished five weeks ahead of schedule and was opened on Thursday last week. I would like to applaud Bardavcol and its staff, who worked so hard on this project. Because the bridge was finished in a timely manner council tenders are still outstanding for the remediation of the surrounding areas. The City of Marion—which is, I might add, an excellent council—is working quickly to deal with this, and I must say what a pleasure it has been to deal with the mayor, Felicity-ann Lewis, and elected members of the council who represent the south and, in particular, the very special area of Hallett Cove. Through working together, the government and the council have come up with a great, safe, new bridge for an outstanding, thriving community. I would like to thank Mr Conlon, Mr Bill Watson, the City of Marion, and Bardavcol for everything they have done. Thank you.

Mrs GERAGHTY: Ms Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ADELAIDE BOTANIC GARDEN AMAZON WATERLILY PAVILION DEVELOPMENT

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): I move:

That the 245th report of the Public Works Committee, entitled Adelaide Botanic Garden Amazon Waterlily Pavilion Development, be noted.

This afternoon I would like to speak about the Amazon Waterlily Pavilion. Prior to the 2004-05 financial year the government allocated \$5 million over three years towards an estimated \$10 million of capital works for the 150th anniversary of the Adelaide Botanic Garden from 2005 to 2007. The development of a new Amazon Waterlily Pavilion to replace the Victoria House and Schomburgk Range was one of the proposed 'Gardens 150' projects.

The proposed new waterlily pavilion involves building a contemporary glasshouse over the original footprints and ponds at the Victoria House. The pond is used to propagate the giant Amazon waterlily on an annual basis. The outcome is to be a contemporary glasshouse, using modern structural glass technologies to complement the existing cast iron structured Palm House and the aluminium structured Bicentennial Conservatory in terms of evolving glasshouse technologies.

The project will replace the dilapidated set of glasshouses with a new glasshouse dedicated to showcasing the Amazon waterlily and other plants associated with the era of plant exploration by German botanists in the mid-19th century and

their connections with Adelaide through Richard Schomburgk, the second director of the Adelaide Botanic Gardens.

The Amazon waterlily is the key plant of a group known as the 'charismatic plants' component of the focus collections at the Adelaide Botanic Garden. Charismatic plants are loosely defined as a collection of plant species exhibiting unusual or bizarre modifications with public appeal as attractions. The collection of these plants was a major goal of botanical explorers in the mid-19th century in order to satisfy the horticultural interests of Europeans and their colonies at the time. The terrestrial bromeliads to be housed around the new glasshouse are also part of the charismatic plant focus collection.

The building is designed specifically for the ongoing display of the Amazon waterlily and related plants, but paving will be laid on fill in certain areas for future planting changes to occur. The Amazon Waterlily Pavilion will be surrounded by a new formal garden area reminiscent of the original 19th century garden layout, and the original pond has been incorporated in the project to minimise new building work and to respect its cultural significance. The project's expected total capital expenditure (including contingencies and contractor, documentation and management fees) is \$4.221 million, excluding GST. Practical completion of the main building works is scheduled for May 2007, and the facility is expected to be open to the public in mid-2007.

A number of ESD strategies have been employed in the project that are consistent with best practice ESD principles, including passive heating and ventilation systems, combined with efficient building plant. The new pavilion replaces several old glasshouses that had high running and maintenance costs. It will not be a big user of electricity because of the very nature of the all-glass building, and through the design of optimum building orientation, shape and layout. Passive heating and ventilation systems have been incorporated to supplement a gas-fired boiler system.

The building itself is designed with encircling galleries that act as airlocks and installation cushions. Given the minimum energy demands of the building, its greenhouse gas emissions can possibly be totally offset through the use of green power and/or sequestering via accredited tree planting to create a carbon neutral or zero net emissions building. These measures will not require a change in design and will be investigated during construction. Wherever possible, locally sourced and manufactured materials and finishes are incorporated.

The master plan for the Adelaide and Mount Lofty botanic gardens highlights the proposed construction of the Amazon Waterlily Pavilion as part of a redevelopment of the precinct around the main Botanic Lake. It will provide an improved, unique experience within the gardens for families, enrich the state's cultural milieu, and highlight the cultural heritage of Adelaide as a key component in the world trade of unusual exotic plants and its links with the network of German botanists and plant explorers.

We should be very proud of our Botanic Garden because it has been at the forefront, not only nationally but internationally. We had the good fortune to listen to Mr Stephen Forbes of the Botanic Garden give us a history of what has happened over the past 150 years. It would be worth everyone's while to go down to the gardens to see everything that is there, and also in terms of the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Botanic Garden in South Australia. Based upon the evidence that it has considered pursuant to sec-

tion 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): I rise to support the member for Norwood. Indeed, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to support the member for Norwood. It was a most satisfying morning that the Public Works Committee spent down at the Botanic Garden and, as the member has indicated, being briefed by Mr Stephen Forbes. They are a delight to be in, and it took my mind back many, many years to the early 1960s when we used to traverse the Botanic Garden on our way back to boarding school on a Friday night.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: No, it wasn't Princes, I'm sorry; it's the other way. In those days the gates were locked. We used to have to hurdle over the top of the fence and hurdle over the other side to get through. I took one good look at it when I was down there with the member for Norwood and decided that hurdling the fence was way past me, and it was many, many years ago. But it is a very good project. As the member indicated, there has been a huge amount of work gone into it. Mr Forbes gave us copious amounts of advice on just what is happening in the gardens, and the breeding patterns of various butterflies.

Ms Ciccarello: What the plants do at night!

Mr PENGILLY: Yes, we learnt about all the mating habits of various animals and birds, and God knows what else that goes on down there. But it was a good briefing that we had from Mr Forbes, and also from the department for environment officer, Mr Bob Furner, who was down there, who has a passion for the gardens and who is very much hands-on with the project. I have known Bob Furner for a long, long time. Indeed, Bob and I in the mid-80s used to work together carting gypsum. I was pleased to see the extent to which Bob has gone up in the world in the department, and it gives me great delight that he is down there actively involved in this project in the Amazon Waterlily Pavilion development.

So, yes, I do have a great deal of pleasure in supporting the member for Norwood, and indeed I will be most pleased and happy to see the project finalised, and when it is up and running it will add to the Botanic Garden, it will add to the Conservatory, and it will add to everything else down there. It is a most important part of Adelaide. It is very well cared for. The people who are in charge of it down there take great pride in those gardens, and they are an absolute icon of Adelaide and South Australia. So, I support the motion.

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): I welcome the tabling of the 245th Public Works Committee Report on the Adelaide Botanic Garden Amazon Waterlily Pavilion Development. The Amazon Waterlily Pavilion is the third major capital works project as part of the 150th anniversary of the establishment and opening of the Adelaide Botanic Garden. The first two were the building of the Schomburgk Pavilion and the development of the SA Water Mediterranean Garden to the north of the Museum of Economic Botany, both of which were opened on 21 June this year. These projects are part of a \$10 million capital works program at the gardens, of which the state government is contributing \$5 million. The rest of the contributions are coming from sponsorships and donations, both corporate and public.

The anniversary celebrations and capital works are being spread over three years from 2005 to 2007, to coincide with

the site being identified and surveyed, a committee of management constituted in 1855, and it being opened to the public in 1857. The Amazon Waterlily Pavilion is being built to replace the dilapidated Victoria House and Schomburgk range of glasshouses which had become a maintenance burden. The future direction sees strategic and focused collections that inform the community about our rich botanical history.

In this context, the Amazon Waterlily Pavilion's prime purpose is to continue the tradition of showcasing the Amazon waterlily, *Victoria amazonica*. The original wooden framed Victoria House was built and the first waterlilies grown 1868 by the second director of the gardens, Dr Richard Schomburgk; only 31 years after the waterlily was first discovered in British Guiana by Richard Schomburgk and his brother, Sir Robert Schomburgk.

It was also only 19 years after the waterlily was first grown in England by Joseph Paxton, who subsequently designed the famous Crystal Palace based on the structure of the Amazon waterlily leaf. This was all at a time when people were fascinated by exotic and strange animals and plants. The *Victoria amazonica*, with its leaves of up to two metres in diameter and enough rigidity to support a small child, was one such plant. When it first flowered in Adelaide it was reported that 30 000 visitors were recorded in a five-week period in 1868.

The new glasshouse will not only incorporate the original pond for growing the giant waterlily, it will also be used to grow other plants that are associated with this period of plant discovery and pay testament to the part that Richard Schomburgk and the Adelaide Botanic Garden played in the propagation and promotion of such plants. In addition, the collection of terrestrial bromeliads that were planted around the previous Victoria House will be re-established around the new Amazon Waterlily Pavilion.

Bromeliads are almost as diverse as orchids in terms of form and colour. While the pineapple is the best known bromeliad, many botanists, collectors and gardeners covet collections of this remarkable plant group. These plants also form part of the garden's collection of exotic and charismatic plants that fascinated earlier generations of botanic garden visitors and represent one of the best collections in the world. Consequently they will complement the collection within the glasshouse and the whole site will provide a focus for educating the public about the history of collecting such exotic plants.

The glasshouse site will also form a central iconic destination within the Adelaide Botanic Garden as it is located not only against the main lake and the main north-south route through the gardens, but it will also be adjacent to the new east-west route. This new route is being created through the gardens from Hackney Road to the proposed new western entrance that will provide access to Frome Road via the Frome Road parkland currently being built by the Adelaide City Council. The glasshouse will be totally clad in structural and other glass to form a totally transparent structure. In addition, the northern curved form of the glasshouse and its pergola and use of steel support trusses hint at both the design of the giant waterlily leaf structure and the adjacent Schomburgk Pavilion glass canopies.

To assist in the aesthetics of the glass structure, the boiler is being housed out of sight below the Schomburgk Pavilion. The new Amazon Waterlily Pavilion will indeed become an iconic glasshouse within the Adelaide Botanic Garden alongside the Bicentennial Conservatory and the heritage-

listed Palm House. Consequently I welcome the tabling of the Public Works Committee's report on the Amazon Waterlily Pavilion development.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): It was indeed a pleasure to visit the Botanic Garden with the Public Works Committee on that August day when we considered the matter in the sunshine and amidst the botanical beauties of the gardens. The member for Finniss and I strolled down North Terrace, that beautifully refurbished terrace, though we were not hand-in-hand, and we admired along the way the wonderful work done by the former Liberal government in doing up North Terrace, the State Library, the Museum, the Art Gallery and the university. We entered the gates of the Botanic Garden and went down to see what is a very worthwhile project.

As my friend the member for Finniss has pointed out, the opposition supports the investment. I think it snuck in over the \$4 million public works requirement by about \$100 000, but it was a very convivial day. I should have taken my hat because I got a bit sunburnt. We then walked, of course, for the briefing and the hearing down to the wonderfully refurbished Herbarium in the former tram barn down on the main road there beside the Wine Centre. We could see the beautiful work of the former Liberal government which, of course, refurbished the tram barn amidst great controversy.

I remember there were a lot of protests about the Herbarium moving from the Wine Centre site to its new location. I remember the Labor Party going around and saying that the world was going to end, that it was going to be terribly unpopular and that it was a waste of money. But, of course, we sat there resplendent in the antique furnishings of the new Herbarium—and I would commend to all members a visit to that location. It is a beautiful bit of architecture. I love the joinery. If you are into doorframes, doors and joinery, it is a place you will really enjoy. We heard a very convincing argument from the proponents of this waterlily project that it should go ahead. By the time we left there, the member for Finniss and I were absolutely convinced that this was a good investment to make.

Sitting across the road was another very good investment: the Wine Centre. We remember that the Premier and the Treasurer demolished that single-handedly and scuttled the whole thing at great cost to the taxpayer, but that is another story. I would not want to stray off the subject of the motion which is, of course, the waterlily pavilion.

The Botanic Garden is an asset to the state. It really is a gem. It is world class and I think the waterlily pavilion is going to be a very fine investment on behalf of the taxpayers in a future for our kids, because they will be able to go there and see an absolutely splendid example of a botanic pavilion. We support the motion and look forward to the quick development of the project.

Mr KENYON (Newland): I rise briefly to support this report and to place on record my thanks to the Director of the Adelaide Botanic Garden for his tour.

Mr Pengilly: Steve Forbes.

Mr KENYON: It was Steve Forbes. I thank the member for Finniss for reminding me. Mr Forbes was an enthusiastic and passionate advocate for the gardens and very knowledgeable, and it really was an informative morning. I would like to place on record my appreciation of that. I also commend the report to the house. It is a worthwhile project, as the member for Waite said. It will be excellent for our children

to be able to go and see it at some point. I am looking forward to taking my children there when it is completed.

I am tempted to respond to the member for Waite and his enjoyment of the Wine Centre. I think it should be placed on record that it was the Treasurer, in fact, who was able to pull together a plan to save the Wine Centre, which was in dire financial straits. It was uneconomic; no tourists were visiting and it was—

Mr Bignell interjecting:

Mr KENYON: Exactly right. The member for Mawson is correct when he says it was a folly of the Liberal government. It was poorly conceived, it was poorly marketed, and that is why it was in such great trouble when we finally came into government. Through the hard work of the Treasurer and his officers, who were able to find a workable plan—I think Mr Bruce Carter was involved in that and he should be congratulated for his efforts—it now seems to be running quite smoothly.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Hamilton-Smith:

That a select committee be established and inquire into public transport service levels and, in particular to:

- (a) the reliability, reach and breadth of services, convenience and safety;
- (b) the affordability of bus, rail and tram services across the greater Adelaide metropolitan area; and
- (c) options open for improvement of affordable public transport services in the future.

(Continued from 30 August. Page 782.)

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): I rise to support the member for Waite's motion. I believe it is important that we have an in-depth look at the whole public transport system in South Australia. There has been a lot of conjecture and a lot of bad decisions have been made. There have been a lot of budget overruns and many things are inherently wrong with the system at the moment. It is my belief that a public transport select committee across the board—given that, as the member for Waite said, quite clearly the government would have the majority on that select committee—would be a worthwhile and useful exercise for South Australia.

It is all very well to take note of your departmental staff and there have been some inherent problems at departmental level that the current Minister for Transport has had to deal with. However, there seems to have been a series of ongoing cataclysmic disasters, overruns and God knows what else in that department. So I lend my support to the member for Waite in his desire to have a select committee look at it.

There is a multitude of things that we can actually look at in a select committee such as this. We have the tram issue, and we have buses and trains; we have all sorts of things in South Australia, but I guess one of the things in which I do take a great interest in relation to public transport is the methods of the propulsion and fuelling of public transport. I think this is a good opportunity to have a look at alternative fuel technology to drive public transport in South Australia, and this could be done by a select committee.

Quite clearly, there has been a failure by this Labor government to get its head around the public transport issue. The government is not contributing to the debate. Where is the Minister for Transport? He comes in here gesticulating and giving us a hard time during question time, but, right now, I am afraid he is nowhere to be seen—and I am

disappointed about that. I am a great supporter of public transport; I use it whenever possible. I see both the good parts and the pitfalls of public transport. Indeed, I see some of the problems that occur on public transport in South Australia, more particularly in Adelaide. We have little or nothing by way of public transport outside the metropolitan area; indeed, that is something else we could probably look at. I do believe that the supposed announcements of changes to the public transport bus routes and God knows what else that are coming up Friday before—

Mr Piccolo: Talk to the people of Angle Vale about public transport and the Liberal Party. They really love you people out there, I can tell you. They had a bus system for six months, and it closed down. Excellent system!

Mr PENGILLY: If members opposite wish to say a few words, they are more than welcome at the conclusion of my remarks. I have the floor at the moment, and, while they interject, I will keep talking. Public transport in South Australia is a critical area.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Light is out of his place.

Mr PENGILLY: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. This is a critical issue for South Australia. The future of public transport in South Australia deserves the Labor government and the Minister for Transport taking a good look at our public transport system. We need to look to the future. I think that, along with many other things, we are not looking very far ahead at all. We have to look at what is in the best interests of the future of the South Australian public transport system. We have to look at the trains, buses and trams. There is no plan in relation to them. We have a State Strategic Plan, but, for the life of me, I cannot see anything about public transport in it.

I believe that the motion is a good one. The bus and train fare hike of about 10 per cent will not be well received by the public. The public of South Australia have had no tax relief, and the government has increased charges on public transport. The other day, when I was travelling on the tram between the city and Glenelg, I was rather astounded at the number of people who, when they got on, shuddered when they had to buy their ticket. A huge number of people in this state have little or no income to travel, and bus, trains, trams and the like are their only method of getting around. I feel inherently sorry for them. I am aware that the public transport system will always be disadvantaged financially, and my colleague the member for Waite is aware of that as well.

I think we can do it a lot better. In Perth, where they are spending a fortune on public transport, they are extending the train down to Mandurah, some 100 kilometres south of Perth, and they are putting in a tunnel from the bank of the Swan River up through to the central train station. These are things we need to look at, and a select committee could do that. Rather than coming in and getting belted around the ears day by day by the transport minister, I think it is time we adopted a bipartisan approach and had a good look by way of a select committee at the problems with the public transport system—and perhaps we could have a good look at the problems in the department of transport generally. I support the member for Waite in his desire to have a select committee.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I rise to lend my support to the motion of the member for Waite. Public transport is very important in this—and every other state, probably. It seems to me that select committees do some of the most valuable

work that is done by this parliament because of their bipartisan (or nonpartisan) nature.

The Hon. R.B. Such interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: I note the agreement of the member for Fisher, who has chaired a committee or two of which I have been a member, and he has done that very well. We need to start looking at the whole area of public transport in a more visionary way, and the only way for us to really do that is not to just rely on bureaucrats who tend to be focused on one budget to the next but to look at other options.

When I was in Melbourne, I had a briefing from the public transport people there. They have a very complex public transport system, of course: more trams by far than this city—a huge network of trams—as well as the buses and an extensive train network. They indicated, though, that their aim, their big vision statement, is 20 by 2020, by which they mean achieving a 20 per cent usage of public transport by the year 2020. At the moment their public transport usage runs at about 8 per cent. They indicated, during the course of this briefing I had with them, that they will be lucky if they can get 15 per cent—that is, about a doubling of what they currently have in terms of usage—on this extensive and complex network they have in Victoria. That means that the reality is that, at the moment, if we were extremely successful in running public transport systems, 85 per cent of journeys would still not be on public transport.

We need to be considering the big picture issues about the environment and the way in which we now live. I have a suspicion that, if we continue with the public transport system the way it has been to date, we have already passed the peak point for that public transport. When people generally did not own their own car and when people generally worked 9 to 5 in the CBD, that is probably when public transport was at its peak. Unless we start to think innovatively about how to provide more flexible transport options for those in the community who cannot afford the penalties imposed on owning a car (not just the car but the running costs: petrol, insurance and all the other things, as well as parking) it will be difficult to conceive that people in the lower economic areas are going to be able to afford their own car. Therefore, if we are going to allow them to travel on public transport, we need to be a bit visionary about how we provide that public transport, and providing simply routes into the CBD during peak hour will not be sufficient.

I am a great lover and user of public transport, and I try to use it wherever I go. In the past I have used it in Hawaii, where they have a wonderful thing called 'the bus'. You pay a fixed amount to get onto the bus. It does not matter whether you get on and travel one stop or get on and travel further around the island of Oahu, the bus costs the same. There is an extraordinary level of public usage of that public transport system.

I have used public transport in Sydney. Recently, when in Sydney, I bought a \$15 fare which allowed me to go anywhere on all the ferries, trains and buses in Sydney for the day. It was an extraordinarily good value option. I have not travelled around the world very much, but, recently, my sister has been doing a lot of travel on cruise ships. Every day the passengers got off the cruise ship wherever they were, they simply got on public transport in that city or town and away they would go to explore the area, just using public transport.

I think there is a great deal of merit in the proposal by the member for Waite to have a select committee. It would enable members in a non-partisan way to look at the bigger picture issues in terms of how to address the need for public

transport and balance it against the fact that, at present, at the most only 15 per cent of people would be using public transport in its current form. Unless we find other ways in which to look at public transport and use a select committee to do that, in the longer term we will be doing a disservice to the people of this state who need and rely on public transport.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): I support the call for a select committee to be established, but I want to speak specifically as it relates to regional areas.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: You'd better amend the motion then, because it doesn't include that.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, it does. Paragraph (c) refers to 'the options open for improvement of affordable public transport services in the future'.

The Hon. R.J. McEwen: Read it in context with the second paragraph.

Mr GRIFFITHS: I've considered it differently. Those who live in the metropolitan area are very lucky that, no matter where they are, they can jump on a train, tram, bus or taxi, but there are very few options for people who live in regional areas. The age profile of people living in regional areas makes it even harder. In many cases, they moved to the country because they wanted a sea change, or whatever. Sometimes they live a long way from hospitals, and it is difficult to get to dentists and doctors. As those people age and they have difficulty driving, or if their partner who does the majority of the driving passes away, they are dependent totally on friends or some form of informal network to provide them with transport to important appointments.

Within the southern Yorke Peninsula area, a service was established about four years ago by the Passenger Transport Board. It operates on a two-week cycle and services all the communities south of Curramulka. That was a fantastic commitment. The government made a commitment to fund that service for five years. The people who use that service and who meet the eligibility criteria can get a return ticket for \$5—which is very cheap—but without that service people really struggle.

In the doorknocking that I undertook prior to the election, particularly in the Adelaide Plains area, people from Mallala and Balaklava—predominantly older people, but a lot of people in regional areas are older—were very concerned about how they would get anywhere. Their children have moved away. We all know that the global family which now exists means that generations of families do not necessarily live close together, so they rely on friends or older relatives in the area. We need to ensure that the select committee gives consideration to regional South Australians. Some 25 per cent of the population of South Australia live outside the metropolitan area. It is important that a return of their tax dollars allows them to access public transport.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: AFTON HOUSE REDEVELOPMENT

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Ciccarello:

That the 243rd report of the committee entitled Afton House Redevelopment be noted.

(Continued from 20 September. Page 887.)

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I want to comment on this proposed redevelopment, which I know is supported by the

Public Works Committee within its terms of reference. I thank the house for the indulgence granted to me last week to allow this matter to be adjourned so that I had a chance to read the report and make a few comments. Prior to the election I had occasion to meet with some members of the South-East City Residents Association who are quite concerned about the nature of this redevelopment—I think with good reason. Members would know that I am very much one who favours improvements in social justice areas, and I recognise that the proposal, hopefully, will lead to an improvement.

However, the point made by the residents' committee from the south-east sector of the city has some validity. Their point is that they have moved into the city but, in terms of homeless people, people with a mental health illness or psychiatric difficulties or a drug addiction and problems such as that tend to be congregating in the city because that is where the services are provided. Instead of those people with those sorts of difficulties being dispersed through the community in the same sorts of ratios as they appear throughout the population, what happens is that, when they are facing homelessness or have drug or alcohol issues, they tend to congregate and be dealt with in the city. They are not being dealt with in the area from which they have come.

I have driven through Light Square on occasions, and I have seen the food vans pull up in the middle of Light Square. It is almost like seeing sheep going towards feed that has been brought into an empty paddock during a drought. People just come out of the woodwork and arrive from nowhere, and they are all around the city.

I was interested to read the report. One of the defined functions of the Public Works Committee includes inquiring into the present and prospective public value of the work. So, I think that consideration of that issue was within the terms of reference. In terms of consultation, the report indicates the following:

The issues raised by adjoining neighbours about the management of residents and congregation on South Terrace will be addressed through improved design and engagement, with support agencies visiting Afton House.

I do not want to question the workings of the committee, but it seemed odd to me when I read that the list of witnesses and submissions included only people who worked for the Department for Families and Communities. Three gentlemen from that department attended before the committee at Old Parliament House on 16 August this year. However, no-one from the South-East City Residents Association attended and I could not find any reference in the report to their being invited to attend or put in a submission, or that they had been made aware of the work. So, on the face of it, although there is an assurance that their interests have been taken into account, there is no evidence in the report of the committee that anyone heard directly from those residents.

With that in mind, I was somewhat comforted to note that this building, which was purchased by the Housing Trust in 1977, originally housed some 257 single adults in 2003-04 and that the current proposal is for even fewer than what was contained in the proposal that was accepted last year. Originally, it was to be reduced to 122 bed places, and it has now gone down to 99 residents in 95 rooms. They are allocated on the basis of about 50 rooms with ensuite bathroom facilities and a kitchenette, which provides self-contained accommodation for longer term residents; 21 rooms on a room only basis for immediate short-term housing; and 24 rooms with ensuite bathroom facilities for

medium-term residents. There will be a mix of people. A total number of fewer than 100 people is, I am sure, of some comfort to the South-East City Residents Association. I also note that some of the rooms are being designed to accommodate people with disabilities (I was pleased to see that, as shadow minister for disability), and nine rooms in the new proposal are specifically designed to allow disabled access.

Another concern of mine was that the fencing around the building, as it currently appears, is unsightly, to say the least (or, at least it was the last time I saw it). The report indicates that, whilst the front boundary fence will be redeveloped so that it affords security for the development but also allows visual appreciation of the front of the heritage building (presumably, some reasonably nice fencing will be erected), the remainder of the site perimeter will be alternatively fenced to minimise unsolicited intrusion onto the site. What springs to mind is high-rise barbed wire. I was somewhat disturbed to think that, given that a lot of money—\$13 million, which includes allowances for furniture and fixtures and so on—is to be spent on a beautiful old heritage building, it would be a shame if the people concerned do not at the same time work out fencing for the perimeter which not only will be sufficient to keep unwelcome and unsolicited intrusion from the site but will also be reasonably nice to look at for the residents of the surrounding houses.

After having read the report, I believe that, hopefully, there will be an overall improvement to the site. It will accommodate fewer people by far than it accommodated at earlier dates. I hope that it will improve the overall look—I recall reading that some unwanted additions, and so on, will be removed. I hope I can trust that the advice that was clearly given to the committee, to the effect that the residents in the area have had their concerns addressed, is correct and that that was the reason why they did not attend the hearings on 16 August (or on any other date) to give evidence directly to the committee. I hope that there is a speedy conclusion to the project and a good outcome for the building, the people who will reside in it and the residents of the south-eastern corner of the city.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NORTHGATE STAGE 3

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Ciccarello:

That the 244th report of the committee entitled Northgate Stage 3 Land Development Joint Venture be noted.

(Continued from 20 September. Page 888.)

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens): I rise to support this report and contribute briefly on the third stage of the Northgate development, which is in my electorate. Some of my colleagues on this side of the house know that I have some trepidation about the extremely high density housing that is being proposed. However, I accept that we need to ensure that we provide affordable housing in suburban areas and that we need an innovative approach to land management. I think we can certainly see that in this proposed development.

The Northgate 3 development offers an opportunity to develop a state-of-the-art urban environment that moves away from the Australian tradition of a quarter acre block—and I am a keen gardener, I guess it is one of my great passions. It is not only the cost of the land that needs to be considered, it is also the cost associated with servicing an ever-increasing urban sprawl. Northgate Stage 3 should be a model for

sustainable urban development, and I know that the Land Management Corporation and CIC joint venture has set itself a number of key objectives, including:

- a five-star energy rating for all dwellings;
- all dwellings to have a solar hot water system or an equivalent energy-efficient hot water system (instantaneous gas is one example);
- a GreenSmart display village will be built to showcase state-of-the-art, energy-efficient, climate-responsive housing (the joint-venture partners see this display village as being a forum for sustainability education);
- retention of most of the stormwater from the site to maximise reuse;
- all residents to be within 400 metres of public transport;
- CIC will also conduct a feasibility study of a car-sharing arrangement called GoGet, which is Australia's first professional car sharing arrangement and which currently operates in Sydney and Melbourne (I have had conversations with some people there and it is very successful);
- all dwellings are to have access to modern information and communications technology, with access to high-speed broadband infrastructure and services—in fact, the subdivision is to be designed to accommodate FTTP, or Fibre to the Premises. Oddly enough, accessing broadband in parts of my electorate that have only recently been developed is very difficult for residents, and sometimes that can be just from one house to another, one house can have it and the next one cannot.
- a community civic place will be developed with a formal civic centre and venue for community activities and events;
- 8 hectares have been set aside for seniors living, although there is some discussion about exactly how that will take place; and
- a minimum of 15 per cent of the development has been set aside for social and affordable housing.

Given that Northgate 3 will be a high-tech development of the future, there is a need to ensure that education facilities are developed close by to service this and other nearby communities. There are a number of excellent primary schools in close proximity at Hampstead Gardens, Hillcrest and Northfield. The Hampstead Gardens primary school has an excellent Aboriginal education program, while Hillcrest Primary School has an oral/aural hearing centre of excellence. I would also like to say that Northfield is an extremely developing community and has a great focus on literacy, to name just one aspect of the school.

Unfortunately, the nearby Ross Smith Secondary School has been included in discussion about some of the schools that may be amalgamating. We are now looking at this as a possible new venture, one about which we are extremely excited, and within our community we are talking about what we consider will be the world-class educational institution that is to be developed and constructed. We believe we have a site that would accommodate that, and I will certainly be doing all I can to talk about where we think this new school should be.

Finally, I would like to commend the joint venture partners CIC and the LMC. They have been, and no doubt will continue to be, a pleasure to work with, and I would like to congratulate them on their current approach to consultation. They have not only sought to consult with government at state and local levels but also with local schools and the community at large—and the involvement of the community is essential if we are to build a sustainable, community-

friendly, urban environment that is affordable for average and low income earners. I sincerely thank them for the advice they have given to my office and to the community. They have been a pleasure to work with.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (FORESIGHT COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from September 20. Page 888.)

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher): Members will recall that I got part way through the second reading before I was cut down by the Deputy Clerk's monitoring of the clock. As I started to explain a week ago, the purpose of this bill is to look at the big picture issues that we do not get time to look at, and cannot look at, under the current committee arrangements of the parliament.

I have been on many of the committees—Economic and Finance, Social Development, and Environment, Resources and Development—and have also been a minister, and I know that as a minister you do not have time to look too far into the future because you are usually flat out trying to deal with the issues of the day—and I am sure that others who are, or who have been, ministers will agree. If you are doing your job you barely have time to scratch yourself, let alone think about the implications for South Australia of major and significant issues down the track. Even select committees, which have a place (and I have chaired three of them in the last four years), are, by their very nature, ad hoc and may or may not arise to look at an issue.

The foresight committee would, if it were established, be a joint house committee and would follow the pattern that I briefly outlined last week, which is adopted in many countries, including the United Kingdom. The committee there is in the Public Service, and I argue that it is best to have it within the parliamentary arena, because you can still bring in the public servants to give advice, you can bring in people from the private sector, and other experts to give advice. Ultimately, the parliament needs to be informed about issues, because the parliament will be making the decisions. The countries that have really prospered, such as Japan, Germany, England (as part of the UK), and so on, have certainly taken a foresight type of approach to issues.

What sort of issues would the committee look at? As I say, not the day-to-day issues that confront the Economic and Finance or Social Development committees, but issues, for example, such as the ageing of our population and the implications of that for services for our community? How will we deal with an issue like that? It could look at changes in agriculture, for example, that will come upon us, not simply because of possible climatic changes, but changes in technology, lifestyle, and so on. How far down the track are we actually focused in terms of possible changes in agriculture? How far into the future are we looking in terms of new trends in manufacturing, and how well-equipped are we to deal with those? We know that some of our industries are into robotics, and techniques like that, but you need to have a big picture focus if you want to deal with those sort of issues.

Nanotechnology—small particle technology—will become one of the most fundamental, society-changing innovations in the future. As a society, we need to focus on it, and as a parliament we need to be informed about it. We have had the IT revolution; we are still feeling the consequences of that.

We have had the biotechnology revolution; we are still feeling the consequences of that. In terms of the nanotechnology revolution, which will really affect us dramatically in the not-too-distant future, we need to be aware of the consequences of that.

There are different ways of transmitting electricity, and new health innovations through nanotechnology, restoring sight, correcting paraplegia, and things like that. It is not science fiction. It is already possible, and it will have a dramatic impact on our lifestyle, because we can now manipulate the molecular structure of things. As I have pointed out in this house before, the difference between a piece of wood and a piece of steel is basically the molecular structure, and we can now alter those. We are not far off having a society which will be dramatically different from anything that we now have or presently envisage.

We need to look at issues such as education. What sort of education system should we develop, not for next week, but five, 10, 15, 20 or 30 years down the track? They are the sort of issues that this committee would be looking at. What are the consequences of infill urban development? Governments and parliaments tend to make decisions based usually on the view of what has happened recently, if you are lucky, or maybe what is happening at the moment, but very rarely are we able to look in advance. This is not meant to be an exercise in crystal ball gazing. It is designed to become aware of all the challenges that are emerging, and then develop and recommend ways in which to influence the future and cope with the changes that are likely to emerge.

What would we need to do in regard to an ageing population? Some things might seem obvious, others are less obvious. There will be changes in the profile of the work force, so people might be working until they are 70 or 80 years old. It sounds a little far-fetched now, but it is quite possible. I have had expert advice from people in some of the pioneering areas of science who argue that it is not in the realm of fantasy to argue that, technically, people could live forever. That would throw up some interesting consequences, if people were able to have their body renewed, and some of us might need the renewal sooner than others. I have heard from people who are not crackpots, but who are very learned researchers, who have argued to me that it is quite feasible for people to live forever on earth with the technology that is almost at hand. Imagine the consequences of that scenario emerging.

In regard to genetic engineering of crops and animals, we are well aware that a bill is before the house, and I will not be reflecting on that. The community and the parliament need to be aware of the consequences of that genetic engineering. We have only seen a trickle of it so far, but we will see huge dramatic consequences down the track.

Debate adjourned.

DENTAL PRACTICE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Dental Practice Act 2001; and to make related amendments to the Chiropractic and Osteopathy Practice Act 2005, the Medical Practice Act 2004, the Occupational Therapy Practice Act 2005, the Physiotherapy Practice Act 2005 and the Podiatry Practice Act 2005. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have a second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The purpose of the *Dental Practice (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2006* is to amend the *Dental Practice Act 2001* to ensure consistency with government policy and the expectations and obligations of all registered health practitioners and registration Boards. The Bill is based on the *Medical Practice Act 2004* template and other health practitioner legislation recently passed by Parliament.

Consistent with the Government's commitment to National Competition Policy the Bill removes ownership restrictions from the current Act. The removal of the ownership restrictions allows a dental services provider, being a person who is not a registered dental practitioner, to provide dental treatment through the instrumentality of a registered dental practitioner. It will now be possible for any fit and proper person to own a dental clinic. The removal of the ownership restrictions will ensure that the Government has properly met its National Competition Policy obligations for this legislation.

Like the *Medical Practice Act 2004*, there will be some new regulatory requirements placed on dental services providers to ensure that there is accountability for the quality of services provided by non-registered providers and to ensure that the health and safety of consumers is not put at risk. These requirements include the need for dental services providers to provide certain information to the Board and the need to report medical unfitness and unprofessional conduct of a dental practitioner or a dental student. In this way the Board can ensure that all services are provided in a manner consistent with a code of conduct or professional standard, and the interest of the public is protected. The Board may also make a report to the Minister about any concerns it may have arising out of the information provided to it. Consumer protection is ensured by these and other measures that require dental services providers and those in a position of authority in a trust or other corporate entity to act legally and professionally in the consumer's health interest.

The definition of dental services provider in the Bill excludes "exempt providers". This ensures that recognised hospitals, incorporated health centres or private hospitals within the meaning of the *South Australian Health Commission Act 1976*, for which the Minister of Health is responsible, are not accountable to both the Minister and the Board for the services they provide. They are therefore exempt from the services provider provisions in the Act. However, they still have an obligation to report medical unfitness and unprofessional conduct to the Board.

Section 88 of the current Act, which relates to the protection of members and employees of the Board from personal liability, is to be repealed. Immunity of Board members and employees is now covered by the *Public Sector Management Act 1995*, as amended by the *Statutes Amendment (Honesty and Accountability in Government) Act 2003*. This Act provides a clear framework for the operation of the public sector, including the Dental Board of South Australia.

The Bill proposes to deal with medical fitness in the same way as it is managed under the *Medical Practice Act 2004*. That is, where a determination is made of a person's fitness to provide dental treatment; regard is given to the person's ability to provide dental treatment without endangering a patient's health or safety. This includes consideration of communicable diseases.

Section 53 – offences by inspectors will not remain in the Act because there are other means by which to deal effectively with any inappropriate conduct by inspectors. These include disciplinary action under the *Public Sector Management Act 1995* for inspectors who are public sector employees and civil action against those inspectors who are private employees. This is consistent with the other health practitioner registration Acts.

Other amendments include:

- references to associations' representative of dental practitioners have been replaced with the concept of representative bodies, with the relevant bodies to be prescribed in the regulations. These representative bodies will be entitled to appear before the Board to speak to an application under certain circumstances;
- replacing the personal address of a practitioner on the register with a nominated contact address to protect the privacy of the practitioner;
- making provision for casual vacancies for an elected position to be filled on the Board without the need for the Board to call an election. This ensures that elections are

conducted by the State Electoral Office under a proportional voting system and enables the Governor to appoint a member where an election fails or where a casual vacancy cannot be filled on the basis of the results of the election. An amendment to the *Medical Practice Act 2004* has also been made to ensure consistency with government policy and other health practitioner legislation;

- changing the terms of membership of the Board so that a person can only hold a position on the Board for three consecutive 3-year terms after which they must step down;
- making provision to prevent the use of legal professional privilege and self incrimination as a means of avoiding the revealing of information under the Act;
- making provision for the Board to receive any revenue from fines resulting from offences against the Act.

