

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday 1 June 2006

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.J. Snelling)** took the chair at 10.30 a.m. and read prayers.

HISTORY MUSEUM

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

That this house calls on the state government to create a comprehensive history museum of South Australia to showcase South Australia's numerous social, political, economic and cultural achievements, many of which have been world firsts.

I have taken interest in this issue for quite a while and, whilst some people might say that I have been a tourist, it is not true. I have looked at every museum that I have had the opportunity to visit, and I have reached the point now where I am 'museumed' out—there is no such word—but it is a bit like visiting England and going to cathedrals, after you have seen a few, you have seen them all. South Australia has a very rich social, economic and political history which we currently do not showcase. We do have some excellent museums, and I am the first to acknowledge that. We have the Migration Museum which is excellent, we have a railway museum, a maritime museum, a motor museum, and a wonderful natural history museum, but we do not have a museum which can highlight—not only to South Australians but also to visitors—the great achievements of the people of this state. I am keen that this government commits to that, and I am sure the opposition would be supportive of this notion as well. Members might recall that we used to have a constitutional museum next door but, owing to pressure of space, that was moved out.

Members might be interested to know some of the achievements of South Australians. Some of these are a little in dispute, because you can argue about when someone actually did it, or when the law was passed, and so on but, in general terms, these are pretty accurate:

- we had the first police force in Australia in 1838;
- the first stripper harvester in Australia—John Ridley in 1843;
- the first non-English language newspaper in Australia, 1848;
- the first public animal-powered railway in Australia in 1854;
- the first state to grant adult male suffrage, including to Aboriginal men, in 1856, sadly taken off them in 1901 in federation because the other states would not agree to continue that;
- the legalisation of trade unions in 1876;
- the creation of the Torrens land title system in 1858;
- the invention of the stump jump plough in 1876;
- the first major long-distance telephone call in Australia in 1878, and I think that call continues today because I see that people seem to be talking on the phone continuously;
- the first state secondary school for girls in 1879;
- women allowed to study at university in 1880;
- first capital city to be connected to a water-borne sewerage system in 1881;
- first agricultural college in Australia in 1885;
- first irrigation settlement in Australia in 1887;
- first juvenile court in Australia in 1890;
- adult women given the right to vote and the right to stand as members of parliament in 1894;
- first to establish a conservatorium of music in 1897;

- first crematorium open in 1903, an issue we are debating, I believe, next week;
- first driver's licence issued in 1906;
- first policewoman appointed in 1915;
- first practicable pedal wireless set in 1928;
- first publication by an Aboriginal author in 1929;
- the establishment of the first public housing authority in 1936;
- the invention of the Hills hoist rotary clothesline in 1945;
- development of the wine cask with flexible bag and later tap, 1965;
- first woman judge in Australia, 1965;
- prohibition of discrimination on the grounds of race, colour or current country of origin, 1966;
- establishment of Aboriginal Lands Trust, 1966;
- decriminalising of homosexuality, 1975;
- passing of sex discrimination laws, 1976.

There are many others; I have just listed a few.

The Mayor of West Torrens, who, as you would know, Mr Speaker, was a speaker of this house, recently wrote to me saying that we should also acknowledge that the creation of the secret ballot (known as the Australian ballot) was pioneered here in the 1800s—another important milestone. Many members may not be aware that the photocopier was invented in South Australia at Woodville. Sadly, we did not get—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: At Woodville.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: At Woodville. The name 'photocopier' came from the process. It was developed by people who were defence scientists. We never got the real benefit. Many other things have been developed here. We have been leaders in a whole range of issues, and, as I say, I think it is worth putting those achievements on show, not only to South Australians but to visitors and tourists. Members would appreciate that tourists are usually very interested in these sorts of things and keen to visit museums which display the achievements of local people.

As I said earlier, I have visited many museums with, obviously, varying themes. I visited one only two weeks ago in Toronto, Canada called the Bata Shoe Museum. Now, that is a variation on a theme. It was created by the daughter of the Bata family—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: Yes. I visited that museum. There are four floors of shoes for anyone who has a shoe fetish. I do not; I like shoes but I do not have a fetish. I saw Madonna's shoes, but I did not get too excited about that. I did see some boots which were designed by an army and which showed the tread going the opposite way from the way in which the soldier was travelling—supposedly, to confuse people who saw the footprints on a beach. I was trying to work out how the person got there in the first place, but I haven't quite resolved that. The point is that this is a specialist museum which attracts many people, but what I am talking about would be more comprehensive: it would add to the great work done at the Immigration Museum and our Natural History Museum, which is fantastic.