These and several other minor amendments to the wording of the Act have been made to ensure that the *Dental Practice Act 2001* is consistent with that of the *Medical Practice Act 2004* and the other health practitioner registration Acts that have recently been passed by Parliament.

I now turn to further amendments that have been made to the Act as a result of the consultation process with stakeholders, including the Dental Board, professional associations, and consumer associations. These amendments will provide for greater public protection, increased fairness for practitioners and will better support the powers and processes of the Dental Board.

Under the current Act the Board has the power to suspend the registration of the practitioner who is the subject of disciplinary proceedings. However, where the Board determines that the complaint should be referred to the Tribunal, the Board can no longer exercise these powers. Where it is not possible to get an urgent hearing before the Tribunal, the consequence is that the person who is the subject of the proceedings is allowed to continue practising to the potential detriment of public health and safety. Consistent with its function to regulate the practice of dentistry in the public interest and to avoid this situation occurring the powers of the Board to suspend or impose conditions on a person's registration have been extended to apply until the complaint has been heard and determined by the Tribunal, or until the Tribunal revokes or varies the orders imposed by the Board.

The Board currently has the power to suspend the registration of a practitioner who is the subject of disciplinary proceedings for up to 1 month. This has been amended to allow the Board to suspend a practitioner's registration for a period of up to 3 months. This amendment will give the Board flexibility in determining the period of suspension to apply in those cases that are not serious enough to be referred to the Tribunal, but where a suspension of one month would be inadequate.

In addition the Bill includes an amendment to make it clear that the Board can lay a complaint to the Tribunal without there first being a complaint to the Board. The inclusion of an express provision for this purpose in the Act will avoid potential difficulties and challenges to the validity of a complaint by the Board to the Tribunal. Because this and the previous 2 issues could also arise under the *Medical Practice Act 2004*, amendments to that Act will also be necessary.

Another amendment gives the Board and the Tribunal the power to impose conditions on a person's registration, in addition to the power to suspend a person's registration, pending hearing and determination of disciplinary proceedings. The Board and the Tribunal would apply these powers where they are of the opinion that it is desirable to do so in the public interest. This is more equitable application of the provision whilst still protecting the health and safety of the public. An amendment to the powers of the Tribunal under the *Medical Practice Act 2004* will also be necessary.

Amendment has been made for the scope of practice for prosthetists to be removed from the Act and placed in the Regulations, similar to the situation for dental therapists and dental hygienists. This amendment will make it considerably easier to update the scope of practice for prosthetists in the future to allow for technological advances and other changes in the profession. A further amendment is the removal of the "advanced dental prosthetist" register to ensure that this register is consistent with those of other jurisdictions. Instead there will be a single register for dental prosthetists with partial dentures only able to be provided by those prosthetists that have been specifically authorised, in writing, by the Board to do so.

The scope of practice of dental technicians has been amended to specifically include corrective appliances. In the current Act

corrective appliances are not included as part of the practice of dental technology. This amendment will ensure that corrective appliances are not constructed without being prescribed by a dental practitioner who is registered to provide such corrective services.

Amendment has been made so that when inquiring into the medical fitness of a dental practitioner or dental student the Board can make an order to both impose conditions on the person's registration restricting their right to provide dental treatment, and at the same time require the person to undergo counselling or treatment. In certain circumstances it may be that in the interests of public health and safety and the registered practitioner to do both. This amendment gives the Board the power to restrict a practitioner's right to provide dental treatment and where it considers it appropriate to require that person to undergo counselling or treatment. To ensure consistency across the legislation, amendments have also been made to comparable sections in all health practitioner registration Acts, including the *Medical Practice Act 2004*.

All recently passed health practitioner registration Acts, including the *Medical Practice Act 2004*, are being amended in relation to fitness of members of a Board that is a body corporate where that person has been disqualified from managing corporations under Chapter 2D Part 2D.6 of the *Commonwealth Corporations Act 2001*. This amendment will provide greater protection for practitioners and the public by ensuring that all members of a Board are fit and proper persons to hold such a position.

A further amendment will remove the requirement from the *Medical Practice Act 2004* and the other recently passed health practitioner registration Acts that all practitioners be insured for the costs of disciplinary action awarded against them. This provision was proposed by the then Medical Board to address situations where the Board found itself confronted with considerable costs when it could not recover the costs awarded against a medical practitioner arising out of a disciplinary proceeding. Because this Act was the template for the other health registration Acts and these other registration boards supported this provision, it was included in these Acts also.

Since the *Medical Practice Act* was passed further information provided to the Department has indicated that it is an uncommon occurrence for the Board to be unable to recover its costs. The provision to address this situation will create an unreasonable cost impost on medical practitioners with little public benefit and therefore I have decided that it should be removed for the benefit of all registered health practitioners. The Boards will continue to meet these costs as they have done in the past.

Schedule 1 of the *Dental Practice (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2006* sets out the proposed amendments to the *Medical Practice Act 2004*, as well as the amendments to the other health practitioner registration Acts mentioned previously. The amendments in this Schedule will better support the processes and powers of the Medical and other Boards and provide greater fairness and equity for practitioners.

In addition, included in Schedule 1 are amendments to sections 25 and 56 of the *Medical Practice Act 2004* based on an instruction from the Attorney-General that in establishing specialist Tribunals, no reference is to be made to the method of appointing a District Court Judge.

Consistent with the function of the Board to oversee the practice of the relevant profession in the public interest, all of the other Acts are being amended so that, pending hearing and determination of proceedings, the Board may suspend or impose conditions on a person's registration only if it is desirable to do so in the public interest. This "public interest" test only applies to this section of the Acts and enables the Boards to consider broader criteria for suspending registration or imposing conditions than is currently the case.

By following the model of the *Medical Practice Act 2004*, this and the other recently passed health practitioner registration Acts will have consistently applied standards and expectations for all services provided by registered health practitioners. This will be of benefit to all health consumers who can feel confident that no matter which kind of registered health professional they consult, they can expect consistency in the standards and the processes of the registration Boards.

I believe this Bill will provide an improved system for ensuring the health and safety of the public in regulating the dental profession in South Australia and I commend it to all members.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

Clauses 1 to 3 are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Dental Practice Act 2001*

4—Amendment of long title

The amendment to the long title of the Act is consequential on the amendments to the Act relating to dental services providers.

5—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts definitions and other interpretation provisions.

6—Amendment of section 4—Medical fitness to provide dental treatment

This clause removes a reference to "prescribed communicable infection".

7—Amendment of section 6—Composition of Board

This clause makes a number of minor amendments to the provisions relating to the constitution of the Board.

8—Insertion of section 6A

6A—Elections and casual vacancies

This section requires elections to choose registered dentists for appointment as members of the Board be held in accordance with the principles of proportional representation. It enables the Governor to appoint persons as members in the event of the failure of an election or in the event of a casual vacancy in the membership of the Board.

9—Amendment of section 7—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause amends section 7 to prevent a member of the Board from holding office for consecutive terms that exceed 9 years in total. It adds a provision that has the effect of making a member's office vacant if the member is disqualified from managing corporations. The section is also amended to allow a member of the Board who resigns before proceedings under Part 5 are completed to continue to act as member of the Board for the purpose of hearing and determining those proceedings.

10—Amendment of section 13—Functions of Board

This clause confers additional functions on the Board and sets out requirements in relation to administrative processes established by the Board to deal with complaints.

11—Amendment of section 14—Committees

This clause amends section 14 to enable committees of the Board to be established to provide advice to the Registrar of the Board.

12—Amendment of section 16—Board's procedures

This clause amends section 16 to enable members of the Board to express concurrence with a proposed resolution of the Board by e-mail.

13—Substitution of section 17

17—Conflict of interest etc under Public Sector Management Act

This section provides that a member of the Board will not be taken to have a direct or indirect interest in a matter for the purposes of the *Public Sector Management Act 1995* by reason only of the fact that the member has an interest in the matter that is shared in common with dental practitioners generally or a substantial section of dental practitioners in this State.

14—Amendment of section 18—Powers of Board in relation to witnesses etc

This clause empowers the Board to require a written English translation and translator's certificate in relation to documents not in English to be produced to the Board.

15—Amendment of section 19—Principles governing hearings

This clause inserts a provision requiring the Board to keep parties to proceedings before the Board properly informed as to the progress and outcome of the proceedings.

16—Amendment of section 21—Costs

This clause provides for costs awarded by the Board to be taxed by a Master of the District Court rather than the Supreme Court.

17—Amendment of section 23—Annual report

This clause inserts a provision requiring certain additional information to be included in an annual report of the Board to the Minister.

18—Amendment of section 25—Composition of Tribunal

This clause provides for the President of the Dental Practice Professional Tribunal to be the Chief Judge or another Judge of the District Court.

19—Amendment of section 26—Terms and conditions of appointed members

This clause makes a number of minor amendments to the wording of section 26 so that it applies only to appointed members of the Tribunal. It also provides for the office of a member of the Tribunal to become vacant if the member becomes disqualified from managing corporations.

20—Substitution of section 29

29—Registrar of Tribunal

This section provides for the person for the time being holding or acting in the office of Registrar of the District Court to be the Registrar of the Tribunal.

29A—Constitution of Tribunal for purpose of proceedings

This section sets out how the Tribunal is to be constituted for the purpose of disciplinary proceedings under the Act and empowers the member presiding over proceedings to deal with questions of laws and certain other technical matters sitting alone.

29B—Protection from personal liability

This section protects members of the Tribunal and the Registrar from personal liability for acts or omissions in good faith in the performance or purported performance of statutory functions or duties. Liability instead lies against the Crown.

21—Amendment of heading to Part 4

This clause amends the heading to Part 4 to encompass practice as well as registration.

22—Amendment of section 30—Registers

This clause makes a number of minor amendments to the provisions dealing with the keeping of registers.

23—Amendment of section 31—Authority conferred by registration

This clause amends section 31 to remove the scope of practice of dental prosthetists to the regulations, to remove references to "advanced dental prosthetist" and to include the manufacture of corrective dental appliances in the scope of practice of dental technicians.

24—Amendment of section 32—Registration of natural persons as dental practitioners

This clause amends section 32 to require dental practitioners to be insured or indemnified against civil liabilities that may be incurred in connection with the provision of dental treatment as a dental practitioner.

25—Repeal of section 33

This clause repeals section 33 which provides for the registration of companies.

26—Amendment of section 34—Registration of dental students

This clause amends section 34 to require persons to be registered as dental students in order to be entitled to provide dental treatment in this State as part of a course of study related to dentistry that is being undertaken outside South Australia.

27—Amendment of section 35—Application for registration and provisional registration

This clause is consequential on clause 55 which inserts new section 73A empowering the Board to require information to be verified by statutory declaration.

28—Amendment of section 36—Removal from register

29—Amendment of section 37—Reinstatement on register
These clauses make minor technical amendments to the provisions dealing with removal from registers and reinstatement on registers.

30—Amendment of section 38—Fees and returns

This clause amends section 38 to require registered persons to furnish the Board with an annual return containing information relating to their practice of dentistry, continuing dental education and other matters relevant to registration.

31—Substitution of Part 4 Division 3

Division 3—Special provisions relating to dental services providers

39—Information to be given to Board by dental services providers

This section requires a dental services provider to notify the Board of the provider's name and address, the name and

address of the dental practitioners through the instrumentality of whom the provider is providing dental treatment and other information. It also requires the provider to notify the Board of any change in particulars required to be given to the Board and makes it an offence to contravene or fail to comply with the clause. A maximum penalty of \$10 000 is fixed. The Board is required to keep a record of information provided to the Board under this clause available for inspection at the office of the Board and may make it available to the public electronically.

32—Substitution of section 43

43—Illegal holding out concerning limitations or conditions

This section makes it an offence for a person whose registration is restricted, limited or conditional to hold himself or herself out, or permit another person to hold him or her out, as having registration that is unrestricted or not subject to a limitation or condition. It also makes it an offence for a person to hold out another whose registration is restricted, limited or conditional as having registration that is unrestricted or not subject to a limitation or condition. In each case a maximum penalty of \$50 000 or imprisonment for 6 months is fixed.

33—Amendment of section 44—Use of certain titles or descriptions prohibited

This clause removes unnecessary provisions. The amendments are consequential on the removal of references to "advanced dental prosthetist".

34—Amendment of section 45—Restrictions on provision of dental treatment by unqualified persons

This clause amends section 45 which makes it an offence for an unqualified person to provide dental treatment for fee or reward. The amendment allows dental treatment to be provided by unqualified persons through the instrumentality of qualified persons.

35—Repeal of sections 47 and 48

This clause removes provisions relating to practising in partnership and the employment of registered persons by companies registered under the Act.

36—Substitution of sections 49 and 50

49—Interpretation

This section provides that in Part 5 of the Act the terms *dental services provider*, *occupier of a position of authority* and *registered person* includes a person who is not but who was, at the relevant time, a dental services provider, an occupier of a position of authority or a registered person.

50—Cause for disciplinary action

This section specifies what constitutes proper cause for disciplinary action against a registered person, a dental services provider or a person occupying a position of authority in a corporate or trustee dental services provider.

37—Amendment of section 51—Powers of inspectors

This clause makes minor technical amendments to the provisions dealing with the powers of inspectors under the Act.

38—Repeal of section 53

This clause repeals section 53 which deals with certain offences by inspectors.

39—Amendment of section 54—Obligation to report medical unfitness or unprofessional conduct of dental practitioner or dental student

This clause amends section 54 to require dental services providers and exempt providers to report to the Board if of the opinion that a dental practitioner or dental student through whom the provider provides dental treatment has engaged in unprofessional conduct. A maximum penalty of \$10 000 is fixed for non-compliance.

40—Amendment of section 55—Medical fitness of dental practitioner or dental student

Section 55 of the Act empowers the Board to impose 1 of the following conditions on the registration of a dental practitioner or dental student who is medically unfit:

- a condition restricting the person's right to provide dental treatment;
- a condition requiring the person to undergo counselling or treatment or enter into any other undertaking.

This clause amends section 55 to enable the Board to impose both those conditions.

41—Amendment of section 56—Inquiries by Board as to matters constituting grounds for disciplinary action

This clause makes a number of amendments to the provisions relating to the Board's powers in disciplinary proceedings. It provides for a complaint to be made in a manner and form approved by the Board and requires the Board to give a respondent the opportunity to elect to have proceedings heard before the Tribunal. It also empowers the Board to suspend registration for up to 3 months (instead of the current maximum of 1 month), and enables the Board to fix a time within which a fine imposed by the Board must be paid, or to extend the time for the payment of a fine.

42—Amendment of section 57—Variation or revocation of conditions imposed by Board

This clause amends section 57 to enable representative bodies prescribed by the regulations to be heard on an application to the Board to vary or revoke conditions of registration of a dental practitioner or dental student.

43—Amendment of section 59—Provisions as to proceedings before Board

This clause amends section 59 to empower the member of the Board presiding over disciplinary proceedings to enter consent orders. It empowers the Board to make an interim order suspending registration or imposing registration conditions restricting practice rights if in the Board's opinion it is desirable to do so in the public interest. In addition, the clause amends the section to entitle a person aggrieved by conduct the subject of proceedings to be present at the hearing of the proceedings.

44—Amendment of section 60—Inquiries by Tribunal as to matters constituting grounds for disciplinary action

This clause amends section 60 to allow the Board to lay a complaint against a person before the Tribunal whether or not a complaint against the person has been laid before the Board. It also expands the Tribunal's disciplinary powers to enable it to prohibit a person from carrying on business as a dental services provider or from occupying a position of authority in a corporate or trustee dental services provider.

45—Amendment of section 62—Provisions as to proceedings before Tribunal

This clause amends section 62 to empower the Tribunal to make an interim order suspending registration or imposing registration conditions restricting practice rights if the Tribunal is of the opinion that it is desirable to do in the public interest. It also enables the Tribunal to vary or revoke such an order made by the Board where a case before the Board is transferred to the Tribunal.

46—Amendment of section 63—Powers of Tribunal

This clause empowers the Tribunal to require a written English translation and translator's certificate in relation to documents not in English to be produced to the Tribunal.

47—Substitution of section 64**64—Costs**

This section enables costs awarded by the Tribunal against a party to proceedings before it to be fixed by the Tribunal or taxed by a Master of the District Court.

64A—Contravention of prohibition order

This section makes it an offence for a person to contravene an order prohibiting the person from engaging in business as a dental services provider or occupying a position of authority in a corporate or trustee dental services provider. It also makes it an offence for a person to contravene or fail to comply with a condition imposed by the Tribunal as to the conduct of the person or the person's business. The maximum penalty in each case is \$75 000 or imprisonment for 6 months.

64B—Register of prohibition orders

This section requires the Registrar of the Tribunal to keep a register of persons who have been prohibited by order of the Board from carrying on business as a dental services provider or occupying a position of authority in a corporate or trustee dental services provider.

48—Amendment of section 65—Power of Tribunal to make rules

This clause amends section 65 so that rules can be made by the President of the Tribunal and 2 other members selected by the President, rather than by the whole Tribunal.

49—Amendment of section 66—Right of appeal to Supreme Court

This clause amends section 66 to specify that appeals to the Supreme Court go to the Full Court against a decision of the Tribunal and to a single judge in any other case.

50—Amendment of section 68—Variation or revocation of conditions imposed by Court

This clause amends section 68 to enable representative bodies prescribed by the regulations to be heard on an application to the Supreme Court to vary or revoke conditions of registration of a dental practitioner or dental student.

51—Amendment of section 69—Interpretation

This clause amends section 69 to remove definitions that are moved to section 3 of the Act by this measure and to bring other definitions into line with those in other health professional registration Acts.

52—Amendment of section 70—Improper directions to dental practitioners or dental students

This clause amends section 70 to make it an offence for a person occupying a position of authority in a corporate or trustee dental services provider to direct or pressure a dental practitioner or dental student through whom the provider provides dental treatment to engage in unprofessional conduct. The maximum penalty is \$75 000.

53—Amendment of section 71—Offence to contravene conditions of registration

This clause makes a semantic amendment to section 71.

54—Amendment of section 72—Offence to give, offer or accept benefit for referral or recommendation

This clause amends section 72 to expand the meaning of *benefit* to include anything of value.

55—Insertion of section 73A**73A—Statutory declarations**

This section empowers the Board to require information provided to the Board to be verified by statutory declaration.

56—Amendment of section 75—Registered person etc must declare interest in prescribed business

This clause makes a semantic amendment to section 75.

57—Substitution of sections 76 and 77**76—Registered person must report medical unfitness to Board**

This section requires a registered person who becomes aware that he or she is or may be medically unfit to provide dental treatment to forthwith give written notice of that fact of the Board and fixes a maximum penalty of \$10 000 for non-compliance.

77—Report to Board cessation of status as student

This section requires the person in charge of an educational institution to notify the Board that a dental student has ceased to be enrolled at that institution in a course of study providing qualifications for registration as a dental practitioner. A maximum penalty of \$5 000 is fixed for non-compliance. It also requires a person registered as a dental student who completes, or ceases to be enrolled in, the course of study that formed the basis for that registration to give written notice of that fact to the Board. A maximum penalty of \$1 250 is fixed for non-compliance.

58—Amendment of section 78—Registered persons and dental services providers to be indemnified against loss

This clause amends section 78 to prohibit dental services providers from providing dental treatment unless insured or indemnified in a manner and to an extent approved by the Board against civil liabilities that might be incurred by provider in connection with the provision of dental treatment. It fixes a maximum penalty of \$10 000.

59—Amendment of section 79—Information relating to claim against registered person or dental services provider to be provided

This clause amends section 79 to require a dental services provider to provide the Board with prescribed information relating to a claim made against the provider for alleged negligence by the provider in connection with the provision of dental treatment. A maximum penalty of \$10 000 is fixed for non-compliance.

60—Substitution of section 81**81—Self-incrimination**

This section provides that if a person is required to provide information or to produce a document, record or equipment under the Act and the information, document, record or equipment would tend to incriminate the person or make the person liable to a penalty, the person must nevertheless

less provide the information or produce the document, record or equipment, but the information, document, record or equipment so provided or produced will not be admissible in evidence against the person in proceedings for an offence, other than an offence against this measure or any other Act relating to the provision of false or misleading information.

61—Substitution of section 83

83—Vicarious liability for offences

This section provides that if a corporate or trustee dental services provider or other body corporate is guilty of an offence against the Act, each person occupying a position of authority in the provider or body corporate is guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as is prescribed for the principal offence unless it is proved that the person could not, by the exercise of reasonable care, have prevented the commission of the principal offence.

62—Substitution of section 84

84—Application of fines

This section provides that fines imposed for offences against the Act must be paid to the Board.

63—Amendment of section 85—Board may require medical examination or report

This clause inserts a definition into section 85.

64—Amendment of section 87—Confidentiality

This clause amends section 87 to enable persons engaged in the administration of the Act to disclose confidential information to registration or licensing authorities outside the State and to interstate and Commonwealth government agencies and instrumentalities.

65—Repeal of section 88

This clause repeals section 88 which protects members of the Board, the Registrar and other Board staff and inspectors from personal liability for acts or omissions in the performance or purported performance of statutory powers and duties. Members of public sector agencies and public sector agency employees are protected from personal liability by section 74 of the *Public Sector Management Act 1995*.

66—Amendment of section 89—Service

This clause amends section 89 to enable documents to be served on a person to be sent to their nominated contact address or be transmitted by facsimile or e-mail to a facsimile number or e-mail address provided by the person.

67—Amendment of section 90—Evidentiary provision

68—Amendment of section 91—Regulations

These clauses make amendments that are consequential on other amendments made by this measure.

Schedule 1—Related amendments and transitional provisions

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Chiropractic and Osteopathy Practice Act 2005*

2—Amendment of section 8—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause amends section 8 to so that the office of a member of the Chiropractic and Osteopathy Practice Board becomes vacant if the member is disqualified from managing corporations.

3—Amendment of section 27—Registration of natural persons as chiropractors or osteopaths

This clause amends section 27 to remove the requirement that an applicant for registration as a chiropractor or osteopath have insurance against civil liabilities that may be incurred in connection with disciplinary proceedings.

4—Amendment of section 44—Medical fitness of chiropractor, osteopath, chiropractic student or osteopathy student

Section 44 of the Act empowers the Board to impose 1 of the following conditions on the registration of a chiropractor or osteopath, or a chiropractic or osteopathy student, who is medically unfit:

- a condition restricting the person's right to provide chiropractic or osteopathy;
- a condition requiring the person to undergo counselling or treatment or enter into any other undertaking.

This clause amends section 44 to allow the Board to impose both those conditions.

5—Amendment of section 50—Provisions as to proceedings before Board

This clause amends section 50 to empower the Board to make an interim order suspending registration or imposing registration conditions restricting practice rights if in the Board's opinion it is desirable to do so in the public interest.

6—Amendment of section 63—Report to Board of cessation of status as student

This clause amends section 63 so that an educational institution does not have to notify the Board that a chiropractic student or osteopathy student has completed a course of study providing qualifications for registration.

7—Amendment of section 64—Registered persons and chiropractic or osteopathy services providers to be indemnified against loss

This clause amends section 64 to remove the requirement that chiropractors, osteopaths and chiropractic or osteopathy services providers have insurance against civil liabilities that may be incurred in connection with disciplinary proceedings.

Part 3—Amendment of *Medical Practice Act 2004*

8—Amendment of section 6—Composition of Board

This clause makes an amendment to section 6 that is consequential on the insertion of section 6A.

9—Insertion of section 6A

6A—Elections and casual vacancies

This section requires elections to choose medical practitioners for appointment as members of the Board be held in accordance with the principles of proportional representation. It enables the Governor to appoint persons as members in the event of the failure of an election or in the event of a casual vacancy in the membership of the Board.

10—Amendment of section 7—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause amends section 7 so that the office of a member of the Medical Practice Board becomes vacant if the member is disqualified from managing corporations.

11—Amendment of section 25—Composition of Tribunal

This clause makes a minor technical amendment.

12—Amendment of section 33—Registration of natural persons on general or specialist register

This clause amends section 33 to remove the requirement that an applicant for registration as a medical practitioner have insurance against civil liabilities that may be incurred in connection with disciplinary proceedings.

13—Amendment of section 50—Medical fitness of medical practitioner or medical student

Section 50 of the Act empowers the Board to impose 1 of the following conditions on the registration of a medical practitioner or medical student who is medically unfit:

- a condition restricting the person's right to provide medical treatment;
- a condition requiring the person to undergo counselling or treatment or enter into any other undertaking.

This clause amends section 50 to allow the Board to impose both those conditions.

14—Amendment of section 51—Inquiries by Board as to matters constituting grounds for disciplinary action

This clause amends section 51 to empower the Board to suspend registration for up to 3 months (instead of the current maximum of 1 month).

15—Amendment of section 55—Provisions as to proceedings before Board

This clause amends section 55 to empower the Board to make an interim order suspending registration or imposing registration conditions restricting practice rights if in the Board's opinion it is desirable to do so in the public interest.

16—Amendment of section 56—Constitution of Tribunal for purpose of proceedings

This clause makes a minor technical amendment.

17—Amendment of section 57—Inquiries by Tribunal as to matters constituting grounds for disciplinary action

This clause amends section 57 to enable the Board to lay a complaint against a person before the Medical Professional Conduct Tribunal whether or not a complaint has been laid against the person before the Board.

18—Amendment of section 59—Provisions as to proceedings before Tribunal

This clause amends section 59 to enable the Tribunal to make an interim order suspending registration or imposing registration conditions restricting practice rights if in the Tribunal's opinion it is desirable to do so in the public interest. It also enables the Tribunal to vary or revoke such an order made by the Board where a case before the Board is transferred to the Tribunal.

19—Amendment of section 78—Report to Board of cessation of status as student

This clause amends section 78 so that an education institution is not required to notify the Board that a medical student has completed studies providing qualifications for registration.

20—Amendment of section 79—Registered persons and medical services providers to be indemnified against loss

This clause amends section 79 to remove the requirement that medical practitioners and medical services providers have insurance against civil liabilities that may be incurred in connection with disciplinary proceedings.

Part 4—Amendment of Occupational Therapy Practice Act 2005

21—Amendment of section 8—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause amends section 8 so that the office of a member of the Occupational Therapy Practice Board becomes vacant if the member is disqualified from managing corporations.

22—Amendment of section 26—Registration of natural persons as occupational therapists

This clause amends section 26 to remove the requirement that an applicant for registration as an occupational therapist have insurance against civil liabilities that may be incurred in connection with disciplinary proceedings.

23—Amendment of section 41—Medical fitness of occupational therapist or occupational therapy student

Section 41 of the Act empowers the Board to impose 1 of the following conditions on the registration of an occupational therapist or occupational therapy student who is medically unfit:

- a condition restricting the person's right to provide occupational therapy;
- a condition requiring the person to undergo counselling or treatment or enter into any other undertaking.

This clause amends section 41 to allow the Board to impose both those conditions.

24—Amendment of section 47—Provisions as to proceedings before Board

This clause amends section 47 to empower the Board to make an interim order suspending registration or imposing registration conditions restricting practice rights if in the Board's opinion it is desirable to do so in the public interest.

25—Amendment of section 61—Registered persons and occupational therapy services providers to be indemnified against loss

This clause amends section 61 to remove the requirement that occupational therapists and occupational therapy services providers have insurance against civil liabilities that may be incurred in connection with disciplinary proceedings.

Part 5—Amendment of Physiotherapy Practice Act 2005

26—Amendment of section 8—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause amends section 8 so that the office of a member of the Physiotherapy Practice Board becomes vacant if the member is disqualified from managing corporations.

27—Amendment of section 27—Registration of natural persons as physiotherapists

This clause amends section 27 to remove the requirement that an applicant for registration as a physiotherapist have insurance against civil liabilities that may be incurred in connection with disciplinary proceedings.

28—Amendment of section 44—Medical fitness of physiotherapist or physiotherapy student

Section 44 of the Act empowers the Board to impose 1 of the following conditions on the registration of a physiotherapist or physiotherapy student who is medically unfit:

- a condition restricting the person's right to provide physiotherapy;
- a condition requiring the person to undergo counselling or treatment or enter into any other undertaking.

This clause amends section 44 enable the Board to impose both those conditions.

29—Amendment of section 50—Provisions as to proceedings before Board

This clause amends section 50 to empower the Board to make an interim order suspending registration or imposing registration conditions restricting practice rights if in the Board's opinion it is desirable to do so in the public interest.

30—Amendment of section 63—Report to Board of cessation of status as student

This clause amends section 63 so that an education institution is not required to notify the Board that a physiotherapy student has completed studies providing qualifications for registration.

31—Amendment of section 64—Registered persons and physiotherapy services providers to be indemnified against loss

This clause amends section 64 to remove the requirement that physiotherapists and physiotherapy services providers have insurance against civil liabilities that may be incurred in connection with disciplinary proceedings.

Part 6—Amendment of Podiatry Practice Act 2005

32—Amendment of section 8—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause amends section 8 so that the office of a member of the Podiatry Practice Board becomes vacant if the member is disqualified from managing corporations.

33—Amendment of section 27—Registration of natural persons on general or specialist register

This clause amends section 27 to remove the requirement that an applicant for registration as a podiatrist or specialist have insurance against civil liabilities that may be incurred in connection with disciplinary proceedings.

34—Amendment of section 44—Medical fitness of podiatrist or podiatry student

Section 44 of the Act empowers the Board to impose 1 of the following conditions on the registration of a podiatrist or podiatry student who is medically unfit:

- a condition restricting the person's right to provide podiatric treatment;
- a condition requiring the person to undergo counselling or treatment or enter into any other undertaking.

This clause amends section 44 to enable the Board to impose both those conditions.

35—Amendment of section 50—Provisions as to proceedings before Board

This clause amends section 50 to empower the Board to make an interim order suspending registration or imposing registration conditions restricting practice rights if in the Board's opinion it is desirable to do so in the public interest.

36—Amendment of section 64—Registered persons and podiatric services providers to be indemnified against loss

This clause amends section 64 to remove the requirement that podiatrists, specialists and podiatric services providers have insurance against civil liabilities that may be incurred in connection with disciplinary proceedings.

Part 7—Transitional provision

37—Removal of companies from register of dental practitioners

This clause requires the Registrar of the Dental Board to remove from the relevant register any company that was registered as a dental practitioner under the *Dental Practice Act 2001* immediately before the commencement of this measure.

Ms CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

OPTOMETRY PRACTICE BILL

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to protect the health and safety of the public by providing for the registration of optometrists and optometry students; to regulate the provision of optometry treatment for the purpose of maintaining high standards of competence and conduct by those who provide it; to repeal the Optometrists Act 1920; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

This Bill is one of a suite of health professional registration Bills that have been reviewed and reformed in line with the requirements of National Competition Policy. These Bills have all been based on the model provided by the *Medical Practice Act 2004* with variations designed to respond to the specific issues unique to the different professional groups that are the subject of the legislation.

The *Optometry Practice Bill 2006* replaces the *Optometrists Act 1920*. While the original Act was passed by this Parliament in 1920, and amendments have been made in the subsequent 86 years, the world of 2006 is clearly a very different place from that of 1920. Technology and the training which optometrists receive has changed significantly over that time as well as the expectations the community has of health professionals. This Bill aims to provide a contemporary framework for the practice of optometry, recognising these changes and providing a sound foundation for the continuing development of optometric practice in South Australia.

Firstly, the key features which this Bill shares with the other health practitioner registration Bills will be discussed. This will be followed by a discussion of those aspects of the Bill which are particular to optometry.

Consistent with the Government's commitment to protecting the health and safety of consumers, the long title of the *Optometry Practice Bill 2006* states that it is a Bill for an Act "to protect the health and safety of the public by providing for the registration of optometrists and optometry students..." At the outset it is made clear that the primary aim of the legislation is the protection of the health and safety of the public and that the registration of optometrists and optometry students is a key mechanism by which this is to be achieved.

This Bill includes the same measures that exist in the *Medical Practice Act 2004* and the other health practitioner registration Acts to ensure that non-registered persons who own an optometry practice are accountable for the quality of services provided. These measures include:

- a requirement that corporate or trustee optometry services providers notify the Board of their existence and provide the names and addresses of persons who occupy positions of authority in the provider entity and of the optometrists through the instrumentality of whom they provide optometry services;
- a prohibition on optometry services providers giving improper directions to an optometrist or an optometry student through the instrumentality of whom they provide optometry services;
- a prohibition on any person giving or offering a benefit as inducement, consideration or reward for an optometrist or optometry student referring patients to a health service provided by the person, or recommending that a patient use a health service provided by the person or a health product made, sold or supplied by the person;
- a requirement that an optometry services providers comply with codes of conduct applying to such providers (thereby making them accountable to the Board by way of disciplinary action).

The definition of "optometry services provider" in the Bill excludes "exempt providers". This definition is identical to that in the *Medical Practice Act 2004* and the other health professional registration Bills and the exclusion exists in this Bill for the same reason. That is, to ensure that a recognised hospital, incorporated health centre or private hospital within the meaning of the *South Australian Health Commission Act 1976* is not accountable to both the Minister for Health and the Board for the services it provides.

Under the South Australian Health Commission Act the Minister for Health has the power to investigate and make changes to the way a hospital or health centre may operate, or vary the conditions applying to a private hospital licensed under the Act. Without the "exempt provider" provision, under this Bill the Board would also have the capacity to investigate and conduct disciplinary proceedings against these providers should they provide optometry services.

It is not reasonable that services providers be accountable to both the Minister for Health and the Board, and that the Board have the power to prohibit these services when the services providers were established or licensed under the South Australian Health

Commission Act. Currently optometrists are not routinely employed in the public health system. However this may change in the future and this provision will ensure that optometry within the public system is dealt with in a similar manner to the other health professions in terms of accountability.

To ensure that the health and safety of consumers is not put at risk by individual practitioners providing services on behalf of a services provider, the Bill requires all providers, including exempt providers, to report to the Board unprofessional conduct or medical unfitness of persons through the instrumentality of whom they provide optometry services. In this way the Board can ensure that all services are provided in a manner consistent with a code of conduct or professional standard and the interest of the public is protected. The Board may also make a report to the Minister for Health about any concerns it may have arising out of the information provided to it.

While the Board will have responsibility for developing codes of conduct for services providers, these will need to be approved by the Minister for Health to ensure that they do not limit competition, thereby undermining the intent of this legislation.

Similar to the *Medical Practice Act 2004*, this Bill deals with the medical fitness of registered persons and applicants for registration and requires that when making a determination of a person's fitness to provide optometry services, regard is given to the person's ability to provide these services personally without endangering a patient's health or safety. This can include consideration of the mental fitness of an optometrist or optometry student.

The Bill establishes the Optometry Board of South Australia, which replaces the existing Board. The new Board will consist of 8 members, 4 being optometrists elected by their peers through an election conducted by the State Electoral Office, 1 legal practitioner, 1 ophthalmologist and other 2 persons. The Optometry Association of Australia (SA) has argued that an ophthalmologist on the Board is not necessary. However, the Medical Board of South Australia has a member who is a nurse and the Nurses Board of South Australia has a medical practitioner as a member. Similar arrangements apply to the other Boards where there are scopes of practice that overlap with another profession. The inclusion of an ophthalmologist on the Board does not derogate in any way from the autonomy of optometry as a profession, rather it reflects the fact that optometry and ophthalmology have overlapping areas of expertise. The fact that this Bill enables optometrists to prescribe ocular therapeutics, an activity in which ophthalmologists are also involved, is a very good reason for an ophthalmologist to sit on the Board.

The composition of the Optometry Board membership is consistent with the other health practitioner registration boards. Both the Occupational Therapists Board and the Psychology Board make provision for 9 members that include a representative of the Universities that provide instruction. The Optometry Board makes provision for 8 members, which does not include a university representative as South Australia currently does not provide university courses for optometry.

A provision is included in all the health practitioner registration Acts that restricts the length of time any member of the Board can serve to 3 consecutive 3 year terms. This provision is to ensure that the Board has the benefit of fresh thinking. It will not restrict a person's capacity to serve on the Board at a later time but it does mean that after 9 consecutive years they are required to have a break for a term of 3 years. This Bill also includes provisions for elections to the Board using the proportional representation voting system and for the filling of casual vacancies without the need for the Board to conduct another election.

Standards and expectations by Government in regard to transparency and accountability are now much more explicit than in the past. The *Public Sector Management Act 1995* as amended by the *Statutes Amendment (Honesty and Accountability in Government) Act 2003* provides a clear framework for the operation of the public sector, including the Optometry Board of South Australia.

Provisions relating to conflict of interest and to protect members of the Board from personal liability when they have acted in good faith are included in the *Public Sector Management Act 1995* and will apply to the Optometry Board of South Australia.

Consistent with Government commitments to better consumer protection and information, this Bill increases the transparency and accountability of the Board by ensuring information pertaining to optometry services providers is accessible to the public.

Currently most complaints are taken to the Board by the Registrar acting on behalf of the complainant. Complainants do not usually

take their own case to the Board because of the possibility of having costs awarded against them and, because they are not a party to the proceedings, they do not have the legal right to be present during the hearing of those proceedings. This is obviously an unsatisfactory situation so the relevant provisions of the *Medical Practice Act 2004* are mirrored in this Bill to provide a right for the complainant to be present at the hearing of the proceedings. This ensures that the proceedings, from the perspective of the complainant, are more transparent. The Board will be able however, if it considers it necessary, to exclude the complainant from being present at part of the hearing where, for example, the confidentiality of certain matters takes precedence and may need to be protected.

New to the *Optometry Practice Bill 2006* is the registration of students. This provision is supported by the South Australian Optometrists Board. It requires that students undertaking a course of training in optometry from interstate, overseas or in South Australia, should one commence again in this State, be registered with the Board prior to any clinical work that they may undertake in this State. This provision ensures that students of optometry are subject to the same requirements in relation to professional standards, codes of conduct and medical fitness as registered optometrists while working in a practice setting in South Australia.

While the *Optometry Practice Bill 2006* shares the same principles and structure as the other health practitioner registration Bills there are some matters which are unique to optometry and I shall now discuss these.

One of the significant differences between the provisions of the Bill and the current Act is that the Bill does not require the registration of optical dispensers. In some states of Australia optical dispensers have never been registered, the remainder, with the exception of New South Wales, have removed the requirement for their registration. The registration of health professionals is required for those professions whose practice has the capacity to cause harm to the public. In the case of optical dispensers there is no evidence that receiving the wrong glasses creates harm. It may be inconvenient, but that is no basis for professional registration.

The current Act restricts the practice of prescribing optical appliances by optometrists and medical practitioners. The Bill however recognises that there is another group of health professionals, the orthoptists who are trained to refract and prescribe glasses, but who have been prevented from prescribing because of the restrictions of the Act. Orthoptists specialise in the investigation and management of disorders of the eye and visual system. They generally work closely with ophthalmologists and their role includes examining patients with eye problems, especially those related to eye movement including amblyopia (lazy eye) or strabismus (squint).

Orthoptists diagnose these problems and determine appropriate management. As orthoptists form part of multidisciplinary teams, they are involved in the management of conditions such as glaucoma, cataract, stroke, retinal disease and neurological disorders. During their training, which is university based, they are taught to refract and are therefore competent to prescribe glasses. In South Australia, there are currently 10 orthoptists, 9 of whom work in public hospitals with ophthalmologists. The Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Ophthalmologists, the Chief Executives of the major public hospitals and the heads of the ophthalmology departments in these hospitals have all been strong advocates for allowing orthoptists to prescribe glasses. Orthoptists in Victoria are generally able to prescribe glasses and there is no indication that this has resulted in anything other than a better service being provided to patients.

A further issue which was not anticipated when the Bill was initially drafted is the matter of plano lenses and their potential effects on the eye health of the community. Plano lenses are contact lenses with no optical power which are used for cosmetic purposes or in some cases as a bandage for the eye. When used in the cosmetic context the lenses can be used to change the colour of the eye, or give the impression that you have cat's eyes, wolf eyes or a vast range of other sorts of eyes. These contact lenses are available from a range of retail outlets or on the internet. Because they have only been seen as cosmetic rather than serving a therapeutic purpose by improving eyesight, they are not subject to the same range of controls as contact lenses which are designed to improve sight.

There is mounting evidence that these lenses are not just a novelty but can potentially threaten the sight of a person if they are not used correctly. Any contact lens changes the physiology of the eye. If they are too loose they can slide up under the eyelid and require professional assistance to remove. If they are too tight they cut off the oxygen supply to the eye which can lead to severe

problems. Any ill fitting lens can rub on the eye, causing abrasions and increasing the risk of infection. Some people should not wear contact lenses because of the shape of their eyes and for everyone it is important that the lens fits correctly.

In addition to having a properly fitting lens, it is important that the person who is going to wear the lens knows how to insert, remove, clean and store the lens, and not to share them with friends. The Medical Journal of Australia recently reported the case of a 13 year old girl who has sustained permanent vision loss through the use of these lenses. She borrowed some plano lenses from her friend over the weekend and on the Monday was brought to a hospital by her mother. She had an abscess on her cornea, required antibiotics to be given every 15 minutes and was in hospital for 3 weeks. She has suffered permanent vision loss as a result.

While this is only one case, it is a topic which is increasingly receiving coverage in medical, ophthalmology and optometry journals, within Australia and internationally. I have also been advised by the Optometry Board of South Australia that local optometrists are reporting an increasing number of people coming to their practices seeking assistance as a result of wearing these lenses. These cosmetic lenses are a relatively new phenomena in Australia but I expect their usage to increase. The United Kingdom and the United States of America have substantial experience with these lenses, and the Government is adopting in this Bill a similar approach to these countries by limiting these lenses to only being available on a prescription from an optometrist or medical practitioner. This way people who wish to wear these lenses will be properly assessed and provided with appropriate information regarding their insertion, removal, storage and cleaning. The community needs to be informed about the proper use of any contact lens with the aim of protecting individuals from loss of sight and other serious eye problems. This approach is supported by the Optometry Board, the Optometry Association of Australia, the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Ophthalmology and the contact lens manufacturers.

The *Optometry Practice Bill 2006* will bring optometry into line with the other registered health professions which have been the subject of similar legislation. It enables optometrists to prescribe therapeutic drugs to treat eye conditions, thereby providing them the capacity to make a more significant contribution to the health of the community. Eye health problems will only continue to increase in South Australia with the ageing of the population. This Bill will ensure that the public can have confidence when they choose to use an optometrist that their health and safety will not be compromised. It will ensure that the Optometry Board of South Australia operates in a transparent and accountable manner and that complaints from the public are dealt with in a professional manner.

I commend the Bill to the House.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause defines key terms used in the measure.

4—Medical fitness to provide optometry treatment

This clause provides that in making a determination as to a person's medical fitness to provide optometry treatment, regard must be given to the question of whether the person is able to provide treatment personally to a patient without endangering the patient's health or safety.

Part 2—Optometry Board of South Australia

Division 1—Establishment of Board

5—Establishment of Board

This clause establishes the Optometry Board of South Australia as a body corporate with perpetual succession, a common seal, the capacity to litigate in its corporate name and all the powers of a natural person capable of being exercised by a body corporate.

Division 2—Board's membership

6—Composition of Board

This clause provides for the Board to consist of 8 members appointed by the Governor. 4 must be optometrists elected by optometrists and 4 must be nominated by the Minister (1 ophthalmologist, 1 legal practitioner and 2 others). The clause also provides for appointment of deputy members.

7—Elections and casual vacancies

This clause requires the election to be conducted under the regulations in accordance with the principles of proportional

representation. It provides for the filling of casual vacancies without the need to hold another election.

8—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause provides for members of the Board to be appointed for a term not exceeding 3 years and to be eligible for re-appointment on expiry of a term of appointment. However, a member of the Board may not hold office for consecutive terms that exceed 9 years in total. The clause sets out the circumstances in which a member's office becomes vacant and the grounds on which the Governor may remove a member from office. It also allows members whose terms have expired, or who have resigned, to continue to act as members to hear part-heard proceedings under Part 4.

9—Presiding member and deputy

This clause requires the Minister, after consultation with the Board, to appoint an optometrist member of the Board to be the presiding member of the Board, and another optometrist member to be the deputy presiding member.

10—Vacancies or defects in appointment of members

This clause ensures acts and proceedings of the Board are not invalid by reason only of a vacancy in its membership or a defect in the appointment of a member.

11—Remuneration

This clause entitles a member of the Board to remuneration, allowances and expenses determined by the Governor.

Division 3—Registrar and staff of Board

12—Registrar of Board

This clause provides for the appointment of a Registrar by the Board on terms and conditions determined by the Board.

13—Other staff of Board

This clause provides for the Board to have such other staff as it thinks necessary for the proper performance of its functions.

Division 4—General functions and powers

14—Functions of Board

This clause sets out the functions of the Board and requires it to perform its functions with the object of protecting the health and safety of the public by achieving and maintaining high professional standards both of competence and conduct in the provision of podiatric treatment in South Australia.

15—Committees

This clause empowers the Board to establish committees to advise the Board or the Registrar, or to assist the Board to carry out its functions.

16—Delegations

This clause empowers the Board to delegate its functions or powers to a member of the Board, the Registrar, an employee of the Board or a committee established by the Board.

Division 5—Board's procedures

17—Board's procedures

This clause deals with matters relating to the Board's procedures such as the quorum at meetings, the chairing of meetings, voting rights, the holding of conferences by telephone and other electronic means and the keeping of minutes.

18—Conflict of interest etc under Public Sector Management Act

This clause provides that a member of the Board will not be taken to have a direct or indirect interest in a matter for the purposes of the *Public Sector Management Act 1995* by reason only of the fact that the member has an interest in the matter that is shared in common with optometrists generally or a substantial section of optometrists in this State.

19—Powers of Board in relation to witnesses etc

This clause sets out the powers of the Board to summons witnesses and require the production of documents and other evidence in proceedings before the Board.

20—Principles governing proceedings

This clause provides that the Board is not bound by the rules of evidence and requires it to act according to equity, good conscience and the substantial merits of the case without regard to technicalities and legal forms. It requires the Board to keep all parties to proceedings before the Board properly informed about the progress and outcome of the proceedings.

21—Representation at proceedings before Board

This clause entitles a party to proceedings before the Board to be represented at the hearing of those proceedings.

22—Costs

This clause empowers the Board to award costs against a party to proceedings before the Board and provides for the taxation of costs by a Master of the District Court in the event that a party is dissatisfied with the amount of costs awarded by the Board.

Division 6—Accounts, audit and annual report

23—Accounts and audit

This clause requires the Board to keep proper accounting records in relation to its financial affairs, to have annual statements of account prepared in respect of each financial year and to have the accounts audited annually by an auditor approved by the Auditor-General and appointed by the Board.

24—Annual report

This clause requires the Board to prepare an annual report for the Minister and requires the Minister to table the report in Parliament.

Part 3—Registration and practice

Division 1—Registers

25—Registers

This clause requires the Registrar to keep certain registers and specifies the information required to be included in each register. It also requires the registers to be kept available for inspection by the public and permits access to be made available by electronic means. The clause requires registered persons to notify a change of name or nominated contact address within 1 month of the change. A maximum penalty of \$250 is fixed for non-compliance.

26—Authority conferred by registration

This clause sets out the kind of optometry treatment that registration on each particular register authorises a registered person to provide.

Registration on the register of optometrists does not authorise the person to prescribe, supply or administer drugs for the purpose of treating abnormalities or disorders of the eye unless the registration is endorsed with a therapeutic drugs authorisation.

Division 2—Registration

27—Registration of natural persons as optometrists

This clause provides for full and limited registration of natural persons on the register of optometrists.

28—Registration of optometry students

This clause requires persons to register as optometry students before undertaking a course of study that provides qualifications for registration on the register of optometrist, or before providing optometry treatment as part of a course of study related to optometry being undertaken in another State, and provides for full or limited registration of optometry students.

29—Application for registration and provisional registration

This clause deals with applications for registration. It empowers the Board to require applicants to submit medical reports or other evidence of medical fitness to provide optometry treatment or to obtain additional qualifications or experience before determining an application. It also empowers the Registrar to grant provisional registration if it appears likely that the Board will grant an application for registration.

30—Removal from register

This clause requires the Registrar to remove a person from a register on application by the person or in certain specified circumstances (for example, suspension or cancellation of the person's registration under this measure).

31—Reinstatement on register

This clause makes provision for reinstatement of a person on a register. It empowers the Board to require applicants for reinstatement to submit medical reports or other evidence of medical fitness to provide optometry treatment or to obtain additional qualifications or experience before determining an application.

32—Fees and returns

This clause deals with the payment of registration, reinstatement and annual practice fees, and requires registered persons to furnish the Board with an annual return in relation to their practice of optometry, continuing optometry education and other matters relevant to their registration under the measure. It empowers the Board to remove from a register a person who fails to pay the annual practice fee or furnish the required return.

33—Authorisation to prescribe, supply and administer therapeutic drugs

This clause empowers the Board to authorise an optometrist to prescribe, supply and administer drugs for the purpose of treating abnormalities or disorders of the eye.

Division 3—Special provisions relating to optometry services providers

34—Information to be given to Board by optometry services providers

This clause requires an optometry services provider to notify the Board of the provider's name and address, the names and addresses of the optometrists through the instrumentality of whom the provider is providing optometry treatment and other information. It also requires the provider to notify the Board of any change in particulars required to be given to the Board and makes it an offence to contravene or fail to comply with the clause. A maximum penalty of \$10 000 is fixed. The Board is required to keep a record of information provided to the Board under this clause available for inspection at the office of the Board and may make it available to the public electronically.

Division 4—Restrictions relating to provision of optometry treatment

35—Illegal holding out as registered person

This clause makes it an offence for a person to hold himself or herself out as a registered person of a particular class or permit another person to do so unless registered on the appropriate register. It also makes it an offence for a person to hold out another as a registered person of a particular class unless the other person is registered on the appropriate register. In both cases a maximum penalty of \$50 000 or imprisonment for 6 months is fixed.

36—Illegal holding out concerning limitations or conditions

This clause makes it an offence for a person whose registration is restricted, limited or conditional to hold himself or herself out, or permit another person to hold him or her out, as having registration that is unrestricted or not subject to a limitation or condition. It also makes it an offence for a person to hold out another whose registration is restricted, limited or conditional as having registration that is unrestricted or not subject to a limitation or condition. In each case a maximum penalty of \$50 000 or imprisonment for 6 months is fixed.

37—Use of certain titles or descriptions prohibited

This clause creates a number of offences prohibiting a person who is not appropriately registered from using certain words or their derivatives to describe himself or herself or services that they provide, or in the course of advertising or promoting services that they provide. In each case a maximum penalty of \$50 000 is fixed.

38—Prohibition on provision of optometry treatment by unqualified persons

This clause makes it an offence to prescribe optical appliances unless the person is a qualified person or provides the treatment through the instrumentality of a qualified person. A maximum penalty of \$50 000 or imprisonment for 6 months is fixed for the offence. However, these provisions do not apply to such optometry treatment provided by an unqualified person in prescribed circumstances. In addition, the Governor is empowered, by proclamation, to grant an exemption if of the opinion that good reason exists for doing so in the particular circumstances of a case. The clause makes it an offence punishable by a maximum fine of \$50 000 to contravene or fail to comply with a condition of an exemption.

39—Prohibition on optometry treatment with laser or by surgery

This clause makes it an offence for a registered person to treat any abnormality or disorder of the eye with a laser or by surgery. A maximum fine of \$20 000 is fixed for a contravention.

40—Restriction on sale of optical appliances

This clause makes it an offence for a person to sell an optical appliance by retail unless it has been prescribed for the purchaser by an optometrist or medical practitioner. A maximum penalty of \$10 000 is fixed.

41—Board's approval required where optometrist has not practised for 5 years

This clause prohibits a registered person who has not provided optometry treatment of a kind authorised by their registration for 5 years or more from providing such treatment for fee or reward without the prior approval of the Board and fixes a maximum penalty of \$20 000. The Board is empowered to require an applicant for approval to obtain qualifications and experience and to impose conditions on the person's registration.

Part 4—Investigations and proceedings

Division 1—Preliminary

42—Interpretation

This clause provides that in this Part the terms *occupier of a position of authority*, *optometry services provider* and *registered person* includes a person who is not but who was, at the relevant time, an occupier of a position of authority, an optometry services provider, or a registered person.

43—Cause for disciplinary action

This clause specifies what constitutes proper cause for disciplinary action against a registered person, an optometry services provider or a person occupying a position of authority in a corporate or trustee optometry services provider.

Division 2—Investigations

44—Powers of inspectors

This clause sets out the powers of inspectors to investigate suspected breaches of the Act and certain other matters.

45—Offence to hinder etc inspector

This clause makes it an offence for a person to hinder an inspector, use certain language to an inspector, refuse or fail to comply with a requirement of an inspector, refuse or fail to answer questions to the best of the person's knowledge, information or belief, or falsely represent that the person is an inspector. A maximum penalty of \$10 000 is fixed.

Division 3—Proceedings before Board

46—Obligation to report medical unfitness or unprofessional conduct of optometrist or optometry student

This clause requires certain classes of persons to report to the Board if of the opinion that an optometrist or optometry student is or may be medically unfit to provide optometry treatment. A maximum penalty of \$5 000 is fixed for non-compliance. It also requires optometry services providers and exempt providers to report to the Board if of the opinion that an optometrist or optometry student through whom the provider provides optometry treatment has engaged in unprofessional conduct. A maximum penalty of \$10 000 is fixed for non-compliance. The Board must cause reports to be investigated.

47—Medical fitness of optometrist or optometry student

This clause empowers the Board to make an order suspending the registration of an optometrist or optometry student or imposing registration conditions restricting practice rights and requiring the person to undergo counselling or treatment or enter into any other undertaking. The Board may make an order if, on application by certain persons or after an investigation under clause 46, and after due inquiry, the Board is satisfied that the optometrist or optometry student is medically unfit to provide optometry treatment and that it is desirable in the public interest.

48—Inquiries by Board as to matters constituting grounds for disciplinary action

This clause requires the Board to inquire into a complaint relating to matters alleged to constitute grounds for disciplinary action against a person unless the Board considers the complaint to be frivolous or vexatious. The Board may make an interim order suspending registration or imposing conditions restricting practice rights pending hearing and determination of the proceedings if the Board is of the opinion that it is desirable to do so in the public interest. If after conducting an inquiry, the Board is satisfied that there is proper cause for taking disciplinary action, the Board can censure the person, order the person to pay a fine of up to \$10 000 or prohibit the person from carrying on business as an optometry services provider or from occupying a position of authority in a corporate or trustee optometry services provider. If the person is registered, the Board may impose conditions on the person's right to provide optometry treatment, suspend the person's registration for a period not exceeding 1 year, cancel the person's registration, or disqualify the person from being registered. If a person fails

to pay a fine imposed by the Board, the Board may remove them from the appropriate register.

49—Contravention of prohibition order

This clause makes it an offence to contravene a prohibition order made by the Board or to contravene or fail to comply with a condition imposed by the Board. A maximum penalty of \$75 000 or imprisonment for 6 months is fixed.

50—Register of prohibition orders

This clause requires the Registrar to keep a register of prohibition orders made by the Board. The register must be kept available for inspection at the office of the Registrar and may be made available to the public electronically.

51—Variation or revocation of conditions imposed by Board

This clause empowers the Board, on application by a registered person, to vary or revoke a condition imposed by the Board on his or her registration.

52—Constitution of Board for purpose of proceedings

This clause sets out how the Board is to be constituted for the purpose of hearing and determining proceedings under Part 4.

53—Provisions as to proceedings before Board

This clause deals with the conduct of proceedings by the Board under Part 4.

Part 5—Appeals

54—Right of appeal to District Court

This clause provides a right of appeal to the District Court against certain acts and decisions of the Board.

55—Operation of order may be suspended

This clause empowers the Board or the Court to suspend the operation of an order made by the Board where an appeal is instituted or intended to be instituted.

56—Variation or revocation of conditions imposed by Court

This clause empowers the District Court, on application by a registered person, to vary or revoke a condition imposed by the Court on his or her registration.

Part 6—Miscellaneous

57—Interpretation

This clause defines terms used in Part 6.

58—Offence to contravene conditions of registration

This clause makes it an offence for a person to contravene or fail to comply with a condition of his or her registration and fixes a maximum penalty of \$75 000 or imprisonment for 6 months.

59—Registered person etc must declare interest in prescribed business

This clause requires a registered person or prescribed relative of a registered person who has an interest in a prescribed business to give the Board notice of the interest and of any change in such an interest. It fixes a maximum penalty of \$20 000 for non-compliance. It also prohibits a registered person from referring a patient to, or recommending that a patient use, a health service provided by the business and from prescribing, or recommending that a patient use, a health product manufactured, sold or supplied by the business unless the registered person has informed the patient in writing of his or her interest or that of his or her prescribed relative. A maximum penalty of \$20 000 is fixed for a contravention. However, it is a defence to a charge of an offence for unprofessional conduct for a registered person to prove that he or she did not know and could not reasonably have been expected to know that a prescribed relative had an interest in the prescribed business to which the referral, recommendation or prescription that is the subject of the proceedings relates.

60—Offence to give, offer or accept benefit for referral or recommendation

This clause makes it an offence—

(a) for any person to give or offer to give a registered person or prescribed relative of a registered person a benefit as an inducement, consideration or reward for the registered person referring, recommending or prescribing a health service provided by the person or a health product manufactured, sold or supplied by the person; or

(b) for a registered person or prescribed relative of a registered person to accept from any person a benefit offered or given as an inducement, consideration or reward for such a referral, recommendation or prescription.

In each case a maximum penalty of \$75 000 is fixed.

61—Improper directions to optometrists or optometry students

This clause makes it an offence for a person who provides optometry treatment through the instrumentality of an optometrist or optometry student to direct or pressure the optometrist or student to engage in unprofessional conduct. It also makes it an offence for a person occupying a position of authority in a corporate or trustee optometry services provider to direct or pressure an optometrist or optometry student through whom the provider provides optometry treatment to engage in unprofessional conduct. In each case a maximum penalty of \$75 000 is fixed.

62—Procurement of registration by fraud

This clause makes it an offence for a person to fraudulently or dishonestly procure registration or reinstatement of registration (whether for himself or herself or another person) and fixes a maximum penalty of \$20 000 or imprisonment for 6 months.

63—Statutory declarations

This clause empowers the Board to require information provided to the Board to be verified by statutory declaration.

64—False or misleading statement

This clause makes it an offence for a person to make a false or misleading statement in a material particular (whether by reason of inclusion or omission of any particular) in information provided under the measure and fixes a maximum penalty of \$20 000.

65—Registered person must report medical unfitness to Board

This clause requires a registered person who becomes aware that he or she is or may be medically unfit to provide optometry treatment to immediately give written notice of that fact of the Board and fixes a maximum penalty of \$10 000 for non-compliance.

66—Report to Board of cessation of status as student

This clause requires the person in charge of an educational institution to notify the Board that an optometry student has ceased to be enrolled at that institution in a course of study providing qualifications for registration on the register of optometrists. A maximum penalty of \$5 000 is fixed for non-compliance. It also requires a person registered as an optometry student who completes, or ceases to be enrolled in, the course of study that formed the basis for that registration to give written notice of that fact to the Board. A maximum penalty of \$1 250 is fixed.

67—Registered persons and optometry services providers to be indemnified against loss

This clause prohibits registered persons and optometry services providers from providing optometry treatment unless insured or indemnified in a manner and to an extent approved by the Board against civil liabilities that might be incurred by the person or provider in connection with the provision of such treatment or proceedings under Part 4 against the person or provider. It fixes a maximum penalty of \$10 000 and empowers the Board to exempt persons or classes of persons from the requirement to be insured or indemnified.

68—Information relating to claim against registered person or optometry services provider to be provided

This clause requires a person against whom a claim is made for alleged negligence committed by a registered person in the course of providing optometry treatment to provide the Board with prescribed information relating to the claim. It also requires an optometry services provider to provide the Board with prescribed information relating to a claim made against the provider for alleged negligence by the provider in connection with the provision of optometry treatment. The clause fixes a maximum penalty of \$10 000 for non-compliance.

69—Victimisation

This clause prohibits a person from victimising another person (the victim) on the ground, or substantially on the ground, that the victim has disclosed or intends to disclose information, or has made or intends to make an allegation, that has given rise or could give rise to proceedings against the person under this measure. Victimisation is the causing of detriment including injury, damage or loss, intimidation or harassment, threats of reprisals, or discrimination, disadvantage or adverse treatment in relation to the victim's

employment or business. An act of victimisation may be dealt with as a tort or as if it were an act of victimisation under the *Equal Opportunity Act 1984*.

70—Self-incrimination

This clause provides that if a person is required to provide information or to produce a document, record or equipment under this measure and the information, document, record or equipment would tend to incriminate the person or make the person liable to a penalty, the person must nevertheless provide the information or produce the document, record or equipment, but the information, document, record or equipment so provided or produced will not be admissible in evidence against the person in proceedings for an offence, other than an offence against this measure or any other Act relating to the provision of false or misleading information.

71—Punishment of conduct that constitutes an offence

This clause provides that if conduct constitutes both an offence against the measure and grounds for disciplinary action under the measure, the taking of disciplinary action is not a bar to conviction and punishment for the offence, and conviction and punishment for the offence is not a bar to disciplinary action.

72—Vicarious liability for offences

This clause provides that if a corporate or trustee optometry services provider or other body corporate is guilty of an offence against this measure, each person occupying a position of authority in the provider or body corporate is guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as is prescribed for the principal offence unless it is proved that the person could not, by the exercise of reasonable care, have prevented the commission of the principal offence.

73—Application of fines

This clause provides that fines imposed for offences against the measure must be paid to the Board.

74—Board may require medical examination or report

This clause empowers the Board to require a registered person or a person applying for registration or reinstatement of registration to submit to an examination by a health professional or provide a medical report from a health professional, including an examination or report that will require the person to undergo a medically invasive procedure. If the person fails to comply the Board can suspend the person's registration until further order.

75—Ministerial review of decisions relating to courses

This clause gives a provider of a course of education or training the right to apply to the Minister for a review of a decision of the Board to refuse to approve the course for the purposes of the measure or to revoke the approval of a course.

76—Confidentiality

This clause makes it an offence for a person engaged or formerly engaged in the administration of the measure or the repealed Act (the *Optometrists Act 1920*) to divulge or communicate personal information obtained (whether by that person or otherwise) in the course of official duties except—

- (a) as required or authorised by or under this measure or any other Act or law; or
- (b) with the consent of the person to whom the information relates; or
- (c) in connection with the administration of this measure or the repealed Act; or
- (d) to an authority responsible under the law of a place outside this State for the registration or licensing of persons who provide optometry treatment, where the information is required for the proper administration of that law; or
- (e) to an agency or instrumentality of this State, the Commonwealth or another State or a Territory of the Commonwealth for the purposes of the proper performance of its functions.

However, the clause does not prevent disclosure of statistical or other data that could not reasonably be expected to lead to the identification of any person to whom it relates. Personal information that has been disclosed for a particular purpose must not be used for any other purpose by the person to whom it was disclosed or any other person who gains access to the information (whether properly or improperly and directly or indirectly) as a result of that disclosure. A

maximum penalty of \$10 000 is fixed for a contravention of the clause.

77—Service

This clause sets out the methods by which notices and other documents may be served.

78—Evidentiary provision

This clause provides evidentiary aids for the purposes of proceedings for offences and for proceedings under Part 4.

79—Regulations

This clause empowers the Governor to make regulations.

Schedule 1—Repeal and transitional provisions

This Schedule repeals the *Optometrists Act 1920* and makes transitional provisions with respect to the Board and registrations.

Ms CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

PSYCHOLOGICAL PRACTICE BILL

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health) obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to protect the health and safety of the public by providing for the registration of psychologists and student psychologists; to regulate the provision of psychological services for the purpose of maintaining high standards of competence and conduct by registered persons and psychological services providers; to repeal the Psychological Practices Act 1973; and for other purposes. Read a first time.

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

This Bill is one of a number of Bills to regulate health professionals in South Australia. Like the *Podiatry Practice Act 2005*, the *Physiotherapy Practice Act 2005*, the *Chiropractic and Osteopathy Practice Act 2005* and the *Occupational Therapy Practice Act 2005*, the Psychological Practice Bill is based on the *Medical Practice Act 2004*. This Bill is therefore very similar to the *Medical Practice Act* and the provisions are largely familiar to the House.

The *Psychological Practice Bill 2006* replaces the *Psychological Practices Act 1973*. Consistent with the Government's commitment to protecting the health and safety of consumers, the long title of the Psychological Practice Bill states that it is a Bill for an Act "to protect the health and safety of the public by providing for the registration of psychologists and student psychologists..." At the outset it is made clear that the primary aim of the legislation is the protection of the health and safety of the public and that the registration of psychologists is a key mechanism by which this is to be achieved.

The current Act was reviewed in line with the requirements of the National Competition Policy Agreement. The Review indicated that the case for regulated title protection as a public benefit was adequate for the profession of psychology. There are apparently many similar services offered in the community and therefore the protection of the title "psychologist" will enable consumers to identify a practitioner with appropriate training and skills. In addition, the National Competition Policy Review Panel acknowledged the importance of the protection of this title. It noted that there are several classes of clients, including abused children, young people with serious mental health problems and persons exhibiting potentially dangerous behaviour who could be exposed to unacceptable risks of further harm which may be caused by inappropriately or inadequately trained persons. The degree of trust afforded clinical psychologists, for example, to work privately and extensively with such clients, is greater than for most other counselling professionals.

The Bill removes the restriction on the "practice of hypnosis" that exists in the current *Psychological Practices Act 1973*. In the current Act, the "practice of hypnosis" is restricted to registered psychologists, medical practitioners, individually approved dentists and "prescribed persons". The National Competition Review Panel recommended the deletion of all references to hypnosis noting that there was no demonstrable evidence of harm and that people in a number of professions and disciplines may wish to use hypnosis for fee or reward but have been restricted from doing so by section 39 of the current Act. The restriction on the practice of hypnosis

therefore failed the public benefit test required for regulation to be consistent with the National Competition Policy Principles.

A further reason for removing this restriction includes the difficulty of drafting a definition of hypnosis that can be applied to the Act. No interpretation of hypnosis has been given in the current Act or regulations. This has limited the effectiveness of the restriction by allowing other providers to offer a related or identical service to hypnosis provided that there is no reliance on the use of the term "hypnosis". The effectiveness of section 39 is further questionable as it has allowed some registered practitioners to use hypnosis, regardless of their lack of specific training in that field.

The continuing difficulty in defining "hypnosis" and related terms such as "hypnotherapy" and the lack of justification based on demonstrable public benefit are the main reasons why, in similar legislation in other States and Territories, the practice of hypnosis is no longer regulated.

Whilst the Bill incorporates "psychometric testing" as part of the definition of psychology, unlike the current Act, it will not seek to create the potential for the restriction of a prescribed psychological practice by including a power to further define or prescribe types of practices or tests or inventories of tests that can only be performed by psychologists.

The current Act has a restriction on practice which has the effect of requiring the Board to specifically identify those "tests of intelligence" or "personality tests" or develop "inventories" of tests that should be restricted. The Board has never done so due to the inherent difficulties of putting into regulations and maintaining a complete and up-to-date list of all such instruments at any given time. While the Act has been in force since 1973, no evidence of harm to the public which could have been avoided by practice protection has been demonstrated.

In practice, access to certain psychological tests is restricted by the companies or organisations that publish or provide those tests to registered psychologists. A person seeking to purchase a certain test should provide evidence of their qualifications to administer the test to the supplying company or organisation.

While psychological associations have asked that access, administration and interpretation of certain psychometric tests be restricted by regulation to registered psychologists, this practice restriction does not pass the public benefit test required by the National Competition Policy Agreement which the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) has agreed to continue to apply.

This Bill does not change in practice the current circumstances regarding psychometric testing. It recognises the reality that there has not been any regulation of this testing in South Australia for at least the past 23 years. It is also consistent with the regulation of psychologists in other States and Territories.

Provided that the title "psychologist" continues to be protected, employers, clients and other persons seeking a service will continue to know who is most likely to be a reputable psychologist or psychological services provider.

Provision for the creation of a specific specialist register is not included in this Bill as sought by some professional associations. The Bill is consistent with the approach taken by the majority of other Australian jurisdictions in not establishing specialist registers in their psychological practice Acts.

This Bill provides a definition of psychology that recognises the broad scope of services provided by the profession and the regulation of psychologists continues to provide the public with confidence in those practitioners who are registered and describe themselves as "psychologists". Consistent with Government's commitment to public health and safety, registration also maintains safe and competent standards of practice for those who hold themselves out to be "psychologists", similar to all other registered health professionals.

The Bill also applies to persons who are not registered psychologists but provide psychological services through the instrumentality of a registered psychologist. The Bill includes the same measures that exist in the *Medical Practice Act 2004* and the other aforementioned Acts to ensure that non-registered persons who own a psychological practice are accountable for the quality of psychological services provided. These measures include:

- a requirement that corporate or trustee psychological services providers notify the Board of their existence and provide the names and addresses of persons who occupy positions of authority in the provider entity and of the psychologists through the instrumentality of whom they provide psychological services;

- a prohibition on psychological services providers giving improper directions to a psychologist or a psychological student through the instrumentality of whom they provide psychological services;

- a prohibition on any person giving or offering a benefit as inducement, consideration or reward for a psychologist or psychological student referring patients or clients to a health service provided by the person, or recommending that a patient or client use a health service provided by the person or a health product made, sold or supplied by the person;

- a requirement that psychological services providers comply with codes of conduct applying to such providers (thereby making them accountable to the Board by way of disciplinary action).

The definition of *psychological services provider* in the Bill excludes "exempt providers". This definition is identical to that in the *Medical Practice Act 2004* and the other Acts and the exclusion exists in this Bill for the same reason. That is, to ensure that a recognised hospital, incorporated health centre or private hospital within the meaning of the *South Australian Health Commission Act 1976* is not accountable to both the Minister and the Board for the services it provides. Under that Act the Minister has the power to investigate and make changes to the way a hospital or health centre may operate, or vary the conditions applying to a private hospital licensed under the Act. Without the "exempt provider" provision, under this Bill the Board would also have the capacity to investigate and conduct disciplinary proceedings against these bodies, should they provide psychological services. It is not reasonable that services providers be accountable to both the Minister and the Board, and that the Board have the power to prohibit these services when the services providers were established or licensed under the *South Australian Health Commission Act* for which the same Minister is responsible.

However, to ensure that the health and safety of consumers is not put at risk by individual practitioners providing services on behalf of a services provider, the Bill requires all providers, including exempt providers, to report to the Board unprofessional conduct or medical unfitness of persons through the instrumentality of whom they provide psychological services. In this way the Board can ensure that all services are provided in a manner consistent with a code of conduct or professional standard and that the interest of the public is protected. The Board may also make a report to the Minister about any concerns it may have arising out of the information provided to it.

While the Board will have responsibility for developing codes of conduct for services providers, the Minister will need to approve these codes, to ensure that they do not limit competition, thereby undermining the intent of this legislation. It also gives the Minister some oversight of the standards that relate to both services providers and the profession.

Similar to the *Medical Practice Act 2004*, this Bill deals with the medical fitness of registered persons and applicants for registration and requires that where a determination is made of a person's fitness to provide psychological services, regard is given to the person's ability to provide psychological services without endangering the health or safety of the patient or client. This can include consideration of the mental fitness of a psychologist or student psychologist.

This approach was agreed to by all the major medical stakeholders when developing the provisions for the *Medical Practice Act 2004* and is in line with procedures in other jurisdictions. It is therefore appropriate that similar provisions be included in this Bill.

The Bill establishes the Psychology Board of South Australia, which replaces the existing South Australian Psychological Board. The new Board will consist of 9 members, 4 being psychologists elected by their peers through an election conducted by the State Electoral Office, 1 psychologist who teaches in the field of psychology chosen from a panel of 3 jointly nominated by the 3 universities in South Australia that teach psychology, 1 legal practitioner, 1 health professional other than a psychologist and 2 persons who can represent the interest of others, in particular, those of consumers.

In addition there is a provision that will restrict the length of time any member of the Board can serve to 3 consecutive 3 year terms. This provision will ensure that the Board has the benefit of fresh thinking. It will not restrict a person's capacity to serve on the Board at a later time but it does mean that after 9 consecutive years they will be required to have a break for a term of 3 years. This Bill also includes provisions for elections to the Board using the proportional

representation voting system and for the filling of casual vacancies without the need for the Board to conduct another election.

Standards and expectations by Government in regard to transparency and accountability are now much more explicit than in the past and the *Public Sector Management Act 1995*, as amended by the *Statutes Amendment (Honesty and Accountability in Government) Act 2003*, provides a clear framework for the operation of the public sector, including the Psychology Board of South Australia.

Provisions relating to conflict of interest and to protect members of the Board from personal liability when they have acted in good faith are included in the *Public Sector Management Act 1995* and will apply to the Psychology Board of South Australia.

Consistent with Government commitments to better consumer protection and information, this Bill increases transparency and accountability of the Board by ensuring information pertaining to psychological services providers is accessible to the public.

Currently most complaints are taken to the Board by the Registrar acting on behalf of the complainant. Complainants do not usually take their own case to the Board because of the possibility of having costs awarded against them and, because they are not a party to the proceedings, they do not have the legal right to be present during the hearing of those proceedings. This is obviously an unsatisfactory situation and the Government has had the relevant provisions of the *Medical Practice Act 2004* mirrored in this Bill to give the complainant a right to be present at the hearing of the proceedings. This will ensure that the proceedings, from the perspective of the complainant, are more transparent. The Board will be able however, if it considers it necessary, to exclude the complainant from being present at part of the hearing where, for example, the confidentiality of certain matters takes precedence and may need to be protected.

New to the *Psychological Practice Bill 2006* is the registration of students. This provision is supported by the South Australian Psychological Board. It requires that students undertaking a course of training in psychology from interstate or overseas be registered with the Board prior to any clinical work that they may undertake in this State. This provision will ensure that students of psychology who are undertaking a course of study leading to registration are subject to the same requirements in relation to professional standards, codes of conduct and medical fitness as registered psychologists while working in a practice setting in South Australia.

Psychologists and psychological services providers will be required to be insured, in a manner and to an extent approved by the Board, against civil liabilities that might be incurred in connection with the provision of psychological services. In the case of psychologists, insurance will be a pre-condition of registration. The *Psychological Practice Bill 2006* ensures that the insurance requirement is consistent with the *Medical Practice Act 2004* and that there is adequate protection for the public should circumstances arise where this is necessary. The Board will also have the power to exempt a person or class of persons from all or part of the insurance requirement, for example, where a person may wish to continue to be registered but no longer practice for a time.