Currently we do not showcase our political achievements, or our economic and social achievements. I think it would be great if we could make that happen in the very near future. I could give details of a whole lot of museums that I have visited. In Singapore, for example, there is a philatelic museum for those who are into stamps. Whilst in Singapore, I visited the Changi Museum—which, I guess, is inspirational

but which is also extremely sad—and the Asian Civilisation Museum. Clearly each museum has something to offer.

I also visited a history museum at Fort Siloso in Singapore, for those interested in military issues. It was of relevance to me. I have always understood that they could not defend Singapore properly because the guns pointed out to sea. The museum tells me and everyone that that is wrong, that they could rotate those guns and that they did point towards the invading Japanese and sunk a Japanese ship coming down the edge of the Malay Peninsula. I did not know that; so that was one thing I learnt from that museum.

I visited the British Museum. I know this is a sensitive issue for people from a Greek background, but I cannot see the British ever giving up the marbles they nicked from Greece. However, that is a wonderful museum. I saw the library where Karl Marx undertook his studies. I am not suggesting that we should try to create another Karl Marx. At that stage the British Museum provided one of the main sources of reading material which was used not only by Karl Marx but by a whole lot of other famous, or infamous, people. Canada has a textile museum in Toronto. Other states of Australia have museums: the Hyde Park Barracks Museum in Sydney, the Powerhouse Museum, which is focusing at the moment particularly on electronic innovation—I am sure every member here has been to the Powerhouse Museum, but if not they should visit it—and the National Museum of Australia, which has been controversial in respect of the portrayal of the European clashes with traditional Aboriginal culture.

Irrespective of what other people do and the particular focus of specialist museums, I come back to the point—and I do not need to labour it any more—that we have in South Australia a fantastic rich history which is hidden away. I know the History Trust of South Australia is very supportive of what I am trying to do and I have spent time talking to Margaret Anderson, the chief executive. At the end of the day it comes down to whether our Treasurer is willing to part with a few dollars to get this underway. I believe and I am keen to encourage the News Corporation to consider being a generous supporter of this initiative, because Rupert Murdoch, in effect, started his particular extension of News Limited from Adelaide. I would be hopeful that maybe the Murdoch family or News Limited would be willing to support this concept, because it was from the original Adelaide News that Rupert Murdoch has gone on to become one of the most successful media owners and operators in the world. So, on that note, Mr Speaker, I conclude. I ask members to look at this and I trust that we can advance this concept to a point where it becomes a reality.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

LIGHT RAIL

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

That this house calls on the state government to replace the existing suburban heavy rail diesel service with an expanded electrified light rail service as part of a much larger suburban network embracing areas not currently serviced by a rail network.

The reason for this—and I have been an advocate for a long time of updating and upgrading our public transport system in South Australia—is that at the moment we have a disjointed public transport system. We have an O-Bahn, and I am told it is the only one outside of Germany. It is a very expensive system. You can achieve the same effect by just

creating a dedicated asphalt busway. They have done it in Brisbane for a fraction of the cost. But, anyway, it works well as it is, as a stand-alone, but it is not really part of a total integrated service. The buses link up with the city and suburbs but we do not have an integrated public transport system.

Sadly, we are now going to have a bus depot in the city, courtesy of the city council, which is not going to be integrated with our rail system, or anything else for that matter. I think it is unfortunate. I have been trying to encourage the city council and others to look at being a bit more innovative and link it in with the interstate rail system and the suburban rail system, but it is a different council area when you come to Keswick. It is not the City of Adelaide; they do not want to spend money there. So we continue on with this disjointed approach to public transport and public transport services.

We are the only mainland capital in Australia without an electric rail system. We are still running diesel trains, which are highly carcinogenic, despite what has been said in the past. For those people worrying about car fumes, I advise that diesel fumes are more of a carcinogenic threat than are car fumes. Anyway, that is somewhat of a side issue, although those diesel trains run all the time while they are sitting at the Adelaide Railway Station waiting for passengers. I have suggested that, even if we have diesels, maybe we could have the quick-start diesel, so that we do not have to keep running them all the time down at the station, pouring out diesel fumes and small particles for the residents to breathe.

We are the only mainland capital without an electric system. I am told that the reason for this is that the federal government years ago (I think it was during the Labor government era) offered us an electric rail system, but it was turned down on the grounds that we wanted to have a bus system. I think we will still have a need for some bus services, but I believe that was a very retrograde decision.

I support the extension of the tramline down King William Street. I cannot believe there are so many negative nellys in our community. I do not think the government has really sold the extension, because it has not said that the extension is part of a bigger network. If we were just running the tramline down to replace the Bee Line bus, then, sure, there would be criticism—and perhaps deservedly so. We have to present the case as an expansion and the beginning of a much bigger network—and running the tramline down King William Street to North Terrace is a good start and an essential part of the core. However, if we just say, 'That's it,' we will get whacked around the ears. I do not think the government has really sold what it is trying to do. It certainly has not made it clear; I have not heard any explicit statement saying, 'Look, this is the start of a new era for light rail in Adelaide.'