This Bill balances the needs of the profession and psychological services providers with the need of the public to feel confident that they are being provided with a service safely, either directly by psychologists or by a provider who uses a registered psychologist.

It is reiterated that the *Psychological Practice Bill 2006* is based on the *Medical Practice Act 2004* and the provisions in the *Psychological Practice Bill 2006* are in most places identical to it. One exception is that unlike the *Medical Practice Act*, this Bill does not establish a Tribunal for hearing complaints. Instead, like the current practice, members of the Board can investigate and hear any complaint.

By following the model of the *Medical Practice Act*, this Bill and the other health professional registration Acts will have consistently applied standards for all services provided by registered health practitioners. This will be of benefit to all health consumers who can feel confident that no matter which kind of registered health professional they consult, they can expect consistency in the standards and the processes of the registration Boards.

This Bill will provide an improved system for ensuring the health and safety of the public and regulating the psychological profession in South Australia and I commend it to all members.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause defines key terms used in the measure.

4—Medical fitness to provide psychological services

This clause provides that in making a determination as to a person's medical fitness to provide psychological services, regard must be given to the question of whether the person is able to provide the services personally to a patient or client without endangering the patient's or client's health or safety.

Part 2—Psychology Board of South Australia

Division 1—Establishment of Board

5—Establishment of Board

This clause establishes the Psychology Board of South Australia as a body corporate with perpetual succession, a common seal, the capacity to litigate in its corporate name and all the powers of a natural person capable of being exercised by a body corporate.

Division 2—Board's membership

6—Composition of Board

This clause provides for the Board to consist of 9 members appointed by the Governor, including 4 psychologists chosen by election and 1 psychologist who teaches psychology nominated jointly by the 3 universities. The remaining members, to be nominated by the Minister, will be 1 legal practitioner, 1 member of another health profession and 2 other persons. The clause also provides for the appointment of deputy members.

7—Elections and casual vacancies

This clause requires an election to be conducted under the regulations in accordance with the principles of proportional representation. It provides for the filling of casual vacancies without the need to hold another election.

8—Terms and conditions of membership

This clause provides for members of the Board to be appointed for a term not exceeding 3 years and to be eligible for re-appointment on expiry of a term of appointment. However, a member of the Board may not hold office for consecutive terms that exceed 9 years in total. The clause sets out the circumstances in which a member's office becomes vacant and the grounds on which the Governor may remove a member from office. It also allows members whose terms have expired, or who have resigned, to continue to act as members to hear part-heard proceedings under Part 4.

9—Presiding member and deputy

This clause requires the Minister, after consultation with the Board, to appoint a psychologist member of the Board to be the presiding member of the Board, and another psychologist member to be the deputy presiding member.

10—Vacancies or defects in appointment of members

This clause ensures acts and proceedings of the Board are not invalid by reason only of a vacancy in its membership or a defect in the appointment of a member.

11—Remuneration

This clause entitles a member of the Board to remuneration, allowances and expenses determined by the Governor.

Division 3—Registrar and staff of Board

12—Registrar of Board

This clause provides for the appointment of a Registrar by the Board on terms and conditions determined by the Board.

13—Other staff of Board

This clause provides for the Board to have such other staff as it thinks necessary for the proper performance of its functions.

Division 4—General functions and powers

14—Functions of Board

This clause sets out the functions of the Board and requires it to perform its functions with the object of protecting the health and safety of the public by achieving and maintaining high professional standards both of competence and conduct of registered persons and psychological services providers.

15—Committees

This clause empowers the Board to establish committees to advise the Board or the Registrar, or to assist the Board to carry out its functions.

16—Delegations

This clause empowers the Board to delegate its functions or powers to a member of the Board, the Registrar, an employee of the Board or a committee established by the Board.

Division 5—Board's procedures

17—Board's procedures

This clause deals with matters relating to the Board's procedures such as the quorum at meetings, the chairing of meetings, voting rights, the holding of conferences by telephone and other electronic means and the keeping of minutes.

18—Conflict of interest etc under Public Sector Management Act

This clause provides that a member of the Board will not be taken to have a direct or indirect interest in a matter for the purposes of the *Public Sector Management Act 1995* by reason only of the fact that the member has an interest in the matter that is shared in common with psychologists generally or a substantial section of psychologists in this State.

19—Powers of Board in relation to witnesses etc

This clause sets out the powers of the Board to summons witnesses and require the production of documents and other evidence in proceedings before the Board.

20—Principles governing proceedings

This clause provides that the Board is not bound by the rules of evidence and requires it to act according to equity, good conscience and the substantial merits of the case without regard to technicalities and legal forms. It requires the Board to keep all parties to proceedings before the Board properly informed about the progress and outcome of the proceedings.

21—Representation at proceedings before Board

This clause entitles a party to proceedings before the Board to be represented at the hearing of those proceedings.

22—Costs

This clause empowers the Board to award costs against a party to proceedings before the Board and provides for the taxation of costs by a Master of the District Court in the event that a party is dissatisfied with the amount of costs awarded by the Board.

Division 6—Accounts, audit and annual report

23—Accounts and audit

This clause requires the Board to keep proper accounting records in relation to its financial affairs, to have annual statements of account prepared in respect of each financial year and to have the accounts audited annually by an auditor approved by the Auditor-General and appointed by the Board.

24—Annual report

This clause requires the Board to prepare an annual report for the Minister and requires the Minister to table the report in Parliament.

Part 3—Registration and practice

Division 1—Registers

25—Registers

This clause requires the Registrar to keep certain registers and specifies the information required to be included in each register. It also requires the registers to be kept available for inspection by the public and permits access to be made available by electronic means. The clause requires registered persons to notify a change of name or nominated contact address within 1 month of the change. A maximum penalty of \$250 is fixed for non-compliance.

Division 2—Registration

26—Registration of natural persons as psychologists

This clause provides for full and limited registration of natural persons on the register of psychologists.

27—Registration of student psychologists

This clause requires persons to register as student psychologists before undertaking a course of study that provides qualifications for registration on the register of psychologists, or before providing psychological services as part of a course of study related to psychology being undertaken outside the State, and provides for full or limited registration of student psychologists.

28—Application for registration and provisional registration

This clause deals with applications for registration. It empowers the Board to require applicants to submit medical reports or other evidence of medical fitness to provide psychological services or to obtain additional qualifications or experience before determining an application. It also empowers the Registrar to grant provisional registration if it appears likely that the Board will grant an application for registration.

29—Removal from register

This clause requires the Registrar to remove a person from a register on application by the person or in certain specified circumstances (for example, suspension or cancellation of the person's registration under this measure).

30—Reinstatement on register

This clause makes provision for reinstatement of a person on a register. It empowers the Board to require applicants for reinstatement to submit medical reports or other evidence of medical fitness to provide psychological services or to obtain additional qualifications or experience before determining an application.

31—Fees and returns

This clause deals with the payment of registration, reinstatement and annual practice fees, and requires registered persons to furnish the Board with an annual return in relation to their practice of psychology, continuing psychological education and other matters relevant to their registration under the measure. It empowers the Board to remove from a register a person who fails to pay the annual practice fee or furnish the required return.

Division 3—Special provisions relating to psychological services providers

32—Information to be given to Board by psychological services providers

This clause requires a psychological services provider to notify the Board of the provider's name and address, the names and addresses of the psychologists through the instrumentality of whom the provider is providing psychological services and other information. It also requires the provider to notify the Board of any change in particulars required to be given to the Board and makes it an offence to contravene or fail to comply with the clause. A maximum penalty of \$10 000 is fixed. The Board is required to keep a record of information provided to the Board under this clause available for inspection at the office of the Board and may make it available to the public electronically.

Division 4—Restrictions relating to provision of psychological services

33—Illegal holding out as registered person

This clause makes it an offence for a person to hold himself or herself out as a registered person of a particular class or permit another person to do so unless registered on the appropriate register. It also makes it an offence for a person to hold out another as a registered person of a particular class unless the other person is registered on the appropriate register. In both cases a maximum penalty of \$50 000 or imprisonment for 6 months is fixed.

34—Illegal holding out concerning limitations or conditions

This clause makes it an offence for a person whose registration is restricted, limited or conditional to hold himself or herself out, or permit another person to hold him or her out, as having registration that is unrestricted or not subject to a limitation or condition. It also makes it an offence for a person to hold out another whose registration is restricted, limited or conditional as having registration that is unrestricted or not subject to a limitation or condition. In each case a maximum penalty of \$50 000 or imprisonment for 6 months is fixed.

35—Use of certain titles or descriptions prohibited

This clause creates a number of offences prohibiting a person who is not appropriately registered from using certain words or their derivatives to describe himself or herself or services that they provide, or in the course of advertising or promoting services that they provide. In each case a maximum penalty of \$50 000 is fixed.

Part 4—Investigations and proceedings

Division 1—Preliminary

36—Interpretation

This clause provides that in this Part the terms *occupier of a position of authority*, *psychological services provider* and *registered person* includes a person who is not but who was, at the relevant time, an occupier of a position of authority, a psychological services provider, or a registered person.

37—Cause for disciplinary action

This clause specifies what constitutes proper cause for disciplinary action against a registered person, a psychological services provider or a person occupying a position of

authority in a corporate or trustee psychological services provider.

Division 2—Investigations

38—Powers of inspectors

This clause sets out the powers of inspectors to investigate suspected breaches of the Act and certain other matters.

39—Offence to hinder etc inspector

This clause makes it an offence for a person to hinder an inspector, use certain language to an inspector, refuse or fail to comply with a requirement of an inspector, refuse or fail to answer questions to the best of the person's knowledge, information or belief, or falsely represent that the person is an inspector. A maximum penalty of \$10 000 is fixed.

Division 3—Proceedings before Board

40—Obligation to report medical unfitness or unprofessional conduct of psychologist or student psychologist

This clause requires certain classes of persons to report to the Board if of the opinion that a psychologist or student psychologist is or may be medically unfit to provide psychological services. A maximum penalty of \$5 000 is fixed for non-compliance. It also requires psychological services providers and exempt providers to report to the Board if of the opinion that a psychologist or student psychologist through whom the provider provides psychological services has engaged in unprofessional conduct. A maximum penalty of \$10 000 is fixed for non-compliance. The Board must cause reports to be investigated.

41—Medical fitness of psychologist or student psychologist

This clause empowers the Board to make an order suspending the registration of a psychologist or student psychologist or imposing registration conditions restricting practice rights and requiring the person to undergo counselling or treatment or enter into any other undertaking. The Board may make an order if, on application by certain persons or after an investigation under clause 40, and after due inquiry, the Board is satisfied that the psychologist or student is medically unfit to provide psychological services and that it is desirable in the public interest.

42—Inquiries by Board as to matters constituting grounds for disciplinary action

This clause requires the Board to inquire into a complaint relating to matters alleged to constitute grounds for disciplinary action against a person unless the Board considers the complaint to be frivolous or vexatious. The Board may make an interim order suspending registration or imposing conditions restricting practice rights pending hearing and determination of the proceedings if the Board is of the opinion that it is desirable to do so in the public interest. If after conducting an inquiry, the Board is satisfied that there is proper cause for taking disciplinary action, the Board can censure the person, order the person to pay a fine of up to \$10 000 or prohibit the person from carrying on business as a psychological services provider or from occupying a position of authority in a corporate or trustee psychological services provider. If the person is registered, the Board may impose conditions on the person's right to provide psychological services, suspend the person's registration for a period not exceeding 1 year, cancel the person's registration, or disqualify the person from being registered. If a person fails to pay a fine imposed by the Board, the Board may remove them from the appropriate register.

43—Contravention of prohibition order

This clause makes it an offence to contravene a prohibition order made by the Board or to contravene or fail to comply with a condition imposed by the Board. A maximum penalty of \$75 000 or imprisonment for 6 months is fixed.

44—Register of prohibition orders

This clause requires the Registrar to keep a register of prohibition orders made by the Board. The register must be kept available for inspection at the office of the Registrar and may be made available to the public electronically.

45—Variation or revocation of conditions imposed by Board

This clause empowers the Board, on application by a registered person, to vary or revoke a condition imposed by the Board on his or her registration.

46—Constitution of Board for purpose of proceedings

This clause sets out how the Board is to be constituted for the purpose of hearing and determining proceedings under Part 4.

47—Provisions as to proceedings before Board

This clause deals with the conduct of proceedings by the Board under Part 4.

Part 5—Appeals

48—Right of appeal to District Court

This clause provides a right of appeal to the District Court against certain acts and decisions of the Board.

49—Operation of order may be suspended

This clause empowers the Board or the Court to suspend the operation of an order made by the Board where an appeal is instituted or intended to be instituted.

50—Variation or revocation of conditions imposed by Court

This clause empowers the District Court, on application by a registered person, to vary or revoke a condition imposed by the Court on his or her registration.

Part 6—Miscellaneous

51—Interpretation

This clause defines terms used in Part 6.

52—Offence to contravene conditions of registration

This clause makes it an offence for a person to contravene or fail to comply with a condition of his or her registration and fixes a maximum penalty of \$75 000 or imprisonment for 6 months.

53—Registered person etc must declare interest in prescribed business

This clause requires a registered person or prescribed relative of a registered person who has an interest in a prescribed business to give the Board notice of the interest and of any change in such an interest. It fixes a maximum penalty of \$20 000 for non-compliance. It also prohibits a registered person from referring a patient or client to, or recommending that a patient or client use, a health service provided by the business and from prescribing, or recommending that a patient or client use, a health product manufactured, sold or supplied by the business unless the registered person has informed the patient or client in writing of his or her interest or that of his or her prescribed relative. A maximum penalty of \$20 000 is fixed for a contravention. However, it is a defence to a charge of an offence or unprofessional conduct for a registered person to prove that he or she did not know and could not reasonably have been expected to know that a prescribed relative had an interest in the prescribed business to which the referral, recommendation or prescription that is the subject of the proceedings relates.

54—Offence to give, offer or accept benefit for referral or recommendation

This clause makes it an offence—

(a) for any person to give or offer to give a registered person or prescribed relative of a registered person a benefit as an inducement, consideration or reward for the registered person referring, recommending or prescribing a health service provided by the person or a health product manufactured, sold or supplied by the person; or

(b) for a registered person or prescribed relative of a registered person to accept from any person a benefit offered or given as an inducement, consideration or reward for such a referral, recommendation or prescription.

In each case a maximum penalty of \$75 000 is fixed.

55—Improper directions to psychologists or student psychologists

This clause makes it an offence for a person who provides psychological services through the instrumentality of a psychologist or student psychologist to direct or pressure the psychologist or student to engage in unprofessional conduct. It also makes it an offence for a person occupying a position of authority in a corporate or trustee psychological services provider to direct or pressure a psychologist or student through whom the provider provides psychological services to engage in unprofessional conduct. In each case a maximum penalty of \$75 000 is fixed.

56—Procurement of registration by fraud

This clause makes it an offence for a person to fraudulently or dishonestly procure registration or reinstatement of registration (whether for himself or herself or another person)

and fixes a maximum penalty of \$20 000 or imprisonment for 6 months.

57—Statutory declarations

This clause empowers the Board to require information provided to the Board to be verified by statutory declaration.

58—False or misleading statement

This clause makes it an offence for a person to make a false or misleading statement in a material particular (whether by reason of inclusion or omission of any particular) in information provided under the measure and fixes a maximum penalty of \$20 000.

59—Registered person must report medical unfitness to Board

This clause requires a registered person who becomes aware that he or she is or may be medically unfit to provide psychological services to immediately give written notice of that fact of the Board and fixes a maximum penalty of \$10 000 for non-compliance.

60—Report to Board of cessation of status as student

This clause requires the person in charge of an educational institution to notify the Board that a student psychologist has ceased to be enrolled at that institution in a course of study providing qualifications for registration on the register of psychologists. A maximum penalty of \$5 000 is fixed for non-compliance. It also requires a person registered as a student psychologist who completes, or ceases to be enrolled in, the course of study that formed the basis for that registration to give written notice of that fact to the Board. A maximum penalty of \$1 250 is fixed for non-compliance.

61—Registered persons and psychological services providers to be indemnified against loss

This clause prohibits registered persons and psychological services providers from providing psychological services unless insured or indemnified in a manner and to an extent approved by the Board against civil liabilities that might be incurred by the person or provider in connection with the provision of such services or proceedings under Part 4 against the person or provider. It fixes a maximum penalty of \$10 000 and empowers the Board to exempt persons or classes of persons from the requirement to be insured or indemnified.

62—Information relating to claim against registered person or psychological services provider to be provided

This clause requires a person against whom a claim is made for alleged negligence committed by a registered person in the course of providing psychological services to provide the Board with prescribed information relating to the claim. It also requires a psychological services provider to provide the Board with prescribed information relating to a claim made against the provider for alleged negligence by the provider in connection with the provision of psychological services. The clause fixes a maximum penalty of \$10 000 for non-compliance.

63—Victimisation

This clause prohibits a person from victimising another person (the victim) on the ground, or substantially on the ground, that the victim has disclosed or intends to disclose information, or has made or intends to make an allegation, that has given rise or could give rise to proceedings against the person under this measure. Victimisation is the causing of detriment including injury, damage or loss, intimidation or harassment, threats of reprisals, or discrimination, disadvantage or adverse treatment in relation to the victim's employment or business. An act of victimisation may be dealt with as a tort or as if it were an act of victimisation under the *Equal Opportunity Act 1984*.

64—Self-incrimination

This clause provides that if a person is required to provide information or to produce a document, record or equipment under this measure and the information, document, record or equipment would tend to incriminate the person or make the person liable to a penalty, the person must nevertheless provide the information or produce the document, record or equipment, but the information, document, record or equipment so provided or produced will not be admissible in evidence against the person in proceedings for an offence, other than an offence against this measure or any other Act relating to the provision of false or misleading information.

65—Punishment of conduct that constitutes an offence

This clause provides that if conduct constitutes both an offence against the measure and grounds for disciplinary action under the measure, the taking of disciplinary action is not a bar to conviction and punishment for the offence, and conviction and punishment for the offence is not a bar to disciplinary action.

66—Vicarious liability for offences

This clause provides that if a corporate or trustee psychological services provider or other body corporate is guilty of an offence against this measure, each person occupying a position of authority in the provider or body corporate is guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as is prescribed for the principal offence unless it is proved that the person could not, by the exercise of reasonable care, have prevented the commission of the principal offence.

67—Application of fines

This clause provides that fines imposed for offences against the measure must be paid to the Board.

68—Board may require medical examination or report

This clause empowers the Board to require a registered person or a person applying for registration or reinstatement of registration to submit to an examination by a health professional or provide a medical report from a health professional, including an examination or report that will require the person to undergo a medically invasive procedure. If the person fails to comply the Board can suspend the person's registration until further order.

69—Ministerial review of decisions relating to courses

This clause gives a provider of a course of education or training the right to apply to the Minister for a review of a decision of the Board to refuse to approve the course for the purposes of the measure or to revoke the approval of a course.

70—Confidentiality

This clause makes it an offence for a person engaged or formerly engaged in the administration of the measure or the repealed Act (the *Psychological Practices Act 1973*) to divulge or communicate personal information obtained (whether by that person or otherwise) in the course of official duties except—

(a) as required or authorised by or under this measure or any other Act or law; or

(b) with the consent of the person to whom the information relates; or

(c) in connection with the administration of this measure or the repealed Act; or

(d) to an authority responsible under the law of a place outside this State for the registration or licensing of persons who provide psychological services, where the information is required for the proper administration of that law; or

(e) to an agency or instrumentality of this State, the Commonwealth or another State or a Territory of the Commonwealth for the purposes of the proper performance of its functions.

However, the clause does not prevent disclosure of statistical or other data that could not reasonably be expected to lead to the identification of any person to whom it relates. Personal information that has been disclosed for a particular purpose must not be used for any other purpose by the person to whom it was disclosed or any other person who gains access to the information (whether properly or improperly and directly or indirectly) as a result of that disclosure. A maximum penalty of \$10 000 is fixed for a contravention of the clause.

71—Service

This clause sets out the methods by which notices and other documents may be served.

72—Evidentiary provision

This clause provides evidentiary aids for the purposes of proceedings for offences and for proceedings under Part 4.

73—Regulations

This clause empowers the Governor to make regulations.

Schedule 1—Repeal and transitional provisions

This Schedule repeals the *Psychological Practices Act 1973* and makes transitional provisions with respect to the Board and registrations.

Ms CHAPMAN secured the adjournment of the debate.

**GEOGRAPHICAL NAMES (MISCELLANEOUS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 26 September. Page 998.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): In speaking to the Appropriation Bill, I indicate that on 6 April this year the Treasurer stated on ABC Radio that the delayed budget—the somewhat unprecedented delayed budget—would provide him with:

... a capacity to meet future demands on health, what we want and what we will. ... as a government, spend a lot more on health than we have announced in the election and in previous budgets.

When the budget was finally delivered last week, it was very disappointing. Increased funds were provided—and I will refer to those shortly—but it was disappointing to find that we actually had nothing in the budget that would, as the Treasurer promised, be aimed at spending a lot more on health than was announced during the election or in previous budgets. What he actually announced was a number of programs which made up the sum of \$360 million worth of promises that were to be delivered to South Australians in the area of health over the next four years, and, of course, not forgetting the extra \$67 million that he promised in January to fix up the overload in the preceding financial year of which we note from the budget he spent only \$14.4 million. So, we knew there was a backlog from that, we knew there were \$360 million worth of promises, and what did we get? We got maintenance of existing services. We got the deferral of capital works, the cancellation of others, and the stretching out of the delivery of election commitments over a decade. That is what we actually got in the end.

It was pleasantly interesting, I suppose, to receive notice that there was going to be a \$640 million increase over four years to be spent on health. It was pleasant for the people of South Australia to hear that. They heard the Treasurer announce that this year the government was going to spend more than ever before, more than \$3 billion, on health. On the face of it, that sounded a lot to the general population. However, being aware that in the year that has just finished we spent \$2.9 billion and before that something like \$2.75 billion, we know that we actually have to spend a lot of money every year just to maintain the services that we currently have. We also know now that fixing the health system for the future was just an excuse for the budget delay, and that this was really an opportunity for the Treasurer to delay the budget to try to sort out how he was going to fix up his own financial mess and provide for services, because we got nothing extra.

I refer to the contribution by Mr Belchev, who interestingly, some people might be aware, is now the new head of Country Health at Port Augusta. On 22 June 2004, when he was the Director of Major Projects in the Department of Human Services, he gave evidence in response to a question from the Hon. Dean Brown to explain that there was an enterprise bargain agreement in place that had come into effect for the 2004-05 year and that it would require a significant increase in funding to pay for the extra pay rises that had been negotiated. Here are the figures he gave us: in

2004-05 they would need an extra \$56 million; in 2005-06 they would need an extra \$107 million; in 2006-07 they would need an extra \$155 million; and in 2007-08, \$167 million.

He explained to the committee at that stage that some of these amounts were already provided for but that there were very significant shortfalls. For this year and next year, it was \$82 million and \$87.5 million for this year and the next financial year. It is important that we appreciate this because, of course, the Minister for Health very kindly advised the house today—I think in an attempt to try to dispel the information provided by me over the last week—that on page 7.5 of the budget there is provision for new employee benefits and costs. In summary, in 2004-05 we spent \$1.394 billion on just salaries and wages.

In 2005-06 the estimated result—I am not quite sure why we cannot have the real result three months after the end of the financial year—is \$1.537 billion, and next year it is \$1.621 billion. So he is absolutely right: there it is in the budget. That is exactly what we are saying: provision has to be made. The Minister for Health needs to appreciate that that money will not fall out of the sky; it has to be provided for, it has to be made available. It is extra money that is necessary. We know from the evidence of Mr Belchev and the subsequent estimates from that period which relate to the current period that significant funds have to be provided.

You do not need to take my word for it. You can actually read the verdict of Lee Thomas of the Australian Nurses Federation Association, who, whilst praising the extra \$140 million, points out:

However, the real increase in the metropolitan area equates to about 5 per cent, and with current increasing demand in our public hospitals this increase will very quickly be eaten up.

She knows the situation full well, because more than 20 000 of this work force is largely made up of nurses as well as the medical profession and other staff. So she knows and I know, and I hope the Minister for Health understands, because he is going to get ripped off every year by the Treasury if he does not get that message very quickly.

The other thing is that about a billion dollars a year is spent on services and supply, on equipment, including everything from surgical gloves to band-aids and everything else used in hospitals. Health costs a lot, there is no question about that. We all know that prices do not stay the same for four years. They have to increase, and there has to be annual indexation. If the Minister for Health does not know this, perhaps he should read the budget, because the authors of the budget—presumably, the people who work in Treasury—tell us that and that there has to be a major provision for that—and that is exactly what has happened.

So, we know that at the end of the day a huge amount of money is spent on health every year and that a lot more money is going to be spent over the next four years, but what we end up with is what we have got. That is the point. I will refer to the election promises in a moment, but in reality we have a situation where we are still eighth, the last state in the country, in relation to waiting times for elective surgery and response times for emergency departments. So, being right at the bottom, we are going to need hundreds of millions of dollars just to continue the services we have which are down at that level. We know that we are going to need a huge amount of extra money.

How has the government carved this out so that it can provide for its legal obligation to the workforce, which I might mention just this year alone is going to increase by 240

full-time equivalents? Even though we have this extra provision for people who are going to be taken out in efficiencies, a lot of extra staff (full-time equivalents) will need to be provided for. We know that, and that is all clearly set out in the budget. So what does the government do? It cuts the capital works budget by \$6 million. That is the first thing. We could perhaps cope with that, except that it is also not spending \$13 million which was set aside in last year's budget for two mental health facilities: the Boylan Ward at the Women's and Children's Hospital, and the project at the Noarlunga Hospital. Included in the Boylan Ward funds is a provision at Helen Mayo House, which is part of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, at the Glenside site. These projects have not been delayed. They have just disappeared altogether. They have been cancelled, finito. That is one way they do it: cancel projects completely out of the budget and take them off the balance sheet so there is no requirement to spend.

In addition to that, facilities are delayed and that, significantly, means that the money is held by the Treasurer in the coffers of the government. It does not have to spend it. It will have the income on it and it makes no other provision for it. So, the government reduces the total amount for capital works—which has dropped from \$134 million to \$129 million-odd—and then it delays other projects and cancels some altogether. This is an era when we are hearing repeatedly that primary health, chronic disease management and mental health are the three key areas of health reform—we have heard it from Menadue, we have heard it from experts all around the country and we have heard it from the Mental Health Council of Australia, and the minister has come into this house and acknowledged that. He has said how important these things are. So, we have two things to do. We have to fix what we have and we have to look into these other areas of health which are absolutely necessary to ensure that we do not have a collapse of the health system. Yet, the government's two major mental health projects are cancelled altogether.

There was even a reduction in the provision of beds for the third project at the Lyell McEwin—a reduction from 65 beds to 50 beds for mental health. This means that 15 people who are sitting at Glenside and who are residents of the northern suburbs will not be able to go back to their facility; they will be kept out at Glenside. It is good enough for the people in the southern suburbs, where the minister lives. His 15 people, of course, are going to have brand new premises this week—which will be opened officially next month—at the Margaret Tobin Centre.

I want to thank the Hon. Dean Brown for the Repatriation General Hospital facility and the Margaret Tobin Centre, which commence operation this month and next month respectively. Those facilities will be magnificent. It is just a shame that, when it comes to mental health, we still have projects that are leftovers from the last administration, and we are not moving on with those that have been announced by this administration but which, of course, have since been cancelled.

So, one thing the government has done is savage the budget. The other thing the government has done—even though we hear about primary health—is to completely abandon the GPs. We had this magnificent announcement during the election that we would have three new GP centres, 24-hour services, allied health services and support to GPs. It was a fantastic idea. Everyone agreed. Primary health was certainly to be advocated and supported. So what have we had? We have had an announcement of the Aldinga GP

facility. It has now suddenly become one of the 10 GP sites. This is a facility which has been contributed to by the local council. This is a facility that was announced by the government in response to outrage and protest by the people in the Aldinga district at not having a GP service. Now, suddenly, it has become one of the GP services. What of the other two? They will be at Elizabeth and Marion. It will take this government four years to open two more. We have the priority of primary health and yet in four years we are not going to get the delivery of service.

The next thing is to completely slaughter the country people. They are in a situation where their services are effectively decimated. There is inadequate provision for the existing services. It is no surprise to us that, out of a budget of \$129 million for capital works in health, the only provision is for 10 dialysis chairs in Port Augusta. It may be that the people of Yorke Peninsula, who do not have a dialysis machine anywhere to be seen, have to go to Port Augusta. The people of Victor Harbor, who also do not have a dialysis machine—and the local CWA is ready to donate money for one—get nothing. The Riverland has a few chairs but there are people who have to travel hundreds and hundreds of miles (often three days a week) to use a dialysis machine in order to keep alive. What is the government going to do? It is going to put 10 more at Port Augusta. That is great for the member for Stuart and for the people of Port Augusta. They probably need it. That is terrific. But what about the rest of the people in South Australia? What about some equity in South Australia?

This is a direct indicator to the rural people of South Australia of what they will not receive and results from the centralisation of taking Mr Beltchev up there and setting him up in Port Augusta. If you want to get well in the country you either have to go to Adelaide or migrate to Port Augusta. That is the truth of the matter and that is how badly country people have been treated.

On that note, I want to mention what the people of South Australia have said about this budget and how the government has gone about dealing with it. Let me first deal with Dr Rischbieth. Dr Rischbieth is the representative of rural doctors and I think he practises in Murray Bridge, if my recollection is correct. Dr Rischbieth has issued a statement in which he has made it absolutely clear that country health has been overlooked and that quite an inadequate provision has been made for services in rural South Australia. He has been honest enough to come out and say it, and I thank him for that, because it takes a bit of courage to take it up to the government and expose where the government has failed and where it pretends to be doing something. That needs to be exposed.

Country people represent a third of the people living in South Australia, and it ought to be important to the house that country people spend about \$240 million of our health budget in metropolitan hospitals. Why? Because they do not have the services out there. Emergency departments in the metropolitan area in this state are already overloaded. So it is in the interests of the other two-thirds of the population being provided with a service that we provide a facility in the country, so that the other one-third of the community have some provision made for them, which they richly deserve.

Then we come to Dr Chris Cain, who is the President of the AMA in South Australia. He has been applauding the government for not just the budget but for the \$70 million announcement that was made during the election to provide extra training in public hospitals. He was very impressed by

that policy announcement. It is a very important for visiting medical specialists to be able to train up our next generation of medical providers. I want him to have a look at the budget, because I cannot find that \$70 million over the next four years. There is some provision, but nowhere near \$70 million. So, Dr Cain, let me tell you this: you have been sold a pup on this. Dr Cain made a statement to *The Advertiser*, as follows:

It [referring to the government] has delivered all the government's election commitments on health, with an additional \$640 million allocated over the next four years and \$400 million specifically to address expected increase in demands.

I say to Dr Cain, read the budget, boy, because you have been sold a pup. When you are out there fighting for GPs and the rest of the people you are supposed to be representing, other than just your specialist colleagues, where were you in dealing with primary health, which is supposed to be an important initiative of this government, and making provision for it?

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, in the words of what is said out there in the country, this AMA president, in relation to what he has given and what statements he has made in relation to this budget and where the government has failed and his failure to expose that, he is as useless as tits on a bull. It is time that people who stand up purportedly to represent the professions understand that they have a responsibility and, if they are not prepared to take up that responsibility, I say, 'Get out of the way and let someone else get in there and do it.' Bring in Dr Rischbieth. At least he knows what he is doing and at least he knows what has to be done. I think it is very important for this parliament to understand that you can buy off whomever you like as far as we go with these representatives, by saying, 'Here we are; here's \$70 million for this. Well, you're not going to get it, actually, but here's what we are offering, and no provision.'

Lee Thomas represents the nurses of South Australia, which is a very important role, and I respect her for that. I respect her for at least having the decency to come out and expose what has been a deficiency in this budget and say that it is not adequate to make provision for the future of health resources. She, of course, has been told that 700 nurses will be back on the public payroll when the government buys the Modbury Hospital, at a cost of \$17½ million to you, me and every other South Australian. She gets a benefit in the ideologically zealous sort of approach of this government, which is prepared to spend \$17½ million on buying back a hospital which is already out there operating efficiently.

Yet the government does not have an extra dollar to put anything into domiciliary care for the people waiting for every piece of equipment you can think of—whether it is the lady in Kadina, whose husband needs to be able to have a regular dialysis chair, or whether it is the 81 year old sitting out there who has waited two years just for a pair of surgical shoes. I know what the priorities are. I am hearing from those consumers. It is important that the parliament appreciates that and understands that there are real people out who are waiting, and they are having a say. They do not get the same profile as all the others, but I will quote from just one of them, who wrote into today's newspaper about Noarlunga. She said:

TAXPAYER-FINANCED advertisement boasts in the media by the SA Premier tell us of the large amount of cash to be spent on Lyell McEwin Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre.

What about their other hospital?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pengilly): Order! The member's time has expired. The member for Heysen.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. May I say what a pleasure it is to be before you, Your Worship, Your Honour, Your Holiness, or whatever you are. I kiss your foot. Having looked at this budget over the last few days, I have to say that at first glance I thought, 'Oh, maybe they have done all right.' But, then, as always, and as the boys on ABC said either this morning or yesterday morning, 'The devil is in the detail.' Once you begin to look into this budget, once you begin to dig into the detail of it, the sleight of hand this government is practising becomes obvious. Now that the election is out of the way, of course, the government does not need to even appear to be doing the right thing.

In relation to Families and Communities (and I see the minister is in the house), there is an overall savings of \$36 million. That strikes me as exactly the wrong direction in which to go: Families and Communities should be getting an extra \$36 million, not overall savings of \$36 million. That includes an efficiency dividend of \$6.1 million and a reduction in operating costs of \$2.3 million. There are, of course, similar figures across a range of portfolios.

The reality of this budget is that this government is failing to deliver to the people of South Australia. This government has enormous amounts of money—more money than any other government in the history of this state. The government is getting amounts of money through the GST that we could not conceive. The government is getting over \$1 billion a year in property taxes alone. The economy is booming, thanks to very good management at the federal level, but, for all of that, the government has nothing to show. The government has been here for four years with those conditions, and it has nothing to show. Not only is the government not reducing property taxes or other levies and charges to make things a little more affordable for the average punter out there, but, guess what, the \$150 payment to senior citizens that was there last year has been removed, post election.

As we have heard in question time over the last couple of days, our schools are being deprived of \$6 million in interest, and they are being asked to manage their own WorkCover claims—as if the principals, teachers and administrators of our schools do not have enough to do already without having to manage WorkCover claims. I can tell members that, having worked for a number of years dealing with WorkCover claims and little else, there is a lot more to managing them than simply filling out the occasional form. That will distract the people who should be looking after our greatest resource and our greatest investment—our children—onto things which are completely irrelevant to their skills and what they should be doing.

We know that we are falling behind in tourism. So what has this government done? On my calculations, it has reduced the tourism budget by 15 per cent from \$33 million to \$28 million. That seems extraordinary. This government keeps coming up with excuses about tourism on the basis that things such as 9/11 and the Bali bombings, and so on, are some sort of basis for our not doing so well. The reality is that this state is doing worse than the other states. There simply is no excuse for it. It strikes me as extraordinarily stupid to reduce funding in an area where we know people will be spending money. We know people are keen to stay and travel within Australia and we know we have some of the best tourism destinations which we are not marketing. We

also know that it is part of the economic prosperity for the future of this state to build the tourism industry.

In relation to road maintenance, the government has allocated \$3.4 million instead of \$200 million. It is extraordinary to see the wasted opportunities of such a wealthy government and to see what it is failing to do. I will refer briefly to the portfolios for which I am the shadow minister. Immediately the budget was announced, the Attorney-General went onto Bob Francis's radio program on 22 September, late in the evening, after 11 o'clock at night. Strangely enough, he came onto the radio—here is the Attorney-General and he will tell us all about the budget—and he spent most of the time talking about prisons. It struck me as an unusual thing for the Attorney-General to be talking about because—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: Bob was thrilled to bits, and, in fact, he said 'bloody marvellous' that there will be prisons. Most of the time, instead of speaking about actual improvements in law and order issues, the Attorney-General was talking about prisons. The surprising thing is that, having told us about how the prisons will operate, how they will close Magill, it turns out that there is nothing in the budget to tell us when these prisons will be built. Certainly, the only thing I have seen in the budget about Magill is that more money will be spent to maintain Magill in its current form. It strikes me as a little odd that money will not go into replacing Magill at present, but, rather, just sustaining the existing Magill facility, with no timetable for it to be replaced, even though the government is making a big announcement about closing it. I cannot find any mention of the remand centre, which is one of the worst facilities but it does not get a mention. What is more, in terms of looking after the prisons, the government is only budgeting for an increase of an extra 1.6 per cent full-time equivalents compared with an increase last year of 4.5 per cent. It does not make sense.