What I am particularly focused on here today is that we need in time to get rid of those diesel trains. They are not going to last for ever, although they will be around for a little while. The cost will be significant; we would be looking at a minimum of \$1 billion to replace the diesel network. But the point is that we do not have to do it in one year. It could be done in stages, and we could convert, say, one line at a time; they do not have to be all done at once. We could switch to electrified light rail and get rid of the diesel trains, which are very costly to build, operate and maintain. Not only that, it needs to be extended and expanded beyond the heavy rail network. We already have the track. As I understand it, the government still owns land out at Penfield and other areas. It should be expanded to areas such as Seaford, using the light rail technology. The light rail can be run up hilly

areas; it could be run out to my electorate. I do not need the votes, but it would be a good scheme.

The federal government could be asked to support this project, As I said earlier, it helped Brisbane and Perth get an electric rail system. I do not think that it would be unreasonable to ask the federal government to kick in, and the infrastructure boost to our economy, especially engineering and associated areas, would be fantastic. We have a lot of engineering firms with a lot of expertise in this state, not totally twiddling their thumbs, but not fully occupied at the moment, because they are waiting for some infrastructure projects. I notice that the Victorian government has recently announced the biggest infrastructure project commitment in the history of that state.

I know we have to be cautious in budget matters, but, sadly, I think the government in this state is still frightened because of the fallout from the State Bank days. I think the government has to get over that and say, 'Well, yes, we've got to be a bit more adventurous—not reckless, but adventurous—and do some things, particularly in the area of infrastructure,' because that infrastructure needs upgrading and improving, and the light rail network would be one way to go. In fact, we could run a light rail network out to areas such as Burnside, which would ensure that the member for Bragg was re-elected. It would obviate some of the problems we are going to have in the very near future in terms of our road system.

We have chosen not to have a freeway system. I believe that is a far-sighted and commendable approach. If we are not going to have a freeway system, then we have to have a good public transport system which will carry a lot of people quickly. I think we need to look beyond the square, as it were. I mentioned yesterday that I am not sure why it is that in Adelaide and South Australia people seem to be reluctant to embrace innovation and new ideas. Even the technology we have on the public train system at present is primitive. Even with the Crouzet system (which is French), the little ticket has to be put in a machine so that you can go through the turnstile. That is old-fashioned technology. For example, in the MRT in Singapore, you do not put a ticket into a hole in a machine: you use tap technology. You just tap your ticket and the machine will tell you how many trips you can take and how much money you have left on it, all in an instant. We need to upgrade not only the major infrastructure but also the supportive infrastructure.

Our local train service is one step up from Thomas the Tank Engine, yet, sadly, we seem to have trouble running it. I came in by train this morning. There were two carriages and the train was full a couple of stops after it started on its journey. I travelled, incidentally, on Thomas the Tank Engine on the Isle of Man, where the story originated; there is now a big dispute about who gets the proceeds from the books, and so on. Adelaide has expanded and it covers an enormous area, bigger than Greater London, I am told. It is very expensive to service a city of that size, but it can be done using light rail technology. We will get increasing congestion on roads. Unley Road and Goodwood Road are becoming increasingly congested. Now is the time, when we can get the land (if we need to get additional land), to do it—not wait for a crisis. Light rail can be elevated over the Parklands. We can be innovative. We do not have to always think of how we have done things in the past.

The Port Adelaide Enfield council wants the tramline extended to Port Adelaide and North Haven so that the Treasurer could catch the tram into Parliament House. That

would be great; I support that. Let us think a bit bigger than going to Port Adelaide or North Haven. Let us think about the comprehensive network. Where are the innovative, creative people in transport in the Public Service who should be looking not at next week's train fares but, rather, the transport system we need in five, 10 or 50 years? We have lost our sparkle and innovative edge in South Australia. We should be leading not only Australia but also the world.

In summary, we need a comprehensive light rail system, not just up King William Street but, rather, throughout the metropolitan area. It must be systematically planned. It cannot be done overnight. It will cost a lot of money. It can be done in stages, one line at a time. It would stimulate the engineering sector and provide a welcomed boost to the economy, and we would then join the rest of the capital cities in mainland Australia in having a modern public transport system that was electrified. I think over time the public would see it as a far-sighted, welcome addition to the public transport system which, at present, is disjointed. We have a mixture of one tram, buses that do not meet, and an O-Bahn which is an ugly duckling and which does not fit in easily with the rest of the system.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Which party was responsible for the O-Bahn?