The Attorney-General, having spent most of his time on the radio talking about the prisons—which are not in the budget even though they have been announced—said, 'You have to invest downstream of the police. You have to invest in prosecutions, in courts and, ultimately, invest in prisons.' 'Ultimately' is a fairly telling word in that context when they have not timetabled anything to do with redeveloping the prisons. But, having mentioned this idea of 'you have to invest in prosecutions', Bob Francis said that the DPP has been saying on television there is not enough money, so 'What have you done about that?' The Attorney-General gave an answer that a share of that was \$2.7 million over four years for the office of the DPP. Francis asked, 'Is that what he asked for?' That was a difficult question for the Attorney-General because it is not what he asked for, of course; it is nowhere near what he asked for.

In fact, when one looks at that \$2.7 million over four years, from memory it was something like \$435 000 over the next year and there is mention of four new prosecutors. I cannot see how four new prosecutors, no matter how hard they work, can make a substantial dent in what is needed in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions. We have four new prosecutors. We know from previous media reports that the prosecutors who work in that office at present are operating about 120 files each. Four new prosecutors will not reduce the number of files to a reasonable level for people to work on over their working day. They will not be able to do the work quickly enough.

Ms Fox interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: The member for Bright is asking about the amount. It is \$2.7 million over four years. When \$2.7 million is reduced over four years, if it was evenly distributed—and it is not quite; it is less in the first year—it is over \$600 000. With add-on costs it amounts to four prosecutors. That is why the Attorney-General hesitated when Bob Francis asked him about this. Clearly, it is nowhere near the amount that is needed to bring this office to an appropriate level for the prosecutors to do the work which they dearly wish to do and which they do to the best of their ability.

When the budget announcement was made—and I think that was one of the pre-announcements—there was also a very short excerpt on the radio from Deej Eszenyi, President of the Law Society. She was asked what she thought of the \$2.7 million for extra public prosecutors. Obviously, she welcomed that announcement and said that she was hoping to see more money for Legal Aid services. When I looked at the budget there is a bit more money for Legal Aid services, but it is a very small bit. My reading of the budget papers is that the state's contribution is increasing marginally from just shy of \$24.5 million to a little over \$24.5 million, but still short of \$25 million; so it is less than a 2 per cent increase. It seems to me implicit in that figure that it will not be sufficient to meet any increase in demand for Legal Aid. In real terms, an increase of less than 2 per cent amounts to no real increase, and probably a decrease, with respect to the amount of work that can be done for that amount of money.

However, at the same time, I note that, in terms of the administration of the Attorney's portfolio, in the savings measures identified in Budget Paper 1 the government is expecting \$3 million extra by increasing its fees for the lodgement of civil actions in the Supreme Court, the District Court and the Magistrates Court. These are not criminals; they are people who simply have a civil action against someone and they want to sue them in negligence or on a contract, or whatever. The fees for these people are being increased so substantially that they have made it into Budget Paper 1 on the savings measures. This government will receive \$3 million extra from these people.

I know that one of the real problems in the civil jurisdiction, in particular, about which various constituents and people from around the state have written to me, is the difficulty for people who have very little money—people who are running a small business of their own, for instance, and they may have a bad debtor, so they bring a small claim. The idea of what are now called minor civil actions is that, at very little cost, a person will be able to achieve an outcome, because it is a court jurisdiction where the parties are not generally represented by solicitors. The magistrate has enough training in the law to understand the issues and to make a determination.

The problem is that people often obtain judgments in that jurisdiction and then find that enforcement is almost an impossibility. The delays in the court, the delays in getting people to behave and do what they have been ordered by the court to do—that is, pay the money—or the impossibility of getting people to pay money if they simply say, 'I don't have the money,' and the difficulties that people face in trying to obtain money which they have properly expended or earned and which is due to their business, create real difficulties in terms of small businesses. I have seen small businesses go under because of bad debts that are owed by people who are legally found to owe them the money, and yet they do not pay up. I suggest to the Attorney-General that, rather than increasing fees for civil litigation, he should be concentrating

on how to work some improvements into the system to ensure that people who have legitimate claims that have been heard and dealt with by the court are able to achieve satisfaction of the claim.

Another thing that I noted (in fact, I noted it before the budget, but it was confirmed in the budget) was that the office of the Ombudsman is being decreased. I received a letter shortly before the budget was brought down in which the Ombudsman's office informed me that the departure of the person who had been dealing with the matter with which I was concerned was as a result of a recent decision to remove funding for a third legal officer's position, which took effect on Monday 4 September 2006. I had a look at the budget in relation to this matter, and it appears that the excuse given for this is that a number of complaints will now be dealt with by the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner.

I acknowledge and accept that there is now this other commissioner (who amounts to an ombudsman) to deal with things, particularly in the health and community services area. However, when one looks at the figures for the budget, one will see that the anticipation and the target of the Ombudsman's office remains at something like 1 900 items a year by way of complaints coming into the office. So, the government is not expecting the Ombudsman to do any less work; it is expecting the Ombudsman to have one legal officer fewer, but to do the same amount of work as it was targeted to do last year. That is simply a nonsense. Anyone can see that they will not be able to do it and that it will lead to inordinate delays.

We all know that the Attorney-General has never practised as a lawyer, but one would hope that he had at least heard the adage 'Justice delayed is justice denied'. If one looks at what is happening in the office of the Attorney-General, the office of the DPP and the office of the Ombudsman, and the failure to address these issues about minor civil claims, in any number of aspects one will see that justice is being delayed in this state. It will be delayed because of a failure to adequately fund the Legal Services Commission. It is consistent in its pattern across this whole portfolio that insufficient funds are being expended to enable people to obtain justice in a timely manner, and justice delayed is justice denied.

It is a hallmark of this government, in my view. It is failing us all, and there is no excuse for it, with the money it has. The government has an enormous amount of money, and it is just wasting it on things such as the tramline extension and extra ministers, who are not members of the Labor Party but who are appointed as ministers to secure the position of this money. Just look at the money that this government has wasted on CEOs. There have been successive CEOs of a number of departments during the government's short term in office, because they get people in, trumpet them loudly, pay them a motser, and then they leave because people advise the government to do things other than what the government wants to do. So they then leave, break the contract and they are paid out.

I now want to briefly traverse some of the areas in my other portfolio responsibilities: the disabled and ageing portfolios. It is deeply saddening to me that the overall decrease in disability funding is at least \$12 million less than last year's actual funding. Some \$10 million has been removed on the basis that it was one-off funding decisions in 2005-06. It translated to me that what this means is that this government was dragged kicking and screaming to a

recognition of the plight of the disability sector. It began to take the tiniest steps towards addressing some of the issues (mostly, I suspect, because of the campaign waged by the Dignity for the Disabled group, led by David Holst), and it did so leading up to the election. However, now that the election is out of the way, it is a case of, 'Let's rip all that out and put everyone back where they were.'

The government has stated that it will achieve an \$8 million saving related to governance reform in incorporated disability services. This is where we reach a real philosophical difference between us and this government. This government—and, in particular, this minister—has an attitude that it needs to bring everything under government control. I defy anyone in government to come up with examples of where government runs things better than private agencies. My experience is that private agencies, such as Anglicare and all sorts of others around the place, do a much better job, and they do it on a shoestring budget. They have enormous political support within the community. They are recognised as doing a good job. They do not do it because they want to win the next election: they do it for the right reasons. They run efficient and appropriate organisations. However, this government has the attitude that it will bring everything under government control.

There are certain people in the Public Service who are building empires so that they get more control and bigger pay packets, and that is what it is all about. They end up with more and more bureaucrats and fewer and fewer people actually out on the ground helping the people who need it most. That is the philosophical difference with this government.

On the issue of ageing, I notice that this government has introduced an enormous decrease in concessions—and I cannot tell from the budget papers whether it simply concerns concessions for the aged (the \$150 I mentioned earlier in my speech that has now been removed) or whether it concerns concessions all around. However, to reduce concessions from \$123 million in last year's budget to only \$87 million in this year's budget is a huge decrease.

I think one of the most significant things about the whole portfolio of ageing (and it was touched on by the member for Fisher in his address regarding the foresight committee) is that the government fails to recognise the impact of our ageing baby boomers—and I confess that I am one of them. The oldest of the baby boomers have now started to reach retirement age. It amazed me to know (and I got these figures from the federal minister for ageing not too long ago) that, on the best count they can do, there are currently more than 2 400 people in this country who are over 100 years old. However, by the year 2055 the federal government anticipates that there will be 78 000 people in this country over the age of 100.

We need to start thinking now about how we are going to deal with a population of 78 000 people over the age of 100. We need to think about the fact that, because of that bubble of the baby boomers going through, it is not going to stay at that high level. However, we are going to have a significant amount of time with a significant sector of the population over the age of 85. To have 78 000 people over the age of 100 is extraordinary, so I think there is quite a bit of merit in the proposal being put by the member for Fisher that we need to start thinking about this and start planning for it. We need to start thinking about the work force implications; we need to start thinking about Alzheimer's and funding dementia screening.

Time expired.

Ms FOX (Bright): Today I rise to speak about a matter that is important to me, and indeed to members on this side the house—that is, the provisions made for sustainability and climate change in this budget. I do not think it is very important to the member for MacKillop, who yesterday referred to my remarks on the subject as inane. He may not think that sustainability and climate change is important, but I do. He may not understand that the things he was talking about yesterday in the house—the increasingly high temperatures, the lack of rain, the shrinking rivers—are not due to some natural, cyclical cause but are being caused by the gradual warming of the earth.

This event is not questionable; the science is there. Those who seek to doubt that science may also believe that smoking cigarettes is beneficial to their lungs. If they choose to go down that path of gross criminal ignorance then we can only pray for their electorates and for the welfare of this country at large. Indeed, the CSIRO report that the Premier released today shows that global warming is a clear and present danger, with findings that climate change in South Australia will lead to higher temperatures, lower rainfall, and an increase in drought and fires. Because global warming shifts nature's balance, in many parts of the world rain is increasing as a result of global warming while in other parts of the world it is decreasing.

Global warming produces more evaporation from the sea to fill the warmer atmosphere with increased moisture and it also sucks more moisture out of the soil, so desertification is increasing rapidly and we cannot ignore that either. To that end, this government will spend nearly \$2 million on rainwater tank rebates to encourage domestic reuse of rainwater. So our government, our Premier, has boldly chosen to establish a portfolio for sustainability and climate change—indeed, Mike Rann is the first Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change in Australia—a bold step, a brave step, and a necessary step.

What are the initiatives outlined in the budget this year? First, the Rann government will seek to ensure that South Australia reaches the Kyoto target, stabilising greenhouse emissions below 108 per cent of 1990 levels by 2012. Now, I know that the member for MacKillop is not currently in the house, but he may like to read this so that he can gain a better understanding of what I am talking about. In 1997 in Kyoto, Japan, nations around the world created a groundbreaking treaty, the point of which was that industrialised countries would reduce their collective emissions of greenhouse gases by 5.2 per cent compared to those in the year 1990. Countries that ratified this protocol committed to reducing emissions of carbon dioxide and five other greenhouse gases or engage in emissions trading if they maintained or increased emissions of these gases.

The accumulation of greenhouse gases, trapped inside the earth's atmosphere, is making our planet warmer. The natural cycle of the planet is changing rapidly; it is changing out of all recognition. Ice caps are melting, species are threatened, hurricanes are increasing, droughts are more prevalent, famine is spreading—and it can all be linked to this human-related problem. We have been dumping CO₂ into the world's atmosphere, and it is toxic. Many countries world wide, including this state, are seeking to reduce these emissions, and one might ask what our brave Liberal government in Canberra is doing. I can tell you that at the time of the treaty's creation, Australia was the biggest emitter per capita

of greenhouse gases—and the federal Liberal government decided not to ratify the Kyoto treaty. Along with the United States of America, which emits nearly one quarter of the world's greenhouse gases, the federal Liberal government decided to stick their collective heads in the sand, dismiss the problem, and hope it will go away. Well it has not gone away and is not going to—and woe betide anyone in this place who thinks this is a political issue. It is not.

Members interjecting:

Ms FOX: Well may you tremble, because it is a moral issue and one of real urgency that South Australians know about. I had a letter from a constituent of mine this morning, a Mr Varley, who is deeply worried about the climate change crisis and what we are doing about it. In his letter he outlines a number of concerns and concludes by saying that the federal government is not showing leadership on the issue. His opinions do not represent a lone voice. I have people calling me about this situation once or twice a week. I get letters. People talk about climate change as a very real crisis, and we in the South Australian government are aware, and we are responding.

We are developing and implementing plans to limit South Australia's ecological footprint. We are preparing climate change legislation for introduction to parliament—legislation which will target a reduction of greenhouse gas emissions to less than 60 per cent of 1990 levels by 2050, and an increase in the use of renewable energy so that it comprises 20 per cent of all electricity consumption by 2014. We will spend nearly \$1 million to establish the Premier's council on climate change control to engage business and the wider community in the development and implementation of policy responses to climate change.

This government has listened to the scientific experts, and we have acted. We have acted in response to a very real emergency that is on our doorstep, one that the Liberals choose to ignore by failing to commit to the Kyoto treaty. When I pointed out yesterday, the member for MacKillop said my comment was inane. When the good people of the South-East ask the member what he and his party are doing to alleviate the crisis they are facing, I hope he has the grace and honesty to answer 'Nothing', because he and his party treat our environment with all the contempt of a Viking pillaging raid. Use, burn, abuse and walk away; that is what they have done.

For the member for MacKillop to name inane my calls yesterday in this place—in the form of an interjection—for the irresponsible federal Liberal government to sign the Kyoto treaty is an indicator of exactly where the Liberals and their colleagues in Canberra stand on this issue of planetary crisis. It shows once again that they are ignorant, arrogant, out of touch and, frankly, they are dangerous.

I care about the world I live in, and this government cares as well. This government will spend nearly \$1 million on establishing the first-ever Chair of Climate Change at the University of Adelaide, named after Sir Hubert Wilkins, which will be spent on research to examine how industries such as wine and agriculture can adapt to the regional impacts of climate change. The government is committing \$10.8 million over the next four years to reduce the impact of government cars on this environment. But, the background to all these great efforts is that we, as a state government, are having to take bold steps where the federal government will not.

Significant world figures such as Mikhail Gorbachev and Al Gore have praised this state and our Premier for what we

are doing. So, we will continue along the path of change and reform. We will continue to act not just for today but for the many tomorrows to come. This is not inanity: this is vision; this is courage; this is intelligence—all these things which seemed to infuriate so much my colleagues opposite. I commend this part of the budget to the house.

Mr PISONI (Unley): As I rise to speak to the Appropriation Bill, I am stuck with the sinking feeling of *deja vu*. I hope that the obvious signs of the gross mismanagement of this state's economy by the current Labor government do not lead to another State Bank-sized financial fiasco, which we on this side of the house will be called upon, once again, to fix, as we did last time. The Liberal Party did fix the mess after the last time Labor was power—\$9.4 billion worth of mess. Yes; the Liberal Party did fix the horrible mess left by John Bannon, who, while simultaneously holding the offices of premier, treasurer and—look out! *Deja vu*—federal president of the ALP—presided over the collapse of this state's economy. The ALP now has a Premier who modestly styles himself on two of this state's most historically significant Labor premiers—John Bannon, who now describes himself as a historian, and who is indeed significant for having bankrupted this state, and Don Dunstan, who was known for his progressive social policy.

The Premier promised to introduce legislation to protect same-sex couples from discrimination in the first session of the 51st parliament. This has not been done. We now learn that the Relationships Bill is to be substantially amended. I cannot help but wonder how the honourable member—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pengilly): Order! The member for Unley has the floor.

Mr PISONI: I cannot help but wonder how the Hon. Ian Hunter is feeling about this sleight of hand, particularly now that we know that this is not considered as important by the Attorney-General. What did the Attorney-General say when he was asked in this place if he had gone soft on this issue? He said that he was too busy. What does that say about the government's priorities when it comes to honouring an election commitment to the South Australian gay and lesbian community? In exchange for their votes, everything else seems more important. When asked what his reason was for delaying the introduction of the legislation, he told the parliament the following:

So many things have happened in my portfolio in the break. There have been crime statistics; there have been delays in indictable manners; the drink/driving case *Police v Conway*; there have been appointments to the Supreme Court, the District Court and the Youth Court; there has been the appointment of a new chief executive in Justice; there has been this morning's debate about wheel clamping; there has been the Keogh case; there has been the question of payments to jurors.

Even the issue of wheel clamping is of greater interest to the Attorney-General than that of removing one of the last strains of discrimination in our community. I do not believe that the promise made by premier Rann to South Australia's gay and lesbian community before the election was conditional, or that it would only be honoured if the Attorney-General had nothing else to do. I believe that this cynical position by the Rann government would have Don Dunstan creasing his safari suit, rolling over in his grave.

Mr Bignell: What about Mark Brindal?

Mr PISONI: And Mark Brindal possibly—but he's not dead yet, although he's off to Bangkok. Then there is the Premier's other idol, the Hon. John Bannon. As a self-styled

historian he has played a large and unique role for himself in South Australian history as the man who bankrupted it. And it should not be forgotten that Mr Rann was the chief adviser to Mr Bannon, and later sat around the same cabinet table making those very decisions on government owned enterprises that proved to be so disastrously wrong. The AAA credit rating, which the Treasurer is keen to claim as his own, was, of course, made possible by the Liberal government as it took action to save interest payments of some \$2 million a day, making the tough decisions that this government will never make.

Mr Bignell interjecting:

Mr PISONI: We are not spending it on interest. But it is taking the biggest risk for all of South Australia's future by taking no political risks, such as an overhaul and revamp of old-fashioned state taxes to secure a future for South Australia in our industries, business and our youth. This Treasurer knows that he is defrauding the public when he claims that it is he who delivered this state's AAA credit rating. And I take particular notice of Mr Maurice Terrell of Goolwa, a constituent of the member for Finniss in his letter to *The Advertiser* last Saturday, when he wrote:

Let's get the facts right. Mr Foley did not achieve the AAA credit rating. It was handed to him on a platter after years of hard yards by the previous Liberal governments to restore the economy that was wrecked by the Bannon government of which Mike Rann was a prominent member.

So, as Mr Terrell points out in his letter to the editor, it is as if the Treasurer and the Labor Party had in some way contributed towards obtaining the state's AAA credit rating. The AAA credit rating has its solid foundations in the work of the Liberal Party by making the hard political decisions that allowed the overriding burden of the massive Labor debt to be filled, to be lifted from the shoulders of South Australians. We must also acknowledge the stable national economic climate made possible by the steady and responsible fiscal policies and workplace reforms put in place by the Howard Liberal government. In particular, the introduction of the GST, the revenues from which, along with our massive housing boom windfall from state taxes such as stamp duty and taxes on employment growth, such as payroll tax, have seen this Labor government rolling like happy pigs in the excesses of over-budget revenues.

On current estimates, the Rann government is the highest taxing in our state's history. It has \$2.7 billion more to spend annually on providing infrastructure and services to South Australia than when it first came to power four and a half years ago. Still there is no tax relief, no reduction in levies, stamp duty for young people trying to break into the housing market, or payroll tax for small business. 80 per cent of South Australian businesses are small to medium enterprises. Payroll tax hits this sector particularly hard, but this government continues to bite the hand that feeds this state's families. We still have unfunded superannuation liabilities for the public sector skyrocketing, as is our unfunded liability of WorkCover.

We still have the closure of schools which will result in cuts to teaching staff. But closing schools is nothing new for Labor governments. The Bannon and Arnold governments closed 63 schools in their term. Still they sell off state assets to pay for recurrent services. And still, despite the ideological protest, they know that the private sector does things more efficiently than the public sector, so they privatise by hire purchase. We in the Liberal Party are honest about our intentions. If we sell a government asset we accept that it is

privatised, and expect the Labor Party to make a cheap political point.

Where is Labor's credibility when this Premier signs pledges not to privatise then sells government schools, pockets the money and then builds super schools using PPPs, or private public partnerships. I find it fitting that these schools are being described as 'supers schools'. The government suggests that it is because of their size, but I would suggest that it is because of their owners, the various superannuation funds across Australia. I would like to make it perfectly clear, I am a supporter of the private sector. I also believe that in general the private sector is a more efficient supplier of products and services than the public sector. The Labor Party knows this, but that does not stop them from tapping into the fears and insecurities that the general public has about change, and misleading the facts for political advantage.

The Labor Party's current scare campaign on WorkChoices is a typical example of this cynical political tactic, and, just prior to the introduction, this Premier told this house that the GST was a confusing and indecent tax that would cause social inequities: 'The parson's nose gets taxed, but the whole chook doesn't,' he equipped dismissively in this house when leader of the opposition. It is a different story now, of course. He is more than happy to see the parson's nose, the wings, the drumsticks, the breast, and indeed all of this juicy chicken taxed. And the Treasurer is salivating.

Mr Bignell: And the Colonel's secret spices!

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order! The honourable member will stick to the task.

Mr PISONI: The honourable member's constituents will enjoy the chicken feed I'm sure. In fact, he would also be happy to apply land taxes to chicken coops, stamp duty on chickens breaking into the coop market and payroll tax on the hens while they lay their eggs. And despite this bounty of GST revenue and massive windfalls in state taxes this Treasurer is stuffing up the accounts. That is why we have seen a four month delay and contractors flown in from Canberra to clip the wings of a budget that is out of control—definitely nothing to crow about! Mr Foley may have been happy to previously inform this house that the GST is a massive injustice for ordinary working Australians, but he has been quite prepared to reap the benefits of the GST and very reluctant to offer relief in the form of reduced state taxes, unless threatened by Canberra to comply with the original agreement of the GST with the states.

In the *Financial Review*, a paper which I believe the Treasurer holds in high regard as he often brings it into this chamber and pretends to read it, the General Manager of the Australian Institute of Chartered Accountants, Mark Jones, said there was nothing in this budget for business. In particular, he cites the failure to cut payroll tax and land tax 'to assist South Australian businesses to remain competitive'. The greater than expected proceeds of the GST should have allowed our state to gain a greater share of economic growth by funding reforms, infrastructure improvements and better service delivery. Instead, this government has massively increased the Public Service, mostly in back offices, while ignoring service delivery and now needs to borrow money to fund infrastructure projects, with cost blowouts spinning out of control.

How can this be so? How could we expect see a reduction in payroll tax, land tax, stamp duty, or relief or encouragement for business, industry and working South Australians when this level of sloppy budgeting and unfettered expansion

of the Public Service and their wages continue? The close ties of this Labor government to the Public Service Association has had an obvious effect in increasing Public Service numbers, but now even the Treasurer, asleep at the wheel for so long, has woken to the need to exercise some discipline in public sector recruitment. The jargon has started already—'ambitious program of public sector reform', 'quite significant agency restructuring', 'targeted voluntary separation packages', 'overhaul and modernise', 'deployees'—all words used by the Treasurer to describe the changes.

Now, just for a change, the Rann government should cut the spin and call a cut a cut. We are talking about sackings. After all, it was Mr Foley who suggested on 22 February before the election that voluntarily separation packages for public servants did not work, and he said that the last public sector employee to volunteer to take a separation package was in May 2004. Just how voluntary will Mr Foley's separation packages be? I note that in New South Wales the effective ban on compulsory retrenchments was abandoned because the policy of voluntary retrenchments simply did not work.

The tasty carve-up of the GST state tax chicken by the Premier and Treasurer has not prevented the PSA General Secretary, Jan McMahon, ending up with egg all over her face. After spending \$250 000 of her members' money on an advertising campaign promoting the re-election of this government on the basis of an irresponsible promise, never likely to be kept, of not cutting Public Service jobs, how embarrassed must Jan McMahon feel now? Not happy, Jan. Presumably with a straight face, she told *The Advertiser* on 6 March that the PSA campaign would focus on the type of jobs that would be lost under the Liberal's proposal and the impact on the community. Strangely, my memory of the advertisements has lots of paramedics, prison officers and frontline service types; not a back-office public servant in sight.

How does Jan McMahon explain the 2 000 proposed job losses to those whose union fees propped this government up at the last state election? As the PSA is so cashed up from its extra members, I look forward to Jan McMahon pushing for a PSA advertising campaign apologising to the people of South Australia for misleading them. No public sector job cuts indeed. What a cheap and despicable fraud that election promise was. Well, maybe the Treasurer did not look at the figures until after the election. Perhaps that is why the budget was so delayed. Perhaps he honestly did not know and that is why, when the realisation struck him, he had to admit to this house on 19 September that the management of public sector numbers has not been as good as it should have been.

If he had looked at the figures he would have seen a Labor government public sector blow-out of 6 000 full-time equivalent jobs in just three years, an extra cost in wages alone of \$550 million per annum, which represents a massive 5 per cent of this state's \$11 billion in revenue. A day of reckoning has come and, whereas the Liberal Party went to the election being quite up-front and telling South Australians that responsible measures needed to be put in place, Mr Rann and his colleagues just smiled and lied.

If the Treasurer reads the *Financial Review* which he carries around, he would know that South Australia is the small or small-to-medium enterprise state. Approximately 80 per cent of businesses in our state fall into this category so it is strange—indeed, quite ridiculous—and certainly counterproductive to employment growth that we have the lowest payroll tax threshold and the highest rate of all the

states of Australia. In South Australia, employers pay a tariff of \$5.50 for every \$100 in wages they pay their staff for the privilege of employing in South Australia. With state tax revenues climbing to over \$3 billion this year, Mr Foley could well afford to give small business in this state some constructive assistance to expand and provide jobs for South Australians. With big business continuing to leave this state and job losses for the likes of GMH, Electrolux and AGL, and similar likely at Mitsubishi, the Rann government should have been far more forward-looking in terms of tax relief incentives for our business sector and, in particular, manufacturing. I could only assume that the Rann government's reluctance to hear the calls and heed the advice from business, economists and political commentators around the nation in regard to reducing the burden of taxes is proof that this Labor cabinet is a business-free experience zone.

I was disappointed but not shocked that the Premier raised the cost of apprenticeship training in his budget because it was this Premier, when employment minister in the Bannon government, who introduced TAFE fees into South Australia in the first place. It was not enough for South Australia to have the highest TAFE fees in the country before the budget, but this increase now puts us well and truly ahead of the scale of service to ratio for those at TAFE colleges throughout South Australia. In typical Labor style, let us see the pressure from the government for the boss to pay, as that was the advice that the Hon. Mike Rann gave me when I wrote to him as an employer of apprentices in the late 1980s expressing my concern about the introduction of TAFE fees.

This is crazy logic. We have a shortage of trades and skills in this state, as the state government knows. The health minister certainly knows, because his department is one of the largest users of the 457 visas in the country. This is a federal government visa program to fill the void of skills in the workplace. We have federal Labor telling us that we need to train more and advocating the removal of TAFE fees, and we have the Labor Party's front-running candidate for the federal ALP presidency increasing TAFE fees, thus confirming that this state has the highest TAFE fees in the country.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para): I would like to make some comments about the budget that has just come down, particularly in relation to my own electorate and things that are very pleasing for my constituents. First, the Golden Grove Police Station, which is a very important issue up in the north-eastern suburbs. My electors in Greenwith, Golden Grove, Surrey Downs and Fairview Park absolutely wanted this and needed this. It was promised in the election, and I am really pleased to see the government immediately setting to the task of building this and for it to be finished by June next year. Also in that neck of the woods is Greenwith Primary School, a very large primary school, and those constituents, whom I share with the member for Wright, largely attend that school. It has received \$500 000 for additional accommodation to cope with the enrolment growth that the school is experiencing.

I am also really pleased to see the funding in the education budget for 10 more children's centres. There are currently 10 on the books but there will be 20 of these built and operating by, I think, 2010. Elizabeth Grove Primary School is well on the way to having its child-care centre and new kindergarten built, and I am really pleased that this one, in particular, is carrying forward. I was instrumental in making sure that, a year or two ago, the Women's and Children's Hospital began working through early intervention programs out of that

school with mums and dads and young families. These children's centres are really important. They are tackling children in the most vulnerable years of their lives, aged nought to eight years. I know the government's agenda will be to have even more centres right across the state, but I am very pleased that Elizabeth Grove has one. It is a very needy area, and I am hoping that, when the department decides on a further five of these centres, there may be another one in the Elizabeth/Salisbury area.

[Sitting suspended from 6 to 7.30 p.m.]

The Hon. L. STEVENS: I was speaking about my pleasure at seeing the funding of a total of 20 early childhood development centres provided through the education budget. I also applaud the further funding of the family home visiting program, which has been a remarkable success in terms of providing much needed support for young mothers across the state. The extra funding in the family home visiting aspect of Every Chance for Every Child through the health budget will enable another set of at-risk family situations to receive support until the child concerned is two years old. So that initiative, and the further strengthening of the Every Chance for Every Child initiative, combined with the 20 early childhood development centres that are being built and resourced with some basic staffing, is a really good start in establishing a program through those very important early years of every child right across the state.

In the northern area of Adelaide I am working with heads of agencies and the government, and we will be bringing in the non-government sector and the federal government to see what can be done in terms of combining all efforts and implementing a theme with the provision of services for children through the years zero to eight. When visiting the schools in my electorate of Little Para—I do not have any high schools within the boundaries—

Mr Pengilly: They have all been closed.

The Hon. L. STEVENS: No, they have not been closed; I inform the member for Finnis that my electorate has unusual boundaries. The concern of the primary schools is the leakage of students to the private sector. They are very concerned about that and are becoming increasingly concerned that some of the private schools in the area are now saying to parents that they might not be able to offer their child a place in year 8, but if the parent enrolls the child at year 6 then a place will be guaranteed when the child gets into secondary school. This is certainly a matter concerning the government high schools.

Closely following that is the concern of principals and governing councils about the state of facilities. None of the schools that have been mentioned in the minister's press release are in my electorate, but the facilities in a number of those schools also require upgrading. This enormous problem that we have in terms of ageing stock in our schools is something that has been coming for many, many years. In that respect, I am pleased that we have an initiative being put forward by the education minister and the government in relation to the PPP initiatives, to provide incentives for schools to obtain new facilities.

Quite clearly, state governments on their own are simply not going to have the money to be able to provide the facilities that are needed, so future partnerships with the private sector are very important. I will be looking forward with interest to seeing that situation develop.

I am very pleased that we are starting in the northern suburbs, around the Smithfield Plains and Munno Para area. I am aware of the issues involving those schools and I understand from my colleague the member for Napier that they are pleased and very enthusiastic about the opportunity that they now have. Mind you, I am also aware that there have been discussions amongst those schools for some time in relation to doing something quite different in terms of the future. I believe that will also be the case in the other areas that have been targeted. Quite frankly, I am glad that the minister has chosen to target areas that would be considered to be solid Labor areas, because certainly in the northern suburbs one of the major issues is lack of educational attainment.

We have an opportunity to make a real difference in terms of providing first-class facilities and in encouraging students from reception (and prior to reception—child care and preschool), primary and secondary school and to encourage them in terms of providing first-class facilities, which is their right. The other point I would make is that school officers often ask me, ‘What is the point of coming up with ideas when, in fact, the money that could be generated through savings is taken from us and returned to the department?’ In other words, there is no positive incentive for people to go through the pain that always accompanies change and reform. I think this is one of the really important wins that the minister has achieved, with the government agreeing that, if schools come up with reforms which can improve learning outcomes and also make savings, then those savings can be used by the schools themselves.

That is a very important change to the way in which things were done in the past under governments of either persuasion. In other words, there has been a positive incentive for people to make change. They get rewards they can then use to promote the reforms they are putting in place.

Finally, the other major plus for the Little Para electorate, although this is a matter much broader than would apply only to that electorate, is the next stage of the Lyell McEwin Hospital, with \$43.5 million for stage B. As people would know, I, along with the Premier, opened stage A a year or so ago, with \$90 million in two parts of stage A. Another \$43.5 million is about to be spent. It is a very large hospital, serving the northern suburbs and much further out into the Lower North regions. It is very much a growing area in terms of population, and it warrants a large hospital, particularly with the Emergency Department and the Emergency Extended Care Unit, which is welcome. The other allocation that is especially welcome is that which will provide a greater number of mental hospital beds at Lyell McEwin Health Service. At the moment, it has 20 acute beds. This redevelopment will see a total of 50 mental health beds (30 acute adult beds and 20 acute aged-care beds).

We will see further decanting of beds from Glenside Hospital out into a regional hospital so that people can receive the services they require closer to home. That is a very strong principle of the generational health review, and that is how services should be delineated, so that people can access the majority of their services as close as possible to where they live. It is a long way from Elizabeth, Smithfield and Gawler to Glenside Hospital; it is a long way for patients and visitors. So, it is really pleasing that Lyell McEwin Health Service will have 50 beds.

I know that the deputy leader, in her speech, criticised the government because it was decided that a further 15 beds were to be left at the Glenside campus. She said that people

from the northern suburbs would miss out on those 15 beds remaining at Glenside. What she has not done is get her facts right.

Ms Fox: What’s new!

The Hon. L. STEVENS: Yes; what’s new! Those 15 beds are for people from country areas. They are rural and remote beds; they are not for people from the northern metropolitan areas. They are country beds that will be centred at Glenside.

In my last few remaining minutes, I cannot conclude my contribution before referring to a couple of comments made by the deputy leader on some of the issues involving health funding. I know she is a new shadow minister, but she really does need to do some homework on how things work. She mentioned (as did the member for Kavel) issues about waiting times for elective surgery in South Australia, as well as issues about waiting times in emergency departments. I point out to the deputy leader and other members opposite that, under the previous government, when the former deputy leader was the minister for human services, he decreased the amount of elective surgery year by year. So, no wonder we had a difficult situation to manage when we finally won government in 2002.

In fact, over the time of the last government, elective surgery increased year by year through extra funding being provided by the Rann Labor government, which reversed the downgrading that had been occurring. The deputy leader needs to realise that history did not begin when she became deputy leader; there has been some time past and circumstances were as I have mentioned. She can check the facts, because that is what happened. Similarly with emergency department waiting times, the most significant amount of work done in respect of emergency departments in South Australian hospitals has occurred in the last two or three years, particularly at Flinders Medical Centre. However, it has also spilled over to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and, I think, to most of the other big hospital emergency departments, where they have at last begun to analyse how they can improve the flow-through and provide better patient care.

In fact, the effort made by Flinders Medical Centre is world class, and people come from all over the place to see what has happened there. That had never happened before, but it has happened in the last two or three years. These things were occurring to a degree, but ministers did not tackle the hard things. The deputy leader also criticised the amount of work being done in relation to primary health care. I have to say that she can be critical, but what is being done now is a damn sight better than what was being done previously. In fact, this definite shift of funds towards primary health care came out of the Generational Health Review; it was a specific recommendation. The government accepted that recommendation, and it has got to work on it. Sure, there is more work to be done but, my goodness, it has made a significant effort. The building of the \$27 million Marion GP Plus centre, the one that is almost finished at Aldinga and those that will be built at Woodville and Elizabeth are the first of many in the state, and they will make a significant difference. With those words, I conclude my remarks.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I will make a few comments in relation to the Appropriation Bill, in other words, the state budget. First, I turn my attention to the impact of the budget on my electorate of Mitchell. I am pleased to note that there are not any mooted school closures in relation to the south-western suburbs which I look after. The government does seem to be targeting schools in the northern and north-

western parts of the city, but I am pleased to say that schools in my electorate remain intact. I say that with some relief because there are some schools where the enrolment has been dropping over recent years, but they happen to be in areas where there is a tremendous amount of regeneration in the suburbs, where old Housing Trust stock has been sold off and new homes are being built, often for young couples who have or will bear children. There is not only a regeneration in the housing stock, but I suspect that will lead to an increased childhood population and, therefore, greater health for the local schools.

There is one sour note in relation to schools, though; that is, the government's decision to take away the interest money earned on funds which schools have parked in holding accounts while they are waiting to spend the money. Some high schools—and I am particularly considering Seaview High School and Hamilton Secondary College, for example—at various times have very significant infrastructure spending. When funds are received from the Education Department, it is often in a block, in a lump sum of some kind, and the fact is that the money needs to be parked somewhere while necessary approvals are obtained, contractors are sought and tenders are put out, and so on. I simply make the point that the parking of money and the gaining of interest is something that happens across every department. Indeed, Treasury itself does it, in a sense. It is certainly happy to get interest on the money put into bonds etc. on the international money market. It is really no different in principle for schools to seek to gain benefit of interest while they are waiting to spend the money.

I do not know of any school, and I have never known of any school in the nine years I have been a member of parliament, that has deliberately withheld money in order to get interest in the bank account. It is absurd. I do not know of any principal or school council that would do that because the money is there to be spent, and, whether it is members of governing councils or the principals themselves, I have never come across any who would rather have earned a small amount of interest than spend the money when it could be spent. My point is that it is inevitable that money will be parked in those holding accounts for a period while necessary approvals and arrangements are made for school improvements.

I turn to the subject of health. I am very pleased to see that a substantial amount in this budget will go towards the Marion health village. I am not sure what it will be called eventually, but I am referring to almost a reincarnation of the Inner Southern Community Health Centre. The current premises of the Inner Southern Community Health Centre are dilapidated, despite the best efforts of staff to maintain them, and they are in a maze of interconnected buildings on South Road, Clovelly Park. Many of the services they provide will be more accessible to more people when the Marion health village is established. I note that will happen in the next couple of years and there is confirmation of that in this budget. I have been calling for this development for many years, and I remember speaking personally with the former minister for health about it some years ago. It is always gratifying when these long-term projects finally become reality. As a member of parliament one begins to feel one is getting runs on the board. The existing buildings of the Inner Southern Community Health Centre could well be maintained as an outpost for services such as counselling or education, for example, in relation to nutrition, while a greater variety of services will be offered at the more central location of the health village near the corner of Diagonal Road and Morphett

Road, Oaklands Park. That is a good news story in the budget.

I turn to the issue of transport in my electorate. There are two burning issues at present; one is in relation to the Oaklands crossing. There has been a wait of over 30 years for a safe and efficient crossing at the intersection of Diagonal Road, Morphett Road and the Noarlunga railway line. That is the place known as the Oaklands crossing. In fact, it was promised in the 1975 budget, and local residents have been waiting ever since then. The fact is that, more than ever, we need a separation of road and rail at that point: the congestion is becoming quite unacceptable. On many days it is worse than what one might see at an even busier intersection, that of South Road and Sturt Road, in the morning at peak hour. The need for a separation of road and rail is becoming even more important now with the increasing prosperity of Westfield Marion, the future building of the Marion Health Village and the proposed swimming pool in the area immediately north of the crossing.

Local residents have been disappointed at the proposal for the relocation and upgrading of the Oaklands station, not because they do not want an improved station—of course they do—but because the project seems to ignore the bigger picture. It seems to ignore the traffic problems around the Warradale shopping precinct and the congestion arising from the extremely busy triangle of commercial and public services available between Diagonal, Morphett and Sturt roads. So, I can only renew the call for a road/rail separation at the Oaklands crossing. We know that there have been department of transport studies on the feasibility, and we know that it is possible. It may cost about \$60 million. I know that is a lot of money, but I can only urge this Labor government to make it an election promise, if not a reality, before the next election, because it would be an extremely popular measure for many thousands of locals who use that intersection on an almost daily basis.

The other burning issue in relation to transport is that of buses. Just today Torrens Transit announced a series of drastic changes to bus routes in the south-western suburbs, and almost all the changes have an impact on people in the electorate of Mitchell. There are a couple of very popular services, the MA1 and MA2 and the 243 bus, which are being cut; that is, they will not continue in their current form. A range of bus services will largely replace those services I have mentioned, but there are bound to be winners and losers. In the glow of the public relations drive from Torrens Transit and the government today it is a bit hard to pinpoint where the losers are but I am sure that, as we go through the detail of changes to the bus services, the unfortunate people who will be worse off will come to light, and then it will be a matter of further lobbying to see whether any shortcomings can be addressed. This is ultimately a budget issue because, if Torrens Transit cannot implement changes for busier services without cutting other necessary services, ultimately, it may be that the budget for that contract may need to be increased. So, it does come back to the state budget.

I turn to a couple of sport and recreation issues relevant to the electorate of Mitchell. The most pressing issue is the proposed pool that is to be built and known as a state aquatic centre. It is proposed to be built in the place called the Marion Domain, which is at the corner of Diagonal Road and Morphett Road at Oaklands Park. The council has been desperate to obtain funding for the pool for a number of years, after having purchased and demolished the housing that was in that area. I have worked with the Marion Council

to see some sort of productive use put to that land and, on the whole, it probably would be a very good thing to have the pool as well as the Marion Health Village go ahead. The pool, however, is not yet a concrete certainty. I note that there is no money in this year's state budget to be spent on the project, notwithstanding that there is an existing promise to match federal funding of \$15 million with state money. I suppose all that means for the proponents of the pool (including me) is that the state government does not expect any of that money to be expended this year. The council, no doubt, might feel anxious about that. The only thing to be done is to continue to seek out private sector funding so that, with the combination of state, federal and private sector funding, the pool can go ahead.

The other sporting issue I would mention is in relation to the sporting precinct between Norfolk Avenue and Sturt Road at Marion. Club Marion is there, the Marion Lawn Bowls Club, the croquet club and the dilapidated stadium that is the home of the Panthers Basketball Club. The sporting clubs in that precinct have done extremely well to continue to flourish, despite the continual struggle to maintain participation (especially among younger players), and to maintain funding for their activities. The ultimate vision for that area would be a completely new basketball stadium. Currently, Souths Basketball Club has a two-court stadium and, with 500 or so players involved in the club at all age levels, it is truly deserving of better facilities.

It is my hope that one day we will see a modern four-court stadium built in the vicinity of the existing community and sports club closer to Sturt Road. I make that assertion in light of the state government's recent bail out of the Basketball Association of South Australia. Millions of dollars can be spent bailing out a peak body yet we have clubs struggling at ground level, getting \$5 here and there from every player and every parent as they come through the door just to keep going in a stadium which does not have the comforts and facilities one expects these days of a busy sporting facility. I see some inequity in that; if the government can throw millions of dollars towards the peak body in the state then I believe a lot more of that money should find its way to the ground level, where the kids are learning to play and moving up through the ranks to become senior basketballers.

I make one brief comment in relation to an environmental issue in the electorate of Mitchell. For many years I have been advocating that the state government should take action to preserve the Field River catchment and, in particular, the immediate river environs. Some of the environment around the Field River, as it goes from the Glenthorne estate down to Hallett Cove and the sea, is in almost original 19th century condition and there is special built heritage in the area as well with significant remnants of early mining. The area is regularly trashed by four-wheel-drive enthusiasts as well as motorcycle vandals—who even go to the extent of tearing down fences to get into the place—and the noise they create is the bane of nearby residents. It would not be so bad if it was a purpose-built recreation facility, but there is often a complete disregard for local flora and fauna and for the built heritage of the area. I mention this tonight because it is a matter which the Minister for Environment and Conservation should think about, and I trust that in future the state government will work with the Onkaparinga and Marion councils to resolve the ownership and maintenance issue in relation to the Field River.

I would like to make some general comments in relation to the budget, and probably the most significant one is in

relation to jobs. A lot of money is flowing through state governments these days after the GST decision—and, while I lament the imposition of the goods and services tax, the fact is that a lot of that money has flowed through the state budgets. In fact, the South Australian budget this year shows just how much states are benefiting from that federal money. It means that in a post-election budget the management team in South Australia has been able to deliver more money for health services (which I applaud) without any significant cuts. Of course, as I have mentioned, there are swings and roundabouts in relation to schools in the northern suburbs—some will go and some will be built—but overall it is a steady-as-she-goes budget.

My concern is in relation to job losses and how South Australia is going to cope, and what the government is going to do in terms of the next few years and the worsening economic climate. Just recently we have seen 77 jobs go overseas from BT Australia, one of the back-office processing centres in the electorate of Mitchell, and of course Mitsubishi, one of the most significant manufacturing enterprises, is also located in the Mitchell electorate. There are also the hundreds of businesses which rely on Mitsubishi's future. I believe the state government is vigilant in relation to Mitsubishi's future, but there is more that can be done in terms of supplying research funding, looking forward to the next model that Mitsubishi might choose to produce, and cushioning the impact of job losses where they have occurred.

Time expired.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): Madam Deputy Speaker, I would like to say what a delight it is to have in the chamber tonight the young ladies from the YWCA as guests of the Hon. Michelle Lensink.

On Thursday 21 September 2006 the Treasurer of South Australia, the Hon. Kevin Foley, laid down the budget for the nine remaining months of this financial year. It was some four months late and—despite much rhetoric, a great amount of smoke, and shining mirrors—it does little to address the future direction of the South Australian economy and does even less to soften the tax slug on the citizens of South Australia. It is, to quote a number of other speakers and, in particular, our leader the Hon. Iain Evans, a budget of broken promises and lost opportunities. Make no mistake, this is a Labor budget, with a vision of only 2010 in its sights and little else.

Any vision for the long-term sustainability of the state is sadly and badly lacking. Grandiose announcements relating to super schools fail to recognise the core community values of the close-knit school organisations and the 'keep it local' ethos, which is so much a part of South Australia. We see the re-release of funding to do capital works in my electorate on the Victor Harbor High School and the Kingscote campus of Kangaroo Island Community Education. Re-release? We are still to see the works commence. Is it any wonder staff and parents lose trust in government? We suffer the highest taxing government in South Australia's history. It is awash with riches—rolling in them—gaining enormous revenue from the GST. It is a tax that it bitterly opposed, and one that the Premier and Kim Beazley said would be rolled back. Well, I wonder how much rolling back is still on the agenda.

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: I think the member has had his turn. South Australians with school-age children must be wondering who is next. What do they do with their children to

provide a stable and non-disruptive period of education over these very formative years? Is it any wonder that 2 000 South Australian children per year are going into the private system? John Bannon, alas, presided over the greatest financial disaster in South Australia's history. Given the massive WorkCover liability, which has risen from \$67 million unfunded to \$617 million unfunded, is Premier Rann intending to better the Bannon record? Re-announcing capital works on schools does little to put governing councils' minds to rest.

In the health sector, the massive expenditure to justify the socialist ethos in relation to Modbury Hospital at the expense of other much-needed health expenditure around the state seems to have clouded sound common sense judgment. And, lo and behold! We will have another 600 public servants back on the payroll—back on the public purse. Much-needed projects have been sidelined, including, in my electorate of Finnis, a dialysis service, so badly needed, so critical to easing the discomfort of those needing such facilities. It is a disgraceful, philosophical bent of doing what unions want—buying back Modbury.

We in South Australia now equal the worst waiting list in Australia. Capital expenditure in country hospitals over and above current works has been stopped dead in its tracks for the next five years. The smokescreen of developing a new country management system is a joke, which undoubtedly will be found wanting. Is this the way to disguise critical work projects, to roll out another method of administration? I think not. In short, the health budget is a sham.

Now, in saying that, there are aspects of the state budget which are obviously worthwhile projects, and there is no hiding that. Every government of every persuasion always does things with its budget that are worthwhile for the state. Further education has taken a body blow. Increased TAFE charges for struggling students makes a mockery of Kim Beazley's call for HECS to be removed. In addition, the failure by the Rann government to build and renew TAFE facilities in regional South Australia is a further sign of the contempt in which it holds rural Australia.

My electorate of Finnis has the most rapidly rising population in South Australia, and there is a desperate demand by many local youth and others for a new TAFE facility, which was on the books. It was shelved by the Rann government when it came to office in 2002. Hopes were built up in 2006, and it was slashed again. This budget will not be forgotten by the young and not so young voters in Finnis in 2010—rest assured. There has been a continuation of a critical lack of honesty with the people of South Australia. Some of my new colleagues on the other side are in swinging seats. They will not forget what is transpiring across the state, and well may you rule the troika running the state on the morning of 21 March 2010.

In regard to transport, a series of hocus pocus, Mickey Mouse announcements on overpasses, tunnels and the like lacks credibility at the very least, and, more to the point, they lack any design, plans, proper area identification or sound strategic planning. In short, there is nothing to fly with. I look forward to the day when they come before the Public Works Committee so that we can see what the government will put forward, because, at this moment, there is Sweet Fanny Adams. One can be left wondering at the amount of froth and bubble expenditure of overruns and scoping charges that undoubtedly will surface in the months ahead. Which poor public servants will be targeted by the Minister for Transport for the errors that are forthcoming? Who is next on the hit

list? Who next will be thrown out the door? Where is the plan for a north-south transport corridor to ease major traffic congestion through the city? There is not one.

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: The member opposite puffs and blows, but there is no plan. There is a series of ideas. The paltry amount of remedial work to be done on the ageing and deteriorating arterial road network is entirely inadequate, and will only further serve to alienate the wider South Australian population. Where is the funding to develop further the Adelaide to Victor Harbor road? Where is the funding to further develop the Goolwa to Mount Compass road, to fix up the shoddy goat track that passes for a road from Yankalilla to Victor Harbor? Where is the money to rebuild a crumbling network of archaic roads on South Australia's premier international tourism destination, Kangaroo Island? Hundreds and hundreds of kilometres of roads—

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith: You were the mayor.

Mr PENGILLY: And you were the lord mayor. Hundreds of kilometres of roads in my electorate are totally beyond the ability of local government to cope with. The scheme that was in place to provide funding in those areas is gone. Millions of dollars of GST revenue are lost in some crazy forms of expenditure which serve little or no public good. Shame on you, Premier, and your government. All this is to be sacrificed in the name of the 'Rann tram to nowhere'—surely a monument to stupidity if ever there was one. John Bannon has the State Bank, Mike Rann will have this little gem to remember him by.

Of major concern are the ongoing cuts to the South Australian Tourism Commission budget. Despite puffing pompously about tourism, including trade shows and the like, there is a very fundamental lack of understanding by the government of the industry and what makes it tick, and I have had some experience in the industry, so I am not speaking off the top of my head here.

Mr Kenyon: Not like you normally do.

Mr PENGILLY: Keep going. I am enjoying it; keep going, members opposite. Poor old chief executive Bill Spurr must tear his hair out at the diatribe from his government principals when he understands that, quite simply, further cuts to his budget will serve only to crucify marketing in a cutthroat industry already struggling with cheap flights overseas and interstate governments who understand just how much is required to be injected to maintain the status quo, let alone increase the market share.

Domestic tourists are increasingly conscious of targeted marketing and high value outcomes for their scarce dollars. International visitors use Adelaide reluctantly to get to Kangaroo Island and the Outback. They want the wildlife and the stunning scenery. They don't want to join the latte set and eat in restaurants that can be found anywhere around the world. Marketing dollars cut out of this budget are a sign of madness and a total lack of understanding of this most valuable industry. The thousands of employees in the tourism industry have been done a disservice by a most foolhardy decision.

The wine industry in its current dire straits needs reassurance and commitment to at least hold its market share and maintain its employment levels. I never heard a thing about it. Emergency services seem to have been given the kiss of death from the Rann government in its haste to appease its union masters who keep on supplying their MFS employees with all they demand. The constant shower of dollars to satisfy the looney left has undervalued the volunteer organisa-

tions of the CFS and SES. Is it any wonder that the volunteer numbers continue to decline in the CFS, or indeed is that just what the Rann government wants? My constituents tell me that in the CFS they just want to go to a fire, put it out and go home; not have to put up with the ridiculous amount of increasing bureaucracy and demands on their time. That is in addition to being held to ransom by lunatic government laws and regulations under the Native Vegetation Act which inspire fear of retribution by members and community members only trying to get on with their jobs—fire and the need to combat fire—instead we have the ludicrous situation where CFS volunteers are frightened to light up burnbacks because of Big Brother. It is a sad situation.

Some welcome news is the cut to koala relocation and sterilisation funding. A few of us around the place have actually got a few theories on what to do about koala culls. It doesn't include—

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Yes, I'm like the Minister for Transport, I'm starting to get excited. When I talk about koalas I get excited.

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: The member for Enfield inspires me to speak about corellas, but the member for Stuart has far more knowledge of corellas than I. I am very pleased to see the reduction in the koala funding because we have a very sure-fire way of reducing koalas which requires commonsense and something that happens very quickly. Giving them a first-class ride after vasectomies and various things—

Ms Fox interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: This is what they are doing, member for Bright. This is the real world. They give them vasectomies and tubal ligations, then they give them a first-class trip down to the South-East via aeroplane. This is way you fix up the koala problem. This is an introduced species.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Anyway, enough on koalas. Local government continues to struggle under the impost of an increasing raft of new laws.

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: You guys have had your turn; I've got my turn. Local government continues to struggle under the impost of an increasing raft of new laws and Big Brother bureaucrats. In my short time in this place I am astounded at the lack of respect shown to the local government sector. The imposition of further waste management levy increases will only serve to further antagonise local councils and create increasing distrust of the state government. Nothing can be more unjust than the imposition of additional compulsory revenue-raising by a sector of government that is hamstrung by government statute.

Trying to fix the waste issue needs to be sensitively and carefully handled as a partnership. Consultation, consultation, the government is big on consultation. Well, there has not been a lot happening with local government, let me tell you. They should not be subject to further imposts of this kind and the dictatorial jackboot antics of some Environmental Protection Authority officers. My councils—Alexandrina, Kangaroo Island, Yankalilla, Victor Harbor—are all labouring under the demands of waste management requirements and the huge amount of money they are required to put into this from the poor old ratepayer. The poor old ratepayer suffers again. All this wealth from the GST and they are getting very little from the state government.

Another area of concern raised with me by constituents is the generous financial handouts to the South Australian Cricket Association and the South Australian National Football League, in particular. What a turnaround. To quote the Treasurer from *The Advertiser* on Saturday, 6 July 2002:

The South Australian Cricket Association would not like the decision [that is the withdrawing of the \$11 million grant] which would place the \$57 million redevelopment of Adelaide Oval in jeopardy.

But, I quote the Treasurer:

If they want a grandstand they can build it themselves. The Labor Party's priorities aren't grandstands.

That was the Treasurer in 2002. He stated:

I think we have enough taxpayer-funded grandstands in this city.

Again, to quote from *The Advertiser* of Friday, 24 January 2003, the Treasurer reiterated:

The Labor Party's priorities aren't grandstands. They are hospitals and schools.

Well, lo and behold, we got some money for hospitals and schools this time. We got the grandstands as well. My, how the Treasurer's priorities have changed, or is he bowing to the good news Premier, who also, to quote *The Advertiser* of 30 June 2006 said:

The state government will also invest \$1.6 million with the South Australian Cricket Association to assist in a major upgrade of South Australia's most iconic landmark, the world-renowned Adelaide Oval.

Welcome, Kevin. There is recognition by my constituents and myself of how big a place the Adelaide Oval and Football Park have in the scheme of things. They are a wonderful asset for South Australia. But everyone does not live in Adelaide and everyone cannot go to these venues. Across South Australia hundreds of small sporting bodies struggle with inadequate resources and facilities. My electorate has a multitude of them. These bodies are as much deserving of government funding from the Rann government as are the aforementioned. Keeping country sport going should be seen of equal importance as Adelaide Oval and Football Park. The decisions are city-centric and single-minded. It is my view that the Rann government could not give a hoot about what lies beyond the metropolitan area. It is arrogant, out of touch and dismissive of anything other than playing to Don Farrell's tune, various other unions, and la-la land, woofy-poofy self-indulgent groups such as SHine.

Where is the vision for economic growth? Riding on the shirt-tails of a successful federal government and a resource driven boom, driven by China and India, shows a short-sightedness and a narrowness. No economic vision. We have seen considerable government money spent on the South Australian Strategic Plan. There are roadshows around South Australia to consult—we are consulting again. It appears to be a case of spend the money on public relations, listen, don't take any notice of the general populace, and produce glossy documents, let the Premier announce it. It is good news Mike. And behind the scenes it is stuff rural South Australia. The Rann election campaign in 2002 promised to lower electricity prices. Another broken promise from masters of the art.

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Bring it on, let's have a look at the electricity prices.

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: Bring it on fellas, bring it on. Is it any wonder I am cynical? Is it any wonder people lose faith in government? Is it any wonder they talk about the good news

Premier and his Rann tram to nowhere? This Labor budget could not be further removed from the Liberal budget. It fairly distributes expenditure across the state and does not stop at Gepps Cross or other suburban boundaries. A Liberal budget would have set targets and identified key areas for economic growth. It would have fostered and encouraged areas of growth potential. This budget lacks guts, lacks credibility, lacks fairness, lacks leadership, lacks detail, and is a recipe for further flim-flam good news announcements from a Premier who is more intent on becoming president of the federal Labor Party. The grass is greener on the other side, Madam Deputy Speaker. We need a Premier with the single task of steering South Australia, not a Premier who will be even more absent from the state.

Fairness, equity and a fair go are hallmarks of the Australian ethos. This budget lacks those hallmarks and further divides metropolitan and country South Australia. \$1.4 million spent on Thinkers in Residence does not do a lot to assist the difficulties faced by Afghan meatworkers in Murray Bridge adapting to an alien culture. \$250 000 per year to fund a chair of climate change does nothing for those thousands of South Australians affected by the worst drought in South Australia's history.

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: I am pleased that climate change has been mentioned. I am pleased that my colleague the member for MacKillop mentioned it. I am pleased that my colleague the member for Stuart mentioned it. I am even more pleased that my new colleague the member for Bright mentioned it, because it just so happens that there are a few of us in this place who have lived in the bush and have worked with the land and worked with the weather and worked with the climate, and lived with drought over many, many years. No-one ignores the fact that climate may well be changing, but the climate has changed for many, many hundreds and billions of years. I well remember the first year on the farm in '67 we had a drought, in '72 we had a drought, in '82 we had a drought, in '92 we had a drought.

Members interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: So, you know, if the member for Bright wants to come and have a bit of a chat about the land I am more than happy. I will take her and buy her a cup of coffee. \$10 million in additional levies on waste does nothing for the Aboriginal families seeing children dying from brain damage and dying from petrol sniffing.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member's time has expired. Before calling upon the minister I will briefly acknowledge in the gallery members of the Salisbury Playford Mayor's Leadership Training Group. Welcome.

Bill read a second time.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I move:

That this bill be referred to Estimates Committees.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Minister for Police (Hon. P. Holloway), the Minister for the Environment and Conservation (Hon. G.E. Gago) and the Minister for Emergency Services (Hon. C. Zollo), members of the Legislative Council, be permitted to attend and give evidence before the Estimates Committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I move:

That the house note grievances.

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): I would like to talk about the wonderful things that are going to happen in Morphett from this budget—but I can't because there is absolutely nothing. Absolutely nothing, not a brass razoo. The trams we got in the last budget, they are the wrong trams. Can I give just a very quick example in the short time available. A couple of weekends ago we had the fantastic City-Bay Fun Run. I knocked seven minutes off my time before; I went down in 1 hour 37. I don't know what the Premier did it in. The Minister for Recreation and Sport did it in, I think, 55—did very well. But I drove in in the morning, walked back down to the Bay. I thought 'I'll catch the tram in,' after I had opened the season for the Glenelg Bowling Club. Anyway, this is about a quarter to five at night and I thought I would catch the tram back in and pick up the car. I went to Brighton Road. Because you cannot couple the trams, you can only have one tram at a time. These trams are twice as long but have the same seats as two old trams, and by the time you put the crush capacity in them they only carry about half of what the old trams could. By the time they got to Brighton Road, this is quarter to five on Sunday afternoon, from Moseley Square, it was like one of those Japanese movies where you see them trying to jam people into the trams. Those trams were at full to overflowing capacity. I had to wait for the third tram, the third tram out of Moseley Square, out of the Bay, that afternoon to try to get on to one. Had you been able to couple those trams, had you bought better trams, more capacity—

Members interjecting:

Dr McFETRIDGE: Well, it could have been so much better. I am a tram fan, I admit that. I am tram fan. But you got the wrong trams. And we can go back to the Public Works Committee, where I gave them information nearly three years ago about airconditioning, about coupling the trams and about the overheating because of the windows—I told you so and I told you so. But let us get back to some of my major portfolio areas of arts, education and tourism. The arts portfolio—and I am glad the Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism is here because I do actually have some nice things to say about some of the things that have actually happened.

As regards the arts portfolio, I will give credit where credit is due. The Adelaide Festival Centre, built by a Liberal government, is showing its age. The government has put \$8 million aside, not for the refurbishment of the restaurants and not for the refurbishment of the spaces there, but for essential maintenance, and do not let anybody think that it is anything other than money that has to be spent. A lot more money should be spent on maintaining, developing and refurbishing the Festival Centre, which is a fabulous cultural centre for Adelaide. The government is spending \$8 million, and that is what they are having to pay for essential repairs.

Let me talk about the Fringe festival. I went to Edinburgh a few months ago and I spoke to the Edinburgh Fringe festival people, being somewhat concerned about making the Adelaide Fringe an annual event. Having spoken to those people, I am more than convinced about this and more than happy to support the Fringe as an annual event. It will be an absolute ripper of an event. People can put it in their calendar. They come to South Australia from all over the world. A vast majority of those who go to the Edinburgh Fringe actually come from South Korea; they all come straight down to

Adelaide too. It is going to be a great event, even better than it has been in the past. So, congratulations on that decision.

I do have some serious issues with the \$2 million guitar festival. That is a hell of a lot of guitars. I do not know enough about it, and I am open to be persuaded about that. I am not a philistine; I love the guitar—Tony Emmanuel is a fantastic guitarist, but I am sure there is more to it than that.

Mr Bignell: Tommy Emmanuel.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Tommy Emmanuel. I stand corrected by the member for Mawson. He is a very helpful chap at times. However, the guitar festival pales in comparison to the four-star international horse trials we have in South Australia, the only event of its kind in the southern hemisphere. The information I received today is that the office is being closed; it is to be vacated by December, and no more funding will be available after this year. That is an absolute travesty. The press release put out by the minister states that they are reinforcing the value of major events to the South Australian economy. The horse trials are a big boost for our economy—a major event that we need to keep and not lose to Sydney for the sake of a few hundred thousand dollars.

Returning to the arts portfolio for a moment, I point out that the Feast festival is coming up in November. Although a lot of people do not like the Feast festival, I am a sensitive new-age guy and I am happy to see these festivals come to Adelaide. I am watching this very carefully because the Premier wants to be involved in the Feast festival; commencing with the procession along Rundle Mall and through the East End, it is a fantastic event. However, will the Premier bring in the same-sex legislation and have it passed before then? There will be a lot of egg on a lot of faces if he does not, because the gay, lesbian and bi community is very carefully watching what this government is doing. They have seen the government postpone the bill and they have been let down. They will see the government introduce a more conservative bill this time. The pink dollar (a significant part of the economy), and the pink vote, should never be neglected, but this government is doing just that.

Yesterday I spoke briefly about the opportunities in the tourism industry in South Australia. People say in South Australia you are going to dig it up, you are going to grow it or you are going to think about it, and I include education here. The other big industry in South Australia is the experience industry. This is the big one that people have really not yet grasped, and the tourism industry is part of that. There is tourism, sport, art and culture, all the synergy rolling into one big industry. It is a \$4 billion industry for South Australia. It should be noted, though, that in 2004-05 funding dropped to \$260 million. It was a significant drop, which I hope was just a bit of a glitch, but the way the government is going with its belt-tightening measures and with tourism budget cuts, I hope that this is not a trend, because 30 000 people are employed by the tourism industry. Most of those are small businesses but there are some larger businesses.

I have spoken to some people who employ 200 or 300 people in tourism enterprises. What did the small to medium enterprises get in this budget? No stamp duty relief, no sales tax relief, no payroll tax relief. Small businesses need that relief, and they are looking for a bit of help from a government that has a river of gold in the form of GST. Imagine if Greg Smith, Mr Option C, who is recommending all the cuts now, had been able to convince Keating and Hawke in 1985 to bring in that 12½ per cent GST. Imagine how much money we would all have. We would even be able to fund the broken bank saga that we had from the Bannon government, when

Mike Rann and Kevin Foley were sitting there as well. But those issues are in the past and I will not dwell on them, because they are just too painful to remember.

Let me just remind the house what is happening in education. This is the Labor Party merry-go-round; up and down, around and around we go, and where we end up in another 14 years nobody knows. What were the issues in 1992? Bleating and complaining about an ageing state population; bleating and complaining about declining school enrolments; bleating and complaining about a shift to private schools. This was in 1992, not 2006. They were going on about retention rates and about an ageing teaching population—they were all going to retire. They were going on about class sizes. Back then at least they recognised that class sizes were not the be all and end all. Let us hope they do not do this year, next year and the year after what they did then.

They are going to let down public servants. They did not tell them the truth—they are about to get rid of them. In 1985 they got rid of 180 teachers. In 1990 they got rid of 795 teachers and 106 SSOs—1 081 teachers and SSOs were gotten rid of by the last Labor government. This government has a golden opportunity and has a river of gold with the GST coming in. We have seen total mismanagement, broken promises and lost opportunities. I hope that at least they learn from their mistakes. I live in hope. I am the eternal optimist although a pragmatist, and I hope they learn from their past mistakes because, if they do not, we will go down the same path we went down in the early 1990s to 1993, when we had a State Bank that was broke and a state debt of \$10 billion.

We lost the AAA rating because of them. The Treasurer says that we got it back because of him! No way! Self praise is no recommendation. Standard and Poor's has said it and the Auditor-General has said it: the only reason we got back our AAA rating is that we sold ETSA. I have no problem with that because, if you look at the risk associated with keeping it in a Labor Party nationalised electricity market, we were going to lose out really big time. It was a very prudent move on the part of the Liberal government back in the early 1990s.

We hope Labor learns. Labor says that it listens and that it looks and consults. I have real issues with that and I am not convinced of that. I live in hope. It is shifting to the right and trying to steal our ground, having come right across. The economic rationalists over there with their privatisation and asset sales will ensure that South Australia faces a disaster if there is not some smart thinking. We have the prima donna Premier, but we have the prima donna assoluta Treasurer. Let us hope they get over their egos and look at what is best for South Australia.

Time expired.

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell): This budget does not require much support from this side as it speaks very clearly for itself. It is a clear reflection of the promises and commitments made by the Rann government at the last election, and it is also a clear response to the requests of the many members of the community who have met our Premier as he goes around the state holding park and street corner meetings and community forums. I know this because the priorities reflected in this budget are exactly the priorities asked for again and again by the constituents of Reynell.

I have on several occasions surveyed the whole of my electorate, as well as providing a number of opportunities at various community events where people come up and say what is important to them. At about half a dozen community

events I have provided a star chart so that people can give Mike Rann feedback on what is important to them. In these surveys again and again the top priorities are health, health and health. When I ask people what they mean by health, their first request is for hospital services.

So, I know the people of Reynell are very pleased that their request and demand for hospital services have been so well reflected in this budget. It is not everything. Some of them will still be on waiting lists, but the efforts that have been made by the successive ministers for health to meet the demands for services while, at the same time, working on improving the general health of our community and therefore decreasing future needs, are very much in line with the requests of the people of Reynell. I commend the member for Little Para for the detailed analysis she gave of the budget. The remarks she made were very much in accord with the desires of the people of Reynell.

Another issue that is important in Reynell is dental health. One of the least pleasant aspects of my work as a member of parliament is having people come in to see me to show me their teeth that need dental work. I find this quite unpleasant, and I find quite unpleasant and really callous and cowardly the actions of the Prime Minister when he first came to power in cutting and, in fact, eliminating the pensioner dental scheme. The huge impact that then had on state dental schemes meant that the state had to devote ever more resources to attend to a health need that has traditionally been the responsibility of the commonwealth.

Each budget since the Rann government came in has seen increasing amounts of money directed towards dental health. The fact that we will be able to provide extra funding for restorative dental care for 28 000 people over the next four years is very important indeed. So is the fact that we have been able to cut dental waiting lists by 48 000. My recollection is that when Labor came to power the dental waiting list was 4½ years, that is, about 100 000 people. It is now down to about two years, and I think it is approaching less than two years. That is not good, but it is a significant improvement on the situation we faced through of the callousness of Howard and the incompetence of Brown.

Dental health is extremely important to people's well-being. It affects them in so many ways. I have had wives tell me that their husband, who used to be friendly and garrulous, no longer goes outside the home, because he cannot eat and does not want to open his mouth. He knows his mouth smells, and he does not want to go near people. This is not a situation we should expect in 21st century Australia, and I commend the successive ministers for their attention to this area. The GP Plus Health Centres, an initiative of the Generational Health Review, are also important.

I want to turn briefly to some of the education initiatives. One that is very important in my area is trade and professional training. The trade school that has been opened down south at a cost of about \$16 million will provide places for a maximum of 60 students graduating per year—120 students all at once.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Ms THOMPSON: The member for Unley, who is out of his place, is showing his ignorance of one of the Howard government's greatest initiatives. He is criticising the Howard government and showing his ignorance of what it sees as one of its flagship initiatives, which I see as a very poor use of money. An amount of \$16 million contributed towards the schools in our area to assist in training young people for the trades and professions would go a very long way. The

inefficient way Howard has chosen to spend \$16 million will help 60 students a year. As the member for Unley says—if they can afford to go there. At the orientation night, the parents were staggered that it applied only to years 11 and 12.

In contrast, the state government is going to make the most of \$24.8 million to establish 10 trade schools, which will give maximum opportunities for students at ages younger than years 11 and 12, as well as the older students, to be introduced to a wide range of technical and trade skills. These are very important and are greatly welcomed by people in my area. They will enable them to build on the existing networks, where schools share resources in order to give maximum opportunities for young people to develop skills in trade and professional areas.

The Education Works project, which has been treated with some disdain by members opposite, who seem to fail to understand the state of our current education system, is also welcomed in our area. While our schools are not yet the subject of the reforms, I have already heard members of one governing council in my area on the radio putting their hands up and saying, 'We want to be in the voluntary initiatives. We know that our schools could do with a good healthy injection of capital funding, and they could also do with thinking again about the organisation of school communities in the 21st century.'

The schools in my area were built 30 to 40 years ago. They reflected a different culture and a different community, and the opportunity to have a good hard look at them in the community is welcomed. Indeed, I am very pleased that I had already invited representatives of all governing councils to Parliament House later in the year. It will be a wonderful opportunity for them to meet with the minister to discuss their plans and to meet with each other, as they do not often have that opportunity.

While the upgrade of South Road is not happening in my area, it is also important. Many of my constituents have to journey to other suburbs for employment and study, and their journeys will be made quicker, much safer and less environmentally polluting by the upgrades to South Road, which we know are very complex and difficult to establish but welcome all the same. We are very pleased that the minister continues to persevere with these matters.

These are but a few items of importance to the people of Reynell from the budget. The time available does not allow me to discuss them all, but I do not need to. They know that they have been listened to, and they welcome the response.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Kenyon): The member for Waite.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. You look very resplendent in the chair. I rise to draw to the house's attention that there are actually two budgets at the moment. Members may not realise this, but there is the official budget—here it is; this is the one the Treasurer tabled in the house—and then there is another secret budget being run by the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. This secret budget is the off balance sheet budget, this is the stashed cash budget and this is the one where he goes around telling people a week after the budget is tabled—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: —that he has \$10 million here, \$5 million there and signed off on \$3 million there. It is all a done deal. It is not in the budget, but they will get the

money. It does not matter that it is not in the official figures, but they are going to get the cash. It is a bit like the bank saying, 'Look, I know there's only \$500 on your bank statement, but I've got another \$200 for you. Don't you worry about that.'

Today, I came across (from sources in the South-East) a mysterious media release issued on Tuesday 26 September—well after the budget. It states that there is a \$10 million boost for South-East roads in 2006-07. It talks about how the South-East is booming and that there is going to be a \$5 million contribution to kick-start the Penola freight access project in 2006-07. It states that money will be spent widening and rehabilitating Clay Wells-Penola road. Some \$4 million will be set aside to fund the Penola bypass, should the Wattle Range Council obtain funds from the federal government's strategic regional program. There is a little 'should' there. In the meantime a series of the works will occur in the South-East. There will be overtaking lanes on the Riddoch Highway costing \$1.7 million and 23 kilometres of shoulder sealing, and so on. There is \$14 million or \$15 million worth of work.

There is just one problem: none of it is in the real budget. Is that not dandy? This has come from the shadow budget. This has come from the off balance sheet budget, the one to which the Treasurer did not agree; the one that does not see any cash in the account; the one that apparently the Minister for Transport has dredged up and has in his little drawer over there. We will have to have a little peek in a minute. He got up in the house today and said, 'Look, I approved that two months ago.' I want to make something very clear to the media in the South-East, the Wattle Range Council, Grant council, Mount Gambier council, Naracoorte council, the Regional Development Board in the South-East and SELGA: if it ain't in the budget it ain't there! If the money is not in the bank account, you cannot spend it.

There is one thing I forgot to mention. This little media release which came my way, is it signed by the minister? Is it from the minister's office? No: it is from the Director of Transport and Planning, Mr Mark Elford, an officer and public servant in DTI. In eight years I do not think I have seen an official government media release signed off by a public servant without the minister's imprimatur. I wonder whether that could be because, if it all goes belly up, the minister will be able to say, 'I didn't say that. I never promised that money. How did that get out? I am just absolutely astounded.' We have the stashed cash shadow accounts run by the Minister for Transport—that is his budget—and then we have the real budget.

I will rely on the budget that the Treasurer produced because that is the one with the money in it. I say to the people of the South-East: does anyone really believe that if the minister intended to put \$9 million into the Penola bypass, it would not be in here with bells and whistles? Does anyone believe that Mike Rann would not be flying down there in a helicopter with a guard of honour with bayonets bristling waiting to welcome him; that every media outlet in the country would not have been invited to the South-East. 'Wow! We're putting \$9 million into the Penola bypass!' If the money was there that is how it would have been announced. Instead it sneaks out on a little bit of paper five days later, courtesy of an officer in the department. Guess what? It is sent quietly to a media outlet in the South-East—I do not think anyone else knows about it—in the hope they will pick it up and run it locally. I do not think it is floating around Adelaide. I do not think it is out here for public scrutiny. I do

not think the Treasurer has seen it. He keeps talking about fiscal discipline. I think if I gave this to the Treasurer he would probably choke on his silk tie; he would be in terrible shape. He would be going to the Minister for Transport and saying, 'What are you doing throwing away this money? It is not in the budget!' So, it is really creative accounting.

I have to take my hat off to the Minister for Transport. He said, 'We will build the Northern Expressway. It will cost only a couple of hundred million.' Now it is \$550 million. Then he said, 'I got my sums wrong, but that is okay. That happens all the time. It is normal now. We will dig a couple of tunnels along South Road. They will cost only \$65 million.' Some \$150 million later, he said 'We will build Bakewell Bridge which will be only a lazy \$30 million.' But it's some \$43.5 million later.

We cannot build a tunnel. We cannot build a Bakewell Bridge replacement. We cannot build an expressway. We cannot even buy red-light cameras or train safety equipment. Everything seems to go belly-up. We cannot win our arguments around the cabinet table, to get extra money into our budget for the South-East, so what we will do is we will have the secret budget, the Conlon budget—that is the one—and we will send it down to the South-East and tell them that they are going to get their money (even though it is not in the bank account). I have to take my hat off to them. This is what the South Australian Roads and Transport Association had to say about this budget. In regard to roads, the executive director, when he was in the budget lock-up, stated:

... that officials, when asked to point out the detail on expenditure for road maintenance in the budget, couldn't because it is not there in any definable way. Obviously the government is seeking to hide behind the big projects and it will just keep saying that this is a big budget for infrastructure. That's fine, and we welcome the fact that the government is proceeding with the road projects that it announced recently, as it should. However, the government's continuing failure to arrest the deterioration of the state's roads is nothing less than a grossly irresponsible act.

Stakeholder groups are not stupid. They know that you have left country roads up in the air—literally up in the air. This nonsense about money being there for the South-East that is not in the budget is nothing more than that: smoke and mirrors and absolute nonsense. If it is not in the budget, the money is not there. I look forward to seeing where the minister is going to pluck it from. Will he pluck it from the tram project? No, we found out today that is \$22.5 million over budget, too. He is running out of burrows to pull the money from, because every burrow he has is overloaded.

I only have two minutes left so I will not bother going into too much detail about his bus schedules announcement. I will simply say this: when you cut bus routes from route A, and you put those buses onto route B, there has been no increase in the number of buses. If you move a bus from this road to that road, you have still got the same number of buses. This is the stunning, startling reality of today's announcements. We have no more buses, we have no more resources, we have no more money, we have no more new schedules, but somehow or other, this is the best thing since sliced bread. People are going to be jumping for joy about these bus schedule announcements! The minister has conducted a bit of a fraud here—and I say that in the nicest possible way. He is fooling people into thinking—

Mr BIGNELL: Point of order, Mr Acting Speaker.

The ACTING SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I hope I get my last minute, Mr Acting Speaker.

Mr BIGNELL: Mr Acting Speaker, I request that you ask the member to withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER: I think committing a fraud is different from accusing someone of being a fraud, and I do not think there is any point of order.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you for your protection, Mr Acting Speaker. We are going to get these bus schedules on the eve of the grand final; we are going to get the printed copies. That will be all the bad news. While people are watching the grand final they can read whether or not they are going to have a bus to catch to work in the morning. It is a bit of nonsense. The shadow budget needs to be examined.

Time expired.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): I rise in this brief grievance to talk about the seat of Ashford, and to outline the areas that I think will be of direct benefit to Ashford constituents. Obviously, the record spending provided in this budget for health services will be of direct benefit to people living in the area of Ashford. I am particularly pleased to see that the Flinders Medical Centre, which is one of the hospitals that is greatly used by Ashford residents, will have some building upgrade. Having had a lot to do with the Flinders Medical Centre in recent times, I think it is great that their working conditions are going to be improved and I acknowledge the fantastic work done by the people at Flinders Medical Centre, in particular.

Obviously, improvements for the Women's and Children's Hospital are also of direct benefit to the Ashford residents, and I commend the government, and also the Minister for Health, for carrying on the excellent work that was done by the previous minister, the member for Little Para. I congratulate him on those initiatives and also on the work that is being carried out.

I was pleased to see that the TAFE campus (particularly at Marlestone, which is in the electorate of Ashford) will continue with its building program. I am very impressed and proud of the work that TAFE does, especially at Marlestone. I commend the workers there for the fantastic results they manage to achieve, and also the students, who continually win prizes at both national and international levels, not only in the furnishing trades area but also in fashion and the shoe design areas. There are some fabulous students there and, as I said, they will be famous not only at a national level but also at an international level. A number of other courses are run through Marlestone TAFE that have made it possible for people to find paid employment, whereas previously they may not have had the opportunity to embark on the careers they have chosen as a result of their undertaking those courses.

A number of public works projects affect the electorate of Ashford directly. Obviously, the \$59.4 million that has been allocated to the South Road upgrade program is of direct benefit to us in the electorate, and it also will be of great benefit with regard to traffic moving from the south and the north across the city. I have every faith that the South Road Neighbourhood Action Group, in particular, will make sure that the interests of not only the people directly on South Road but also the people and businesses in the surrounding areas, especially the Glandore and Kurralta Park areas, which will temporarily be interrupted by the upgrade program, are looked after.

I am very pleased to see that, because Ashford seems to be in the centre of pathways to and from the city, there will

be a \$50 million upgrade over two years from 2008-09 to continue the public transport bus fleet replacement program. It is quite heartening to hear that. I know that there are a number of critics of the extension of the tram system, but I think that it is an exciting project. Having had the opportunity to experience light rail and tram travel overseas, I can see Adelaide really blooming with the extension of the tram system. I know that a number of constituents in Ashford are very excited about the fact that we will spend another \$24.2 million to extend the tram system from Victoria Square to the City West campus. That is a really pleasing initiative as far as I am concerned and, as I said, it has a lot of support in the electorate of Ashford.

One of the things about Ashford that I think has to be underlined is the fact that we are greenies. I am very pleased, being a greenie, to see that a number of initiatives have been taken up by this government to look at the issue of climate change. I think it is particularly important that the Premier has taken on the responsibility for sustainability and climate change. I know that many of the schools in the area of Ashford are also very excited about this. In fact, Cowandilla Primary School has offered itself up as being the model climate change school. It has taken up a lot of environmental initiatives. I am looking forward to seeing that school leading the charge with respect to the climate change debate and also making sure that our younger citizens are well versed in what we need to do to make big changes in this area. The initiative of setting up the Premier's Climate Change Council is very welcome.

I am also really pleased to see (and there is probably a double-edged sword in this) that Ashford is right in the middle of the stormwater flood mitigation area. The member for Unley and I are looking very anxiously at making sure that the new authority represents the people in both those and also the neighbouring electorates. However, I also think that the \$2 million rainwater tank rebate over four years will encourage people in the electorate of Ashford to build on what has already been discussed at many public forums about the reuse of rainwater with their own residential contribution to that. I also think it is important that the government has committed itself to having a green fleet program, which will see 50 per cent of government vehicles (around 3 900) converted to more environmentally friendly fuels by 2010. At the moment 23 per cent of the fleet, or 1 800 vehicles, are alternatively fuelled, so I am very pleased to see that taking place.

A number of initiatives have been taken by the Rann government in the area of road safety, but I am particularly pleased to see that the government is committed to developing dedicated walking and cycling corridors along existing rail corridors and also wants to improve access to activity centres, public transport routes, and local cycling and walking routes. Again, I know that the members for Adelaide, Unley, West Torrens and I will benefit greatly if we can get cycling paths, particularly, joined up so that people can readily avail themselves of cycling as a form of transport. Getting across some of those major roads is obviously a big issue, and a number of constituents (certainly in Ashford) have told me that they would like to see this moving ahead with some priority.

One of the other comments I would like to make about transport is that I am very pleased that the department is seriously looking at ensuring that people with all sorts of abilities and disabilities can actually access public transport—and, again, this reflects the inquiries we get in the Ashford

electorate office. This has been a big issue for us, and I am very pleased to see that not only minister Weatherill, in his outline of commitments for the disability area and joining up our community services, is taking up the issues that have been raised in the electorate but also that the transport department is doing the same.

In the education area I think the Minister for Education and Children's Services really does need to be congratulated for the foresight she has shown in working in a very difficult area. Our demographics do not work well for us in South Australia—as we all know, South Australia has the oldest population in Australia and there needs to be a lot of babies born very quickly for us to improve that situation. Obviously, reform in the education area—particularly in the compulsory education area—is really important, and I notice that Cowandilla has been chosen for one of the 20 children's centres that will be one-stop shops for child care, health and school services. This will be very welcome in our area, and I know that the constituents of Ashford will make sure that we have our name down for other children's centres in the area.

Overall, while there are a number of concerns (not everything on the Ashford wish list has been realised), I think the government has made a good effort in assisting the constituents of Ashford, particularly in the area of education and disability.

Time expired.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): This budget has not been a budget for all South Australians; a large sector of our community has missed out on any benefits at all from the fifth Rann Labor budget. The engine room of this state, as we know, is small business—a sector that has been totally ignored. You only have to listen to what Business SA and others have said, particular privately, about what they think of this budget. Rural communities have missed out in every way, and it has been branded a city-centric budget. It is, as the South Australian Farmers Federation called it, a AAA budget—it is 'All About Adelaide'. The real government spending stops at Gepps Cross. SAFF goes on to say:

While the state government continued to enjoy large budget surpluses it was 'miserable' when it came to investment outside the metropolitan area.

It also said: 'What about something in return on the investment the bush makes to the state?'

Health spending in our regions is almost non-existent. A new Barossa health facility was not even mentioned in these budget papers; it was not on the radar screen at all. In every priority list I ever saw when I served on the Public Works Committee, the hospital at Angaston was listed as the worst in South Australia. In 1998 it was announced that it would be replaced—and it would have been completed by 2004-05 if the Liberals had remained in government. The people in my electorate have been let down again. My electorate pays more than its share of tax: it is only fair that they are considered. They are entitled to a new hospital, better roads, better recreational facilities—and the list goes on. There is something very wrong when a government can blatantly ignore a complete sector of the community.

Governments should be accountable at all times. The government misled the people at the election—it really did. We in the Liberal Party knew what the problem was. It was a major blow-out in the Public Service which was costing \$550 million—a big black hole in the state budget. That is 5 per cent of the budget. We (that is the Liberals) said that we

would do the only honourable thing and dispense with 4 000 public servants through voluntary redundancies. Labor hammered us. It conned the Public Service Association and Jan McMahon to support it, denying that there was a problem—'Save Public Service jobs, vote Labor'. Well, we know what has happened; we were right. The government conned the people and is now doing exactly what we said we had to do—and look at the cost.

How did Labor end up with 8 300 more public servants than when it came to power—and it did not even know it had them. That is, 8 300 public servants in a population of 1.55 million people and it did not even know it had them. We know the answer to where all the money has gone, don't we? We know where all the money has gone over the past five years. It has gone into jobs for mates—and Labor did not know where they were. They were in middle management; they were in the higher paid jobs. They were not nurses or police—they were in the middle order. The TAFE colleges will tell you where these people are. All these people just appeared. This is a disgrace. All governments have to be more accountable. We should establish an efficiency of government formula.

Every government should earn an efficiency rating, that is, income from taxpayers, GST income, fines and charges, all incomes which would equal the total income of a government. Divide that figure by the 1.55 million people in this state and that is the per person income. Then, on the expenditure side, total money spent on infrastructure, essential asset maintenance and essential Public Service wages—that is, police, schools, hospitals, all those things we have to have—divided by 1.55 million is the total cost per person expenditure. Then we can compare this government and subsequent South Australian governments and other state governments to see how we rate. Surely, the Auditor-General has access to this information and surely he ought to be able to put this together for us.

Mr Bignell interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I wish the member would dry up, sir. As I have said before, Australia is going through a resources-led boom and the government is swimming in revenue. We have a fantastic opportunity to renew our state's ageing infrastructure and what are we doing? We are blowing it.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I remind the members for Light and Mawson that they are both young enough to be here to see the problems their government has created. I will be gone. You will still be here and I will be back to remind you—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Kenyon): Order! Members will control themselves.

Mr VENNING: You are just blowing it sky high. I warn the government again that this resources boom will not go on forever. Primary industries is going through a very difficult time. Members should go for a drive if they do not believe me, especially south of Murray Bridge. Our grain, wine and wool industries are going through a pretty difficult time. Manufacturing is also going through a difficult time—car industries, Electrolux—you name it. We all know about that and we do not want to play politics with that. When the resources boom cools—and it will—what happens then? What do we do? We were the best state in Australia. Look at that gentleman over your head, Sir Thomas Playford. We were the best state in Australia. Our fathers left us a fantastic infrastructure. What are we going to leave our kids? We have already dropped to the second worst state in Australia. We

have the worst infrastructure and the highest debt, and the bottom looms.

Labor's record is appalling. Members of the government delude themselves, and they do not understand. We must spend money in areas which will assist our state into the future when things are not so good. This government, which I compare to the prodigal son, is living a life of luxury, laxity and waste. Labor trumpets our great successes at Roxby Downs—the largest uranium mine in the world. You would think that they were basking in their own success. No way! If we did not have the Tonkin Liberal government and the courageous Norm Foster in the upper house, Roxby Downs would really be Labor's mirage in the desert.

The government has also scrapped and sold off the MATS plan. Remember that? Now the biggest single infrastructure cost to this government today is just a small portion of that original plan. Members are silent. What a record! What a dismal and disgraceful record! The evidence is very damning indeed, but the message never gets through. The media are soft on this government, and why is that? Why are the media soft? There are nine million reasons why it is soft: because the government spends massive amounts of taxpayers' money on a very slick public relations outfit. There are over a 100 of them, and the average pay is \$80 000.

I know the previous government did it, but it was nothing compared to now, but that does not make it right. I think we have come to a point when governments should not be allowed to spend this sort of taxpayers' money on promoting itself—yours or ours. Right? In a state with 1.55 million people, how can you spend \$9 million or more on promoting yourself when you are in government? I am quite happy for every minister to have a public relations officer; I am happy for the Premier to have two. What do we on this side get? We have a total of five, and you wonder why our message does not get across. You wonder why there is an imbalance around here. You wonder why we cannot get our message out there. Hello! You call this democracy? It is not.

It is high time the media in this country woke up, because they can wear the blame. In 10 years' time when we are on the skids, I will be hammering the media. I will be saying to Greg Kelton, 'You didn't highlight this problem. You sat up there and got cosy, because all of your mates are employed by the government, that's why; because all your mates are on the payroll, that's why; being totally bought off in a state of 1.5 million people.' When you have \$9 million expenditure on PR, I think it is high time somebody said 'enough'.

In Brazil, it is against the law to spend money on self-promotion. I think it is a disgrace. You have over 100 people employed in the public relations outfit for the Premier, earning in excess of \$80 000. That is a disgrace when we are talking about projects of \$2 million or \$3 million, in many cases, in our country areas, and here we have \$9 million. What do we have to show for that? Do you think that is good? Is that right? I am not saying that we did not do it; we did it, but not to the extent of \$9 million—more like \$5 million. But that is too much.

Time expired.

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson): The member for Schubert said enough is enough and, thankfully, enough is enough when your time is up. What the member was saying is absolute rubbish. There are not 100 people in the public relations department of the Premier's office. It is rubbish, and he knows that it is rubbish. I think it would be not bad if he came into this house and showed a little bit of gratitude for some

of the work that has been done over the years to benefit people in rural South Australia. It is very easy for the people on that side to get up and say that this government has ignored rural South Australia. What about the Port River Expressway, the Northern Expressway, the bridges that will link those expressways to Outer Harbor, and the deepening of Outer Harbor? The money that is being spent there by this government is helping rural South Australia.

We get out and talk to the people in the bush—the people on Eyre Peninsula, who are very grateful for the work we did over there during the bushfires. The people in the Mid North, the Riverland, Yorke Peninsula and Eyre Peninsula tell us about the 20 minutes they are cutting off their travelling time in their trucks to get their products to port, and they are extremely grateful for it. So I think it is a little rude of the member to come in here and bleat and bleat, because he is so out of touch with the people in his electorate and the rest of the people in rural South Australia. I come from rural South Australia and am in touch with people on the land, and the story I hear is very different to the one the member would like to present to this house.

This budget is an outstanding measure. It is another step on the road to repairing the damage done by the Brown-Olsen-Kerin governments. For 8½ years we had an absolute rabble of a government which fought amongst itself. Look across the border. All you have to do is look at what Jeff Kennett did when Tricontinental and Pyramid collapsed. He got in, rolled up the sleeves, made the hard decisions and got the Victorian economy back on its feet. What did John Olsen do? He simply tried to knife the premier, Dean Brown. And what did they do? They talked the state down—'Those Vics!', 'Kick a Vic', 'They stole our Grand Prix.' No, they did not. John Olsen and Dean Brown let that Grand Prix slip through their fingers, and all they did was grizzle about the Victorians for 8½ years. They presented—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: Dean Brown and John Olsen talked South Australia down so much—they had the big chip on the shoulder. They had kids coming out of schools and their parents were saying, 'You have got to get out of here, this is a terrible state. You have to go to Victoria and New South Wales. That is where the jobs are and the future is.' Why? Because that is what their leaders were telling them—leaders such as the then premier, Dean Brown (who was then knifed by John Olsen), and the whole rabble of Ingerson and Joan Hall and whoever else was up before the Auditor-General and got chucked out in disgrace. They had 8½ years of missed opportunities. In 2002 we finally got a decent government—a government that was prepared to work with the business community and bring in people such as Robert Champion de Crespigny and actually turn this state around. It turned around the fortunes of this state after 8½ years of an absolutely disgraceful Liberal government that did nothing to fix up this state.

Mr Pisoni: What a load of hogwash!

Mr BIGNELL: Members of the opposition talk about rubbish but that is all we have heard from their side. They have come in here and grizzled about things that are in the budget and are not in the budget. If the member for Waite does not know how to read a budget, that is surely not our problem. I would like to thank the government for the contribution it has made in its budget—

Mr Griffiths: You can't read it if it's not in there.

Mr BIGNELL: If you know how to read it, you will probably find it. The people of Mawson are extremely

grateful for the \$88 million which will be spent on the Flinders Medical Centre redevelopment, and the \$14.4 million which will be added to the accident and emergency section at the Flinders Medical Centre.

What about the new ambulance station at McLaren Vale? The people of McLaren Vale and the surrounding areas have been waiting many years for this ambulance station. It is one that the Liberals, again in their financial mismanagement and madness, during the heat of an election campaign promised to build, but if you are going to build an ambulance station it probably would be good to have some ambulance officers in it. It probably would be good to have some ambulances in it, maybe some defibrillators, and maybe some stretchers. And we would want to staff it 24 hours a day, seven days a week, wouldn't we? That is what we thought when we got in. So, we had to knock it on the head because what the former member for Mawson and his government did was promise that they would build an ambulance station but not put staff in it. It was like a story out of Monty Python, and it was a disgrace.

That happened time and again under the Liberal government. They did not know how to manage the finances and they made outlandish promises that they could never deliver on. Members should not just take my word for it; the Auditor-General inquired into the McLaren Vale ambulance station project and found that there were some fairly serious irregularities in what had happened about that.

This government has shown great courage and foresight in finally addressing something that governments for decades have not been prepared to do, and that is to open up a north-south corridor. The first work will be a tunnel along South Road, under Grange Road, Port Road and the Outer Harbor line, and an underpass under Anzac Highway and Sturt Road will link—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: It was all sold off.

Members interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: You had 8½ years under Olsen, Brown and Kerin to do it and you did not do it. We will make South Road a seamless corridor. It will connect the south with the north so that the people of McLaren Vale, those great wine makers, those award winning wine makers from the electorate of Mawson, can get their products to port, onto ships and overseas, and we will see this state's economy grow even further. This budget delivers on every promise made by this government at the March election, which is more than we can say for the promises made by the Liberals in election campaigns. The Liberals told us that they would not sell ETSA, and what did they do? They went and sold it out from underneath the people of South Australia, which has resulted in increased electricity costs.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: You say that we save \$2 million a day, but what about the poor people who have increased electricity charges because it has been taken out of government control and into the hands of private companies?

Members interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: The AAA credit rating has come from outstanding financial management by a Labor government over five years—a government that has delivered five surplus budgets. Members opposite had eight budgets and how many were in surplus? None. The Liberals could not deliver a surplus budget. This budget has delivered on Labor's key areas of health, education and police. The police force under the Liberals was ripped apart. We had record low police

numbers under the Liberals. They closed police stations, including the police station at Willunga. We are building them.

A station at Aldinga will be opened in mid November. We are putting an extra 400 police into the police force to add to the record numbers we already have—a vast difference to what we saw under the Liberals in their 8½ years when it just ripped apart the police force, crime rates soared and people did not feel secure in their homes. The Labor government has restored security for the people of South Australia. We are putting the police on the beat. In Hackham West (in the electorate of Mawson) crime has dropped by 35 per cent in the past year, and that is no fluke.

It is as a result of dedicated work by dedicated police officers. It has been brought about by a dedicated government, a government that has the interests of South Australians at the forefront of everything it does. That is different to the mob opposite. The Liberals built a wine centre and Hindmarsh stadium on no other grounds than because John Olsen, a man with a big chip on his shoulder, thought, 'If we don't do it those Victorians will do it.' He was spooked by the Victorians. He was spooked by Jeff Kennett and his stealing of the Grand Prix, and that is all we heard from the Liberals for 8½ years.

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: The Liberal government was given due credit for the Adelaide-Darwin railway line. When Premier Rann went to Darwin for the official opening he took former premier Olsen with him in a great show of bipartisanship, which we never saw from the honourable member's side. The member for Schubert has had a fair crack at the media today about their bias reporting of the Labor government's performance. Let me tell him that today I had two business people in for lunch. Two people who have traditionally voted Liberal sat in this chamber and watched members opposite perform.

They turned to me and said, 'You know, every South Australian should be made to come in here and look at that joke of an opposition. The Liberal party should never win a vote because it is an absolute disgrace. It is no alternative government.' The member for Schubert should not blame the media. He should look in the mirror. He should get himself a full length mirror and have a good look at his performance and stop blaming the media.

Time expired.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): I just want to take the opportunity during the response to the budget, during the grievance session at least, to make some comments about my electorate. I want to go through the issues in Davenport that are not being addressed by the government in this particular budget, and I am sure they will be of interest to the good voters of Davenport in due course.

One of the primary problems within the electorate of Davenport is the traffic issue. The traffic issue is primarily brought about because the Labor government, prior to the 1993 election, did a deal with a developer to develop a piece of land known locally as Craighburn Farm, better known now as Blackwood Park, which allowed 1 200 houses to go onto that development site previously owned by Minda. The development has proceeded, and about 600 houses have been built on that site over the last three or four years, and there are about to be another 600 houses built on that site in the next two or three years, market conditions prevailing.

The government is well aware of this issue and I have met with at least two ministers of transport, or their officers, in

relation to this issue. I have had transport officers at public meetings and they are very well aware of this issue. The issue is simply that the Blackwood roundabout and the road system from, basically, Black Road through Coromandel Valley, through Blackwood, through Belair, right through to Fullarton Road and through to Cross Road, really cannot take the amount of traffic it has now, and certainly will not take the amount of traffic that is going to go down that road corridor when these 600 houses come on stream and all the other development on the individual or smaller number of allotments outside of the Blackwood Park development take place. There are problems with the Old Belair Road-James Road intersection, there are problems with the Laffers Road-Main Road intersection, there are problems on Shepherds Hill Road with the Seymour Street-Shepherds Hill Road intersection, and the Blackwood roundabout is a nightmare.

One of the problems with the Blackwood roundabout is that, on one of the five roads that hits that roundabout is the main Adelaide-Melbourne railway line, there is a crossing, and the community now have a problem where that roundabout is blocked when trains go through. There are 1.2-kilometre goods trains going through. That roundabout is now blocked in the mornings and in the evenings during peak hour with traffic. The community, I think, are quite rightly concerned about what happens in time of fire and, if the fire is at the wrong time, how the whole system is going to work.

These matters are nothing new to the government. They have been raised with this government, certainly over the last five years. The previous government committed \$1.8 million to start the process of correcting this particular issue, and this government in its first term cut \$900 000 out of the project. It is going to be a big issue for the local people. The government has put out a traffic plan for a small section of the main road and stated that there is a draft plan out for consultation, but there is no money attached to it. So we do not hold a lot of hope that the government will tackle what is going to be a major issue as far as the electorate of Davenport is concerned in regards to traffic, but we will keep lobbying the government to see whether we can actually get some money spent in the Liberal electorate.

Further down the hill there are problems with the Grandview Drive-Five Ash Drive intersection. There are also problems with the Springbank Road-Daws Road-Fiveash Drive intersection. It was disappointing for both the member for Waite and myself that, when the government had the opportunity to buy a block of land and fix up the Springbank Road-Daws Road-Goodwood Road intersection, the government chose not to do that, even though the owner was a willing seller and ultimately sold the block of land—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Actually, no, he wasn't, and he approached the government and said, 'Look, here is an opportunity to fix up the intersection.' The seller was willing and you turned your back on it. So, you know, so be it. It is disappointing that that crossing remains a terrible crossing even though the government had the opportunity to fix it.

The schools in Davenport also have some issues that we hope will be addressed in future budgets. The Bellevue Heights Primary School is lucky: it gets a contribution over the next two years of \$1.4 million. I say they are lucky because I remember how hard the Coromandel Valley school fought to get money for their \$2 million upgrade, and the Labor government came in and took the money out of the school. It took \$800 000 out of that particular development, and of the \$1.2 million development that went ahead at

Coromandel Valley Primary School there was not one cent of state government money in it. If no-one in a Labor electorate would accept that, I do not see why people in my electorate should accept that. So, Bellevue Heights has \$1.4 million and we look forward to that being spent over the next two years.

Other facilities are needed. Flagstaff Hill has been lobbying the government for well over 12 months for an upgrade and extension. I see that it gets a feasibility study, which was apparently a big announcement by the government. It has a list of feasibility studies (whoopie!), but at least it is a step forward. It is embarrassing when you walk around with the inspector at the school and you can actually poke your finger through the gutter and see the water run out, or when you can actually shake the veranda post because of the rust. It is a school that needs work and, hopefully, in future budgets the Flagstaff Hill Primary School will get its fair allocation. The Hawthorndene Primary School is also after a sports hall, and I have been working and will continue to work with the school in that regard.

I note with interest the government's announcement about bushfires today. We were out there two weeks ago saying that the government should bring the fire season forward because of the dryness of the season and the fuel load. It is good to see that the government took up our idea today and brought the fire season forward. It disappoints me that the Eden Hills CFS, which was promised a new CFS station back in 2002, is still being told that it might get it in 2010. Given that it is one of the hilliest areas of the Mitcham hills, given it is one of the most fire prone areas of the Mitcham hills, and given that it is one of the most heavily populated areas of the Mitcham hills, I personally think it needs to be a higher priority than 2010, because if the predictions the government is making about the fire season and the likelihood of fire come true, then I think the people in the highest fire danger area need to be protected appropriately.

The Eden Hills community has waited five years too long for an upgrade of its CFS station. The CFS community in the Mitcham hills is a fantastic community. It is very strong right throughout the Belair, Blackwood, Hawthorndene, Coromandel Valley and Eden Hills area. There are very strong CFS networks, and I hope the government can find its way clear to bring forward the upgrade of the CFS station. I do not think that community deserves to be put on hold for eight years when we all know that the government has the money. I recall that the latest figure I saw some time last year showed that the emergency services levy fund had a surplus in it of about \$7 million. That is enough to contribute towards the upgrade of the station.

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para): About two weeks ago, I had the pleasure of accepting an invitation from UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide, to celebrate the 10th anniversary of their community mental health programs. I must say that it was a great occasion, because this organisation, over 10 years, has developed from starting with a \$45 000 grant in 1996 to a multi-million dollar program servicing about 500 people in the Adelaide metropolitan area, Whyalla, Mount Gambier, Coober Pedy and Port Augusta. It is the largest provider of psycho-social support here in South Australia. I offer it on the record here my congratulations, as I did at the time. A large gathering of people had been involved with the organisation and those programs right from the start, including a large number of consumers. One of the things that typifies their approach is that it is innova-

tive, evidence based, meets local needs and is based on recovery. They really are leaders in the field.

There is no doubt that we face a great challenge in meeting mental health needs in this state. We are not the only ones right across the country, and I will speak about that for a while. The need is great. It is estimated that one in five people will have at some stage during their lives a mental health issue of some sort. That means that if we do not have it ourselves we certainly will know someone who has—it may be a family member or certainly an acquaintance. None of us will go through our lives without coming into contact with somebody with a mental illness.

In South Australia there is a huge need and our greatest challenge is to establish a full range of community-based services. The injection of funds by the government early in 2005 of \$25 million for community based services was the largest amount ever allocated to these type of services in South Australia. This money was a one-off injection to enable us to determine what we needed, what would work and so on, and it runs out at the end of this financial year. I am certain that Monsignor Cappo and the Social Inclusion Unit will be addressing the need for the continuance and possible expansion of these projects in next year's budget.

In the meantime, I was pleased to see in the coming budget that over \$20 million has been set aside for practice nurses to provide support in GP surgeries for people with a mental illness and for increasing mental health services for young people. I congratulate the Minister for Mental Health on those initiatives. Earlier today I mentioned how pleased I was that there will be 50 new mental health beds at the Lyell McEwin Health Service over future years and I am also pleased to see that the government will be proceeding quickly with the three rehabilitation centres funded by the commonwealth government, one to be in the inner west, one at Noarlunga and one at Elizabeth, again bringing services close to where people live.

I advise the house of an incident where a constituent came to see me in relation to his son who, in his early 20s, had had his first episode of a significant mental illness. The father asked what he should do and where he should go for help. I spoke with him about local GP services and the fact that the government was putting in more mental health services across the community. The father said to me that his biggest concern was that his son would have to go to 'that place'—Glenside Hospital. I state quite clearly that, if people are honest with themselves, they know what a stigma this is to people with a mental illness. It is so important that we continue to develop facilities close to where people live so that they do not feel that they are freaks if they have a mental illness, that mental illnesses are like physical illnesses and happen to a large proportion of the community and that they are not freaks.

Finally, I make a plea to everybody in this house. Dealing with mental health issues is more than just a health issue—it is a human rights issue.

Right back since the time of the Burdekin inquiry (which is many years ago now) it has been quite clear that people with a mental health issue are disadvantaged and marginalised in so many ways in our community. I make a plea to everyone to treat this matter in a bipartisan and multi-partisan way so that we do not have the cheap and easy political shots that can come when shock jocks and others press the fear button and get the moral outrage and the community fear going, which simply serves to further disadvantage people with a mental illness. If people have an opportunity to speak to Jeff Kennett, the Chairman of Beyond Blue, they will hear

from someone who has a very clear understanding of what needs to happen in terms of the provision of mental health services in the community.

When Jeff Kennett was the premier of Victoria, there was successful reform of the mental health system in that state. Of all the Australian states, Victoria leads the way in the provision of a whole range of services for people with mental illness. One of the reasons Victoria has been so successful is that both major parties decided that they would not play politics with mental health. I make a plea to the opposition and to everyone else in this parliament that we work together on this one and that we try to put aside point scoring, politicking, and particularly pressing the fear button with certain parts of the media, so that we get the services we need in this state for this very marginalised group of people in the community.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH (Minister for Education and Children's Services): I move:

That the time for moving the adjournment of the house be extended beyond 10 p.m.

Motion carried.

Mr PISONI (Unley): I rise to stress the fact that there is nothing in this budget for the constituents in the seat of Unley. In my maiden speech in this house back in May, I said that this government does not tackle the difficult issues. Stormwater is a difficult and expensive problem to fix. I concede that it is long overdue and that it will not be fixed overnight, but I refuse to concede that it is acceptable not even to make a start towards fixing this problem—a problem that sees residents in and around my district of Unley fearing the sight of dark, black rain clouds blowing over from the west. They know from experience that, when those clouds burst east of their homes, they will see a rush of stormwater from the rooftops, roads and paved gardens upstream rushing into the creeks that flow through their suburb and burst over the banks into their gardens and under their front and back doors.

There is no doubt that years of neglect and a lack of forward planning in relation to stormwater management and changing weather patterns now sees shorter but heavier rain periods that have made my constituents anxious and concerned. They have become very impatient with the inability of government at all levels to understand their plight. I take this opportunity to thank the Howard government for its grant of nearly \$100 000 towards funding for safety and flood protection education for those affected.

The Rann government has used its typical style of relying on smoke and mirrors to create a perception that something is being done to deal with stormwater management. The Stormwater Management Authority has been established and, although the parliament has not seen the bill, we have had the announcement of the appointment of the Chair, former Labor senator and left faction heavyweight Nick Bolkus (I believe it is the same faction as that of the infrastructure minister). I see this as simply paying lip service to the Local Government Association, as there is no substantial funding for stormwater infrastructure in the budget over the next four years.

After the government collected millions of extra GST, land tax and stamp duty dollars over its budgeted figures in the past four years, it could come up with only \$16.5 million over four years. Let me put that in perspective. The Unley council is completing the replacement of a stormwater channel between Unley Road and King William Road, the

cost of which is \$3 million. So, \$4 million will not go far at all.

I can just imagine the discussion around the cabinet table when this issue was discussed. I suspect that it sounded a little bit like this: the Premier, 'I understand that stormwater is an issue.' The Treasurer, 'Yes, but do you know how much that will cost to fix? In and around Unley itself it will cost over \$160 million. I am working from Patrick's figures, so we should allow for a big blow out on top of that, and I don't want to lose our AAA credit rating the Liberals handed to us on a plate.' Minister for State/Local Government Relations, 'Well, the LGA wants it fixed, and it will support a new committee. That won't cost much, will it?' Premier, 'That's a good idea. We can set up a committee. That will look like something is being done, and it won't be too difficult for Patrick to blow out the cost.' Minister for Infrastructure, 'Yes, and I can ask my mate Nick to be the chair. I owe him a favour.' Premier, 'Good. That's fixed then. We'll spend a fraction of what we should spend on a serious problem that will take \$160 million to fix, but we might need a little more money for the advertising campaign to tell everybody what a good job we are doing. What do you think, Kevin?' Treasurer, 'No, no more money. They can sack another public servant to pay for it.' I would love to have been a fly on the wall at that meeting.

Over the next four years we will see only \$4 million a year allocated to stormwater infrastructure. The only increases are based below inflation, and anybody who has ever had a quote to build a house or add a new room will tell you that they would be very happy if they had to allow for any increases in the costs from their first quote to completion based only on inflation. The infrastructure minister himself has blamed increases on construction costs over and above inflation to justify the blow-outs in the cost of the Bakewell Bridge and the Northern Expressway, yet he has approved infrastructure funding which, in real spending power terms, will decrease within the life of the budget.

Unley Road has again been left out of the budget. I remind the house that the Department of Transport, Planning SA, Unley council and Unley Road businesses have spent significant resources on studies and plans for the upgrade of Unley Road. The work was to be coordinated with the undergrounding of power lines. The minister himself was so convinced that work should be done that he thought that the safer crossing points had been installed on Unley Road. On 24 May this year, his department told the ABC that the phantom crossings were up and running. Apparently, the state government had funded such crossings, but it was news to me and other users of Unley Road that there were new crossing points. We could not see them because they were not there.

I take this opportunity to thank the Howard government for the black spot funding program for Unley Road, Goodwood Road, Greenhill Road and South Road, totalling \$200 000. It must be remembered that black spot funding is used to make roads safer. The fact that the Rann government has washed its hands of this responsibility and requires federal government intervention is a disgrace and a sign of neglected responsibility on behalf of the Premier and his government.

This budget has also completely ignored the need to make Unley schools safer. Unley is a great place to live and work. In recent years, there has been an influx of families, and our state schools in Unley are defying the statewide trend of losing students to private schools; in fact, our numbers in public schools in Unley are growing. I commend the

government on its plans to reduce class sizes, but I wonder just how committed it is to delivering this when those schools in my electorate are being audited to see which special-purpose rooms, such as music rooms, language rooms and computer rooms, can be given up and used as standard classrooms for extra students.

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith: Meranti wood.

Mr PISONI: If that is not the case, minister, you can use the opportunity now to tell us. Instead, the department should be auditing schools with a view to adding additional curriculum to take advantage of the economies of scale with the larger enrolments.

I note that there is no plan in the budget to speed up the reduction of exposure to asbestos in our state schools. This is a particular disappointment to parents and teachers in older suburbs such as Unley, Parkside, Goodwood and Highgate; if there are, minister, take the opportunity now to tell the house. One primary school in my electorate of Unley still has temporary buildings made entirely from asbestos, and I note that—

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith interjecting:

Mr PISONI: The toilet block! The minister does not believe me. Obviously, the minister has not been to Unley Primary School. The toilet block is made entirely from asbestos except for the urinal, the bowls and, perhaps, the doors.

The Hon. J.D. Lomax-Smith interjecting:

Mr PISONI: Well, the walls, the floors, the ceiling and roof are all asbestos. The minister should note the fuss that Mr Xenophon in the other place raised about a single pipe of asbestos in one of the suburbs of Adelaide. Asbestos is a very dangerous product. I note that the budget highlights the fact that services for those from non-English speaking backgrounds will be in demand. This is a confusing message, as a school in my electorate of Unley has been led to believe that because its LOTE program covers the same language as its mother tongue program, it will lose its mother tongue funding—a mere \$20 000 a year. The money is very well spent, with 90 students or 20 per cent of the total school population attending mother tongue lessons in Italian or Greek once a week. It is the only opportunity that they have to use their mother tongue exclusively in the classroom. Minister, I plead that you save the mother tongue funding.

I am very proud of South Australia's diversity and culture, being of Italian heritage. Some might say that I am being a little precious on this issue, but today's Australian culture has evolved to its welcoming nature and acceptance of people from around the globe. It seems to me to be unAustralian to penny pinch from the mother tongue program; it is unAustralian. The minister should be ashamed. In conclusion, I stand here disappointed, speaking for the constituents of Unley, who have waited four months for the budget while watching TV commercials of our Premier praising the work of his Treasurer. I ask the question: if the budget is so good for South Australia, why did the Rann government need to spend tens of thousands of taxpayers' dollars on prime time television telling us about it? I say that self-praise is no recommendation.

Mr PICCOLO (Light): The 2006-07 Rann budget delivers on the government's three key priorities: better community health, greater community safety and improved education outcomes. Before I address how the budget benefits my electorate, I would like to comment on the opposition's response to this point. The responses have been riddled with

cliches, weak analysis, no sensible alternatives—in fact, no alternatives at all—and downright errors, and I should add now, as a result of the member for Waite's contribution, a few conspiracy theories. If this is the best the opposition can produce, God help this state should members opposite win government again. They would send the state bankrupt within a year.

Opposition speakers have listed hundreds of new measures they want introduced, hundreds of millions of dollars in extra spending, called for further tax reductions, opposed proposed Public Service efficiency gains and not mentioned one new income measure. Quite simply, the Liberal opposition's numbers do not add up. Yesterday the member for Morphet acknowledged that the future of some schools needs to be looked at, but did he have an alternative? No. Did he have a vision for the future of our schools? No. Did he have a plan for our kids? No. He had cliches and rhetoric. Well, this budget will lead to the delivery in my electorate of a purpose-built child centre in Gawler, redevelopment of the Roseworthy Primary School, a feasibility study for the upgrade of the administration centre at Freeling Primary School, a new birth to year 12 school in the Smithfield Plains-Playford North community and a new birth to year 7 primary school in the Smithfield Plains-Playford North community. These commitments exceed the government's promise to this community. The new schools will have additional services for preschool children. These schools will give this community the resources it needs for its children to gain a good education and a bright future.

This opposition is out of touch with the ordinary, working people of this state. What is the opposition's plan, alternative or vision? Nothing. I have heard nothing. Yesterday, in this house, the member for Kavel argued that the government was only prepared to introduce the new super schools in safe Labor seats. How could he get it so wrong? The Playford North/Smithfield Plains—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: A lot of practice.

Mr PICCOLO: A lot of practice, I agree. The Playford North/Smithfield Plains super school is actually in the electorate of Light, the government's most marginal seat. It is doing it because it is the right thing to do. The irony is that the Liberal Party has submitted to the State Boundaries Commission that this community be transferred to Napier, a safe Labor seat—so they want it both ways. Again, how could they get it so wrong? The community and I are tired of Liberal MPs using the north as a political toy for them to play with as they wish. That is why the community voted in doves for Labor at the recent state election, including booting the Liberals out of Light for the first time since 1944.

I fully appreciate that the reorganisation of schools will cause some anxiety in the community, as change always does. It is not helped by the Liberal Party's desperate, unprincipled plan to mislead the community about the reforms proposed. Bereft of any new ideas or vision, they have to resort to the tried and tested fear campaign. This strategy is no substitute for hard work and the community will see through it. This government will work with the local community to deliver the best schools and educational outcomes possible for the children in this area. The people in my electorate will also benefit from the improved services at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, the establishment of a GP Plus centre at Elizabeth, the opening of a new police shop front in the Munno Para area, and an additional 400 police officers—our allocation.

This is my first budget session in this place, and I held high hopes that the opposition would provide an articulate,

intelligent critique of the government's program and a vision for some alternative. I must confess I got it wrong. I was so off the mark. All I have observed is a range of speakers thrashing about like chooks without their heads. The government has delivered a sound, responsible budget which (as I said earlier) meets the government's three key priorities: better community health; greater community safety; and improved education outcomes.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder): I will be gracious enough to talk about some positives within my area initially, and I do thank the Minister for Education and Children's Services for the commitment she has provided to a couple of projects in the area. The first one is her very positive and prompt response to the fire that destroyed the Wallaroo Primary School earlier this year. That project has now commenced, and, hopefully, the building will be recommissioned within the next six months. I also want to commend the minister for the funds that have been provided to the Kadina Primary School—\$500 000 towards a \$1.8 million project—and also for the Narrunga TAFE at Point Pearce, where \$600 000 has been commissioned.

A fantastic disability project is taking place on Yorke Peninsula. A facility is to be built to house people with physical and intellectual disabilities who, in some cases, are nearing the age of 50 and living with very aged parents who can no longer care for themselves, let alone their children. The government has now committed some resources, over the next few years, to build a facility. I commend minister Weatherill on that.

Out of my electorate, I also congratulate the government on the grasshopper control program. Having lived in Orroroo from 1993 to 1999 and suffered through the seemingly constant problems with grasshoppers and locusts (and seen first-hand what it does to the psyche of the people who live there and still try to derive an income whilst putting up with those pests), I do commend the government for that commitment.

However, I want to take up one little point that the member for Mawson made in his speech, when he talked about the Liberal opposition being out of touch with the community. I am a new member to this place but, for 20 years, I have lived within Yorke Peninsula and, for every day of those 20 years, I served that community. I am not out of touch. I have had people coming to me every day, talking about the services that they need, and that is what has equipped me to be in this place.

The government has said that the budget provides for regional areas. There are a couple of comments I want to make with respect to the Regional Statement, where it connects back to South Australia's Strategic Plan and talks about six objectives: growing prosperity, improving wellbeing, attaining sustainability, fostering creativity, building communities and expanding opportunities. If one reads the Regional Statement, one does not find that translated into fact. There are not enough dollars there. We have to recognise that over 25 per cent of our population resides in regional areas in South Australia. The return to those people just is not in this budget, and that is what I intend to fight for in future years.

The issue of regional roads is a key factor. It appears as though the member for Stuart is one of the lucky people in this place. Some roadworks are being undertaken in his electorate towards Parachilna, and I noted the comment by the Minister for Transport yesterday, when he confirmed that

\$9 million has been allocated to the Penola bypass, but there is nothing in it for Goyder. We still live with the frustration of the road between Port Wakefield and Kulpara not yet being finished. That road was worked on and the primer seal was laid about four months ago, and we still have 80 km/h speed limits in place. I wonder how many people have been booked for speeding in that area because they drive for about 10 kilometres in an 80 km/h speed limit zone, the road looks in good condition and, out of frustration, they speed up. It is just a crazy situation to me. We all acknowledge that there is a \$200 million backlog in the regional road network, for which the state is responsible, and the government needs to put more dollars into it. However, I believe that less than \$20 million has been committed.

I want to talk briefly about water supplies. Those of us who live in regional South Australia recognise that a reticulated water supply is critical to the growth of our region, but they also have to live with very high augmentation costs when a project comes along that needs a water supply and it cannot be provided. I have heard of figures of between \$4 500 and \$15 000 being spent for a block of land to be created to have a water supply. To me, it is crazy. It is holding up residential development but, even more importantly, it is holding up industry that wants to establish itself within the Adelaide Plains area. The Primo meatworks abattoir, which has just been established north of Port Wakefield, employs 400 people. It has had to spend a lot of money to augment the water supply to have the water it needs for the business to operate. A very substantial investment has been made in the chicken farms on the Adelaide Plains. Each of the sheds costs \$500 000 to develop and I believe that, in the last 12 months, over 100 sheds have been built. That will equate to a lot of jobs for the Adelaide Plains area and also for the people who live out of the area but work in northern Adelaide and the surrounding regions.

We have to consider alternative supplies for water options. Kangaroo Island has a desalination plant. We have all heard about the proposal to build one in the Upper Spencer Gulf area. My own area of Marion Bay is building a very small plant, with very little support from the state government: it is only a \$10 000 grant from the Tourism Commission that is helping in that regard. We have to consider alternative technologies. I understand that it will come at a cost, but we need to do something about it.

I want to talk briefly about the decision to reduce the investment earnings from school funds. In the past 10 years I have had the opportunity to be involved in two different governing councils as the treasurer. I can assure the Treasurer that, when a school has funds in hand, it is not so they just sit there and they do not do anything with them. They have projects in mind. When I moved to Maitland in June 2000, a very large project was undertaken with the redevelopment of the library. One community member donated \$20 000 to that project, and the rest had been achieved through hard work and savings over the previous 10 years. Since that time, a large project has been undertaken on the gymnasium. Those projects were only able to be undertaken because there is a lot of community support, and a little money was able to be put away each year until eventually they were built.

I believe that, with respect to schools and WorkCover, the change of management back to individual responsibility is crazy. Having previously worked for an organisation with 120 staff, I know about the WorkCover issues and the time they consume, the policies that need to be in place, the control principles, the safe return to work practices and the

management and resources that need to go into it. Schools are not established for that purpose. Staff in schools are there to cater for the needs of the children, to ensure that they receive the best possible education, not to manage WorkCover within their own locality. It is an amazing decision.

I heard today of a reduction in the budget of the SATC from \$33 million to \$28 million: some \$5 million has been taken out. For the last two years, I have had the opportunity to be involved on the Yorke Peninsula Tourism Marketing Board, which is made up of a wonderful group of people who are focused on making sure that they receive the absolute maximum number of visitors to their area. Yorke Peninsula is attractive to people. In 2005 we had 530 000 visitors, of whom 150 000 made it all the way down to Innes National Park.

Promotion within South Australia and the resources that go into promoting the region in other states, at caravan and camping shows and things like that, are important. Those groups cannot operate effectively if there is a reduction in their budgets, so I concur with the comments made by the member for Finnis when he said that Bill Spurr must be pulling his hair out. How the hell is he actually meant to make tourism in South Australia grow, when we all know there has been a reversal in the trend, if he does not have sufficient resources?

Rural areas are truly hurting, and unless you actually live in a regional area you cannot understand what it is like. People are struggling; they are worried about the weather every day and they are worried about getting a return on their investment—and these are people who have invested hundreds of thousands of dollars in the hope that it rains at the right time of the year so that they are actually able to reap a crop and get some money back. I see it on their faces every day as I drive around; I see it in the fact that suddenly we have stock put into crops, because they know that there is not going to be any return and the only viable option is to put the sheep in there and hope they can fatten them up a little so they can sell them off for a bit of money. However, given that there is so much stock going into the markets at the one time, those prices are also depressed.

People are going to try to hold on for as long as they can, and some may have hay stored from previous years, but how do you manage? In other years farmers have had to live with the frustration of good yields but very low prices; this year there is not going to be any yield. We in this house need to understand that and we need to make sure that we support the agriculture industry as much as we can. The fact that there is only \$1.9 million in the budget towards drought relief is ridiculous. Agriculture is a billion-dollar industry in South Australia and it needs a lot more support than it is getting.

Finally, I would like to comment on the regional development boards. I note that the budget includes continued support for these, and that will be a relief to them because there was the threat of rationalisation occurring there. The boards do great work, but to do that they need additional resources. The regional development infrastructure fund has, I believe, been funded to the tune of \$3 million for each year of the next four years—and \$3 million spread around the geographical area of South Australia that needs it is a pittance. These funds have been made available to encourage industry to develop because industry creates job opportunities, it brings people to live in the areas permanently, and it creates a future for a region. We need a lot more than \$3 million.

I would like to reinforce a statement I made last night when I was talking about the budget in relation to my portfolios. We on this side of the house believe that it is a budget of broken promises and missed opportunities. South Australians will also recognise that; let us hope that it is not too late.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): I would like to take a short journey across my electorate of Finniss and identify some of the variety of issues that need to be dealt with.

An honourable member: Virtually?

Mr PENGILLY: I am getting assistance from your backbench, Mr Speaker. As I said, I would like to take a virtual journey across the electorate of Finniss and identify important areas that need to be further addressed over the next 15 or 20 years. I mentioned earlier how rapidly the population in my area is growing and that is, in itself, leading to a large number of issues that must have attention.

I will start with Goolwa on the north-eastern tip of my electorate. We have a multitude of things at Goolwa directly connected with the Murray. The barrages will need a program put in place before much longer. However, probably most importantly, to enable further development to take place in Goolwa we need a substantial upgrade of the electricity supply and distribution system down through the eastern Fleurieu Peninsula. That is holding back the Goolwa area. It is anticipated that Goolwa will grow faster than any other part of my electorate population-wise. Being an old river town, Goolwa has a lot of inherent structural problems that need to be addressed, and Alexandrina Council is doing its best to do that.

If you move a little further south, the town of Middleton is struggling with the issue of disposal of waste water—and quite frankly I would like to see that dealt with by a holistic approach across the whole South Coast area. I am most grateful that the waste water plant at Victor Harbor is now on stream, so to speak, and is dealing with the amount of waste water and effluent coming out of Victor Harbor. However, the town of Middleton also has some major inherent problems. Middleton is quite a different little town. It is very much a transient holiday town, but quite a number of residents do not have a large amount of disposable income, and consequently we need to keep our eye on that pretty closely. Port Elliot is also another most interesting area. Port Elliot is an extremely proud little town. Not only does it have a great heritage and a rapidly growing retiree and elderly population but it also has a substantial amount of younger families. I am also most grateful to the government for the fact that the new Port Elliot Primary School will be open at the start of 2007. That is a most important issue for those people, and the people of Port Elliot are very pleased that that is happening.

One thing that the government needs to take into consideration is what will happen with the land disposal of the current Port Elliot Primary School site. I am very hopeful that that will remain as some form of public land, and that it is very cleverly and strategically thought out for the future and it is not lost to the public. I would not like to see that land go to private development. Indeed, I believe that part of that land at Port Elliot needs to stay as parklands, or something similar, with some cleverly thought out projects to take it into the next century. The main road through Port Elliot requires some attention in relation to people crossing the road. We do need some sort of traffic inhibitors or some sort of pedestrian

crossing in Port Elliot. That is another thing that the department for transport needs to have well and truly on its radar.

I am quite horrified at the prospect of having a tragedy in the main street of Port Elliot. There is a particularly good bakery which attracts a huge amount of clientele in the summer season. It is the best bakery in the state. Enormous numbers of people cross that road, some of them not quite as cleverly as they should, and if an accident did occur—

The Hon. S.W. Key: Boy scouts, that is what you need.

Mr PENGILLY: Boy scouts; okay. If an accident did occur, it could have horrendous consequences. I urge the Minister for Transport and his department to pick up that issue and, hopefully, deal with it. Victor Harbor is a most interesting place. It is coming under enormous development pressures. The council is attempting to deal with those pressures. A large amount of pressure is put on it by developers; and, equally, a large amount of pressure is put on it by the local residents. It is a real case of one against the other, and getting caught in the crossfire makes for a fairly interesting exercise, I can assure members. I have spoken with the minister in another place about the issues relating to planning in Victor Harbor. I am most cognisant of the fact that you do not want to destroy what makes people go there, so you have to be very careful how it is developed.

As you travel out behind Victor Harbor and cross over to the western Fleurieu, you cross over some of the best farming land in South Australia. Much of this farming land is dairy farming land. Much of it has been cut up, to some extent, and has hobby farms on it which—

Mr Venning interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: The member for Schubert had a girlfriend from there—she is probably a great-grandmother by now. The dairy farmers are concerned about issues such as the amount of hobby farms that have been created as it brings people into the district. However, of more concern to the longstanding farmers in that area is the blue gum plantations that are taking place. That is an issue in the Myponga area. The Myponga area is very much a through traffic area. It is a very traditional country town. It has terrific people and a terrific community spirit. Myponga is an area in which I would like to spend as much time as possible, and equally Yankalilla. Yankalilla is major stop-off point for people travelling around the Fleurieu, whether they are visiting the eastern Fleurieu and Victor Harbor or whether, indeed, they are travelling to Kangaroo Island via Cape Jervis to catch the ferry. Indeed, the small community of Carrickalinga and, to a lesser extent, Normanville are favourite haunts of many city visitors on the weekend. I hope that, in its wisdom, the government sees fit to continue funding road improvements down through that side.

Cape Jervis is a different town. Cape Jervis is almost a world apart, and the people down there, in many respects—and great respect to them—choose to do that. It is a fishing town that has come a long way. It is a fishing town which has turned into a ferry terminal and which has turned into a major exit port for the mainland to go across Backstairs Passage to Kangaroo Island.

The improvements that the government made to assist the SeaLink company at Cape Jervis are noted and respected—

Mr Rau: You only have three minutes for the koalas.

Mr PENGILLY: I am getting to them; they are right down at the west end where we are going next. The government's contribution and assistance in getting a decent facility and terminal at Cape Jervis is recognised. I do not know why I must always wear these koalas.

I would like to very briefly turn to Kangaroo Island to wind up my remarks. As you well know, Mr Speaker, I am an island born resident, and I have my property and family there, and the island is very close to my heart. Kangaroo Island has a wonderful future but, equally, it is struggling severely financially. The council is going backwards to the tune of around \$1 million a year in so far as it cannot—

Mr Rau interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: You only get about \$1 per head for koalas, member for Enfield. The council on Kangaroo Island really is struggling to exist. You cannot continue to encourage, market and push the island, where we welcome visitors, when the infrastructure is simply not suitable. To have 1 300 kilometres of road with only 200 sealed is a nightmare for many visitors. With regard to the cost of getting across Backstairs Passage, the SeaLink company has, as I have mentioned before in this place, worked very hard to keep the cost down. I would desperately like to see a real bipartisan approach to the issue of sea transport to and from Kangaroo Island, because it will be a basket case for years if it is not dealt with. It is very easy to push it onto the back burner; however, it needs to be dealt with urgently. I again stress that I am more than happy to sit down with the government of the day and work on that problem with it. I have had discussions with the Premier and cabinet in the past, and I would like to continue those discussions.

Time expired.

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): I was shocked, despairing and distressed. I read through the budget papers only to find that in 2006-07, yet again, there is not a mention of the Britannia roundabout. The poor people of Bragg will have to go on having more than two accidents a week at Britannia roundabout, the worst intersection in metropolitan Adelaide, according to the RAA, and, yet again, we miss out. I want to put on the record, as I did a couple of years ago, that I thank the former minister for transport, who at least came up with a plan. We had a big launch, and a big media event—fantastic—we have a project. And, 11 months later, the new Minister for Transport came out and said, ‘Sorry, it’s all off—cancelled. No, no; we’re not cancelling it, we’re just going to defer it. We’re going to go back, and have a look at it; go round the roundabout a few more times and we’ll have a look at it.’

Just to help the Minister for Transport, I sent off the plans and a sketch of the Britannia roundabout to the engineering students at the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia and said, ‘Well, here it is. We’ve got all these people in the Minister for Transport’s division down there. He hasn’t quite worked out who is going to do this so, here it is. We’ll give you an opportunity to come in, but we’ve got lots and lots of ideas.’ We have put them to a public meeting. We have again raised the issue, sent them all off to the Minister for Transport in the hope that might help him to twig to some new idea.

I thought it was quite interesting; for example, there was one proposal to recommend the reopening of Beaumont Road, which I know would inspire the member for Adelaide to a state of distress if it was reopened. Nevertheless, lots of options came in. There were all sorts of variety, but, sadly, no mention whatsoever of the Britannia roundabout. The people of the eastern area and also the member for Norwood would understand the importance of this to that electorate and, yet, we have absolutely zip, zero, no mention, no forward estimates, no promise, nothing. So, I do not know

what they are doing down there at the transport division, but they are proposing other blow-outs. All I ask for is at least some consideration to leave this project in the budget papers and, at the very least, bring it back with some funding next year.

Then we have the Burnside Primary School, which is packed with children. We have had the problem during the year when asbestos was detected in soil around the swimming pool, and we had to bring that to the attention of the parliament to have it remedied, and, ultimately, it was. They dug out all the soil and replaced it. We asked for some assurance from the government that it would put in place measures to ensure it did not happen to any other school, and all we found was that there was a reprimand to the project manager and no other action was taken. We still do not know what has been put in place to assure us about other schools. That was devastating. This is a school which is rapidly growing, has been a very longstanding school in the state, has many hundreds of children, and which urgently needs development. Sadly, it missed out again.

I thank the government for at least not cancelling the current project for the redevelopment of the Linden Park Primary School. The disappointing aspect is, although they were given I think \$100 000 last year and a few hundred thousand this year, what is about a \$6 million project, if it is to be completed by 2008, will actually have to have something like \$5.5 million spent in the five months to the end of next year (that is, 2007) to enable it to be completed. We all know that is just a fantasy, and the disappointment is that the children at that school will be waiting yet again and inconvenienced by the delay of a very significant redevelopment.

As members of the house know, I represent districts that all have schools that are waiting in line, and we all understand they cannot be done at once. But when they are at least allocated, defined and provision is made for them in the budget, at the very least the minister should ensure that those projects are kept on stream, progress and are not delayed and blow out in costs, so that the children and the parents of those children who have worked hard to have those projects put on the books and slowly watch them go up the ladder towards funding should not have them cruelly ripped away when the projects are delayed.

I also mention the Burnside CFS. It is the only metropolitan-based Country Fire Service in South Australia and, quite frankly, Craig Holt and his team—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: No it is not.

Ms CHAPMAN: Metropolitan-based. You check it with the CFS.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: Is Salisbury not in the metropolitan area?

Ms CHAPMAN: You check it with the CFS.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: No, you are wrong. Is Salisbury not in metropolitan Adelaide? Give us a break!

Ms CHAPMAN: That CFS protects the eastern area of South Australia, often along with the work of the MFS and SES—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: —and that CFS not only contributes towards the education of the community in relation to fire prevention, but also works hard when we do have fires. In fact, when Eyre Peninsula was burning at the beginning of last year we also had a very significant fire in the Adelaide Hills which would have ripped through down into the suburbs of Adelaide had it not been for the work of the people in the

CFS, and in particular I commend the Burnside CFS. Last year it came to the aid of the local community when the Waterfall Gully floods occurred, which caused hundreds of thousands of dollars in damage, and on which we are still waiting for some remedy from the government. Again, there is no mention of it in the budget, not even to repay the local council, which I think is waiting for a \$250 000 payment, or thereabouts, from the government in reimbursement. There is plenty of money for the Gawler floods, but zip for the people who live at Waterfall Gully. I hasten to add that damage was caused in those floods arising out of rock coming from the national park which, of course, is the sole responsibility of the state government.

It is also disturbing to note that, as we are in a drought in South Australia and have had warnings that South Australia is the most precarious of all states in this country (it is a tinder box) in relation to fire, I see in the budget this year a \$3 million cut in services and supplies to be allocated to the CFS in South Australia. It is across South Australia. It is very disturbing to see that, because my local CFS is patiently waiting in line for equipment, but there has been a \$3 million cut in this budget for supplies and services—an underspend, I hasten to add, of \$1 million in the financial year 2005-06. Here we are, facing a very difficult time in the next six or seven months, expecting an extended period of fire risk, yet there is a savage cut to CFS services.

I do wonder whether the restructure of the Emergency Services Board (which was debated in this place a couple of years ago) means that the chickens are coming home to roost. The opposition gave notice to the parliament of its concern that the voice of the CFS on that board would be squashed. The tragedy is that South Australia could be burned as a result of it, and that is something about which, I think, the government should take some heed.

I come now to the Glenside Hospital, which happens to be the only public hospital facility in my electorate. It is a very important hospital, because it provides the statewide service for that small component of the mental health community who require care in an institutional setting. I am pleased to say that it is a small component. As was mentioned by the member for Little Para, efforts have been made to highlight the importance of ensuring that community-based mental health is supported and that, where possible, we have an opportunity to make sure that people suffering mental health have some respite in an appropriate environment and preferably not in an institution. Some people require forensic security. Some people in the aged community are unable to be placed in aged care and they do need that service. Also, there are those people who, from time to time, are chronically ill and who need that service.

I was shattered to see in the budget that the redevelopment of the Lyell McEwin Hospital (in itself an excellent facility) with respect to mental health services has cut back its bed facility from 65 to 50. I was a little disappointed that the member for Little Para did not mention this in her contribution, because this is in her electorate. Fifteen people from her district are languishing in the Glenside Hospital, and they were earmarked to be relocated to Lyell McEwin. It has been confirmed in the budget that those 15 beds are for the people in the honourable member's district. They will not be able to return into that community to enjoy the privilege that those in the south have been given with the establishment of the Margaret Tobin Centre which, of course, started to operate this week. Some question must be raised.

Helen Mayo House had a budget allocation—along with the Boylan Ward at the Women's and Children's Hospital—of some \$7 million. That was a project in the 2005-06 budget. It is a project with which the member for Little Para would be familiar because, as a former minister for health, she would have made some contribution to supporting that. It is an excellent facility. It is an opportunity to be able to provide all the things which she said but which have been cancelled from the budget altogether.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I rise to make few brief comments about matters of concern in the electorate of Heysen having spent 20 minutes this afternoon managing to touch briefly on some of the issues concerning my portfolio responsibilities. The first thing I want to talk about is the Heathfield Recreation Centre, which is a matter dear to my heart. I worked on it for many years. I was a member of the original committee that was formed some eight years ago, I think, to try to get a recreation centre. Members would probably be aware that Stirling, Heathfield, Aldgate and Bridgewater, that sort of area of the Hills, is one of the coldest and wettest parts of the state, and thus far we have no indoor recreation facility at all.

In spite of that, the kids from Heathfield High School have managed to gain and retain the crown as the best volleyball players in the country. They have been the national titleholders for, I think, nine out of the last 10 years, or something like that. They have done that without ever having even a competition-standard court on which to play and practice. All these years ago the committee formed, and the idea was that we would try to get an indoor recreation centre to accommodate things happening during the cold and wet season at Stirling and surrounding areas.

The idea was that the facility would serve not only the high school students but also the community at large. Also, by virtue of having an indoor heated pool, it would serve as the community swimming facility, particularly for all the primary schools in the area. I think that about eight or 10 primary schools will be serviced by it. To cut a long story short, way back before I was even, I think, an endorsed candidate (but certainly well before my election), a deal was struck whereby the Office for Recreation and Sport would put in \$1 million, the Department of Education would put in \$1 million, the local council would put in \$1 million and we would get the facility built.

We had a design, we had someone who was prepared to actually put in money for the pool and so on, but that languished for so long originally with the council that the person who was going to put in some private funds walked away from the deal, and we then ended up having to move to a situation where the council decided it would not put the money in if it did have a pool, whereas their original proposal was that they would not put their money in unless it did have a pool. So we ended up having this proposal, which was approved some time ago, but this government has delayed throughout its term thus far, so throughout the last four years, having this thing built. We have had the money organised and agreed to in budget—some of it actually handed over—but the facility has not yet been built, and so it has gone on for so long that there were kids who were actually at the high school when the cheque for a million dollars from the Department of Recreation and Sport was handed over, because I remember the kids being told, 'Hold this cheque, you'll never ever in your life see another cheque for a million dollars,' and they held it. Well, those kids thought that that

centre was going to be there in a year or two, but instead of that they have finished high school, they are not at the high school any more, and not one sod has been turned to start it.

The most recent delays have been in the Department of Education, and then in the Crown Solicitor's Office. I am pleased to say that, despite the fact that we have had all these delays, it does appear that this centre is about to start and that this community-cum-school recreation facility will be built and someone in the near future hopefully will get to use it. But one of the points to make about this is the effect of the government's decision about the \$6 million in interest payments that they are going to take back from the schools, because I know from going to the numerous schools around my electorate, and there are many, many—I think at the moment I have 18 primary schools, and I try to get to their governing council meetings as often as I can, and obviously I hear bits and pieces around the traps as to what is happening with funding for various projects.

It is clear to me that, when they get the money, they often cannot do a major project in just one year, they have to accumulate some funds, they have to do fundraising, and they rely very much on having the interest to accommodate the fact that costs go up. And when they originally put up the proposal it is often a couple of years before the proposal gets built and costs inevitably have gone up, and the interest that they had been receiving up until now on monies is going to be denied them and create a major problem. But that, I guess, applies to all electorates, not just the electorate of Heysen.

Another matter I want to quickly touch on is the issue of the roundabout at Aldgate, and that again is a major problem that we have been trying to deal with up there. It is a bit like the Britannia roundabout, only not on the same scale, I guess. But it is a major intersection. It is the intersection at the Aldgate Hotel where one road goes off in the direction of Mylor and Strathalbyn and one road goes around through Bridgewater and up through the northern hills, basically; up through Verdun and Balhannah and so on. So it is a major intersection; it is a very difficult intersection. It comes in at a strange angle, it has a local road coming in, and there is a pump in the middle of the intersection, which has historic significance. But the very first Minister for Transport under the Labor Rann government was Michael Wright, and he very kindly came up and had a look at it, and he said, 'Well, where does the road begin and end and where does the car park begin and end?' and I said, 'Well, precisely.' You cannot tell where that begins and ends. It was agreed, ultimately, that this intersection did need attention and that the best thing that could happen to it would be a roundabout. So a roundabout began to be designed, and I wrote to the minister, whoever it then was, and said, 'Look, you need to be aware that there are two things you need to know at this intersection.'

One of those things is that the pump cannot be just destroyed or thrown away. The pump is historically significant and has to stay somewhere in the vicinity of that intersection. And the second thing is that this intersection floods, badly. And, indeed, last November we had a flood that they now think is a 1 in 1 000 year flood. It flooded that intersection so badly that the shops along the main street of Aldgate were universally flooded. The doctors along at one end had computer equipment, brand-new that had not even started working yet that was destroyed. Shops had water going through them three and four feet high, even though they were up in the hills. I can see the puzzlement on the member for Light's face, but it is true that Aldgate floods badly, and the creek there flooded—

Mr Kenyon interjecting:

Mrs REDMOND: The member for Newland remarks that it is a council problem, but it is not just a council problem because those roads are state roads. The creek does need to be fixed, but it is not entirely the creek that is the problem. In fact, I cannot go into the details of the engineering, partly because I do not understand it well enough but also because, even if I did go into it, I could not explain it well enough in the time that is left to me.

Suffice it to say that the intersection is a major problem. It does not only service people in the local area. They are state roads and they need state attention. It is not appropriate to simply say, 'It is the council's problem; the council has to fix it.' It is not the council property that is flooded, it is the state road, and the roundabout needs to be designed so that the flooding problem is overcome. It has already been partially overcome, but it needs to be fully overcome to accommodate not just the people in the area but all the tourists and all the people from around the state who travel through that most difficult intersection. It clearly needs a lot of work.

Just briefly, there are a couple of other issues that I want to touch on. Most importantly—and it was touched on by the member for Bragg—is the issue of fire danger and the season that we are about to have. I note that the government has introduced an early start to the fire season. I make no complaint about that, but I want to alert the government to the issue of burn-off. In the hills, where there are very wet winters, there is often a very short space of time in which people have the opportunity to conduct the burn-off that they need to do on their own properties. People up there generally have larger properties than the average person. The minimum in the area where I live was half an acre; it is now one acre. It is impossible (for the conscientious people) to get the necessary clean-up done in the limited amount of time that is left once the weather has fined up enough for burn-off to be done safely. People recognise the need to do it. It would equally be impossible for them to take the debris to the dump. We need to think carefully about achieving that balance.

The other issue that I think attaches to that is the need for cool burns. We should have been doing cool burns much earlier in the season. We know how risky this season is going to be. I have in my area: Belair Park, Cleland, Mount George, Scott Creek, Sir Mark Oliphant and Lofty Park. I have a number of parks all around the area.

Mr Piccolo: Myriad parks.

Mrs REDMOND: Myriad parks, as the member for Light says. Those parks are terrific, and there are great friends of Parks groups. In fact, I go out and try to help them as often as I can—although my time is limited. These areas need to have cool burns through them. We all know that real Australian bush actually thrives on fire going through it fairly regularly. The difficulty with major fire is the lack of cool burn.

Time expired.

Mr KENYON (Newland): Hopefully I will be concluding the contributions.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: Do you have a CFS in your area?

Mr KENYON: I do actually—Tea Tree Gully CFS.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine: Are they in the metro area?

Mr KENYON: They are in the metropolitan area. I would just like to make a few points quickly and then we can all go home. The first point I would like to make is that the

opposition, over the past number of days—almost a week; I think tomorrow at roughly 3 p.m. it will be exactly one week—has not landed one significant punch on the budget. Not one effective attack has come from the other side of the house. Nothing—not one single line—has gained traction in the population, and we have seen an example of it tonight.

The opposition is reduced to coming in here and whinging and whining about the normal course of budget distribution. It is a very defensive move from members opposite, because now they will go out there and put out their little newsletters, and that is excellent—they will all hold their own seats. We have not seen an attacking line from the opposition. We have not seen anything that will be effective, and nothing that will help them win any seats in the next election.

It is a clear example of poor leadership, and the reason for that is there is no strategy, or very poor strategy, coming from the opposition. It has not been able to land a single punch. It cannot work out whether we should have gone harder or whether we have gone too far. So, it is courting this eternal contradiction of not quite knowing how to attack the budget and not being able to land any punches on it because its strategy is so poor and it has no internal thinking behind its attacks. It is incredibly lazy, it has no vision and that is why it is ineffective. The member for Mawson advocated that they should get a full length mirror and have a good hard look at them themselves. I will go further and take the Roy and H.G. line: I think they should go into a room full of mirrors and have a good hard look at themselves.

Motion carried.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for State/Local Government Relations): I move:

That the proposed expenditures for the departments and services contained in the Appropriation Bill be referred to Estimates Committees A and B for examination and report by Thursday 26 October 2006, in accordance with the timetables as follows:

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE A
18-25 October 2006

WEDNESDAY 18 OCTOBER AT 9.00 AM

Premier
Minister for Economic Development
Minister for Social Inclusion Minister for Arts
Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change
Minister Assisting the Minister for the Arts
Minister Assisting the Premier in Cabinet Business and Public Sector Management Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Office of Public Employment
State Governor's Establishment Arts SA
Auditor-General's Department
Department of Trade and Economic Development (part) House of Assembly
Joint Parliamentary Services
Legislative Council
Minister for Transport
Minister for Infrastructure
Minister for Energy
Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)
Administered Items for the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)
TransAdelaide
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)

THURSDAY 19 OCTOBER AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Police
Minister for Mineral Resources Development
Minister for Urban Development and Planning
Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)

South Australia Police (part)
Administered Items for South Australia Police (part)
Planning SA
Administered Items for Planning SA
Offices for Sustainable Social, Environmental and Economic Development (part)

Minister for Tourism
South Australian Tourism Commission
Minister for Tourism

FRIDAY 20 OCTOBER AT 10.00 AM

Minister for Families and Communities
Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation
Minister for Housing
Minister for Ageing
Minister for Disability
Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Administered Items for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (part)
Department for Families and Communities (part)
Administered Items for Department for Families and Communities (part)

MONDAY 23 OCTOBER AT 11.00 AM

Minister for State/Local Government Relations
Minister for the Status of Women
Minister for Volunteers
Minister for Consumer Affairs
Office for State/Local Government Relations
Administered Items for the Office of State/Local Government Relations

Department for Families and Communities (part)
Administered Items for Department for Families and Communities (part)
Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)

Attorney-General's Department (part)
Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
Attorney-General
Minister for Justice
Minister for Multicultural Affairs
Attorney-General's Department (part)
Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
Courts Administration Authority
State Electoral Office

TUESDAY 24 OCTOBER AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Industry and Trade
Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
Office of the Venture Capital Board
Port Adelaide Maritime Corporation
Minister for Emergency Services
Minister for Correctional Services
Minister for Road Safety
Department for Correctional Services
Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)
Administered Items for Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (part)

South Australia Police (part)
Administered Items for South Australia Police (part)

WEDNESDAY 25 OCTOBER AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries
Minister for Forests
Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Primary Industries and Resources (part)

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE B
18-25 OCTOBER 2006

WEDNESDAY 18 OCTOBER AT 9.00 AM

Treasurer
Minister for State/Federal Relations
Department of Treasury and Finance
Administered Items for the Department of Treasury and Finance (part)
Minister for Education and Children's Services
Department of Education and Children's Services
Administered Items for the Department of Education and Children's Services

THURSDAY 19 OCTOBER AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Health
Minister for the Southern Suburbs

Department of Health
Administered Items for the Department of Health
Offices for Sustainable Social, Environmental and Economic
Development (part)

FRIDAY 20 OCTOBER AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education
Minister for Youth
Minister for Gambling
Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and
Technology (part)

Attorney-General's Department (part)
Administered Items for the Attorney-General's Department (part)
Independent Gambling Authority

MONDAY 23 OCTOBER AT 11.30 AM

Minister for the River Murray
Minister for Regional Development
Minister for Small Business
Minister for Science and Information Economy
Minister Assisting the Minister for Industry and Trade
Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Water, Land and
Biodiversity Conservation (part)
Department of Trade and Economic Development (part)
Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and
Technology (part)

TUESDAY 24 OCTOBER AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Administrative Services and Government Enterprises
Minister for Industrial Relations
Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing
Department for Administrative and Information Services
Administered Items for the Department for Administrative and
Information Services

WEDNESDAY 25 OCTOBER AT 11.00 AM

Minister for Environment and Conservation
Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse
Department for Environment and Heritage
Administered Items for the Department for Environment and
Heritage
Department of Water, Land and Biodiversity Conservation (part)
Administered Items for the Department of Water, Land and
Biodiversity Conservation (part)
Environment Protection Authority

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I point out to members that
the commencing time varies from day to day.

Motion carried.

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

That Estimates Committee A be appointed, consisting of
Mr Bignell, Ms Ciccarello, Hons I.F. Evans and G.M. Gunn,
Mr Pisoni, Ms Simmons and Ms Thompson.

Motion carried.

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

That Estimates Committee B be appointed, consisting of
Messrs Goldsworthy, Griffiths, Hamilton-Smith, Kenyon,
Koutsantonis and Rau, and the Hon. L. Stevens.

Motion carried.

ADJOURNMENT

At 10.48 p.m. the house adjourned until Thursday
28 September at 10.30 a.m.