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: We know who was responsible for it. It was thought to be world leading. They have problems with it in Germany because of the snow and ice. It is a good concept, but in Brisbane, as I said earlier, they do the same thing by having an exclusively dedicated asphalt busway, which does exactly the same job for a fraction of the cost. As I said, the O-Bahn works as a stand alone in so far as it can offer a good service, but it is part of the overall problem. The city council is now going to compound it by having a stand-alone bus terminal which will not be integrated with suburban and interstate rail. Adelaide continues with its 19th century approach to public transport. I commend this measure to the house.

Ms BREUER secured the adjournment of the debate.

ELECTORAL LAWS AND PRACTICES

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

That this house calls on the state government to establish an independent review, headed by a former judge, to consider and make recommendations for improving South Australia's electoral laws and practices.

The reason for this motion is that the time is right to get an independent person to conduct a review into our electoral laws and practices. I am not saying they are bad: I am saying they could be better. Let us be honest, political parties will look for self-interest (so will everyone else) to try to get a system that will favour them. That is human nature. We need to lift ourselves above self-interest, sectional interest and partisan preference to make sure that we have a system which is as democratic as it can possibly be, which allows people to have a say and which does not distort or discriminate.

A judge heading a review panel could look at a whole lot of issues. There is the question of multimember electorates. I do not claim to have the answer on these; I have some views. Is it a good thing? Would it be a good thing? Do we need how-to-vote cards on polling day? They do not have them in Tasmania; they do not have them in the ACT. Do we need them? Is optional preferential voting a desirable voting system? When it comes to the Legislative Council, should we

have above-the-line voting? The parties probably say yes because it favours them, and about 94 per cent of people vote that way. That does not mean that it is the best system; it just means that the parties have designed a system which tends to suit them.

In relation to Legislative Council voting, why should people have to vote for, say, 54 candidates when there are only 11 vacancies? Why should we not be able to vote up to the number of vacancies? Why should you have to vote for someone you cannot stand? That does not apply to anyone in here; I would be happy to vote for anyone in here. But why should the public have to vote for someone they do not like, or hate—not that I should use that word. It does not seem logical. You have to express a preference for 54 candidates when there are only 11 places. That is something else that could be looked at.

Another issue that I have written to the Attorney about—and I think he said some time ago that he would look at it—is dementia voting. I am not talking about people who do not have dementia; I am talking about people who do. Under our current system, if you have dementia you can vote, and many people do. I hinted at this some time ago. In tight seats—and it was not that tight this time, but it could have been tighter and it might be tighter next time—such as Unley or Norwood, the outcome of the election could be determined on the basis of dementia. So you could have a government decided by dementia. If members do not believe me, look at the act: it allows people suffering from dementia to have a vote, because there is no systematic way of deciding that they are not able to cast a meaningful vote. A medical practitioner should be able to exercise a view on that matter.

I mentioned yesterday my dear old mother-in-law, who is nearly 91 years old. She would not have known who were the candidates in the seat of Unley. We could have cast a vote on her behalf. I will not say who we would have voted for, but we could have voted in her name. When I have raised this with people's relatives, they say, 'Oh, no, we're not going to give up the right of our parents to vote,' because that means they will have to give up their second vote—why give that up? At the moment there is a very big problem, and it could potentially be a serious problem in relation to dementia voting. People are living longer. Dementia is a terrible affliction—I have great sympathy for anyone who has it and for their family who have to care for them—but if people do not know what day it is, how can they realistically cast a vote?

Likewise, we allow prisoners to vote, and I think they should be allowed. The punishment, as I understand it, is deprivation of liberty—we do not put them in prison and cut off their hands as well—but the federal government is looking to take away their right to vote. That would be an issue that a learned former judge could look at. Personally, I do not favour it, but if you did look at the electoral system that would be one thing to look at.

In terms of voting preferences, there are arguments for and against the current system or for moving to an optional preferential system. One can argue that some voters have their preferences counted more times than others. A second preference vote appears to have the same value as a first preference vote when the distribution of preferences takes place. It is very complicated and encourages backroom deals hidden from the public, and the system also leads to dummy candidates running, whose main or sole purpose is to garner preferences for the major party. We all know that has happened. It would not have happened in South Australia, but

I am sure it has happened elsewhere—dummy candidates whose sole or main purpose is not to get elected but to get preferences for the major parties.

I love the term—used by, I think, Dean Jaensch—of 'smoke-filled rooms'. I would imagine that in this day and age there would not be too many smokers amongst backroom dealers, although the stress of the backroom deal probably causes them to smoke. It is probably smoke coming out of their ears when they try to decide what they will do with people like Bob Such, who are a pain in the backside. I have talked about dementia voting and I will not go through that again. Overall, there is a compelling case for an independent person (such as a retired judge) to look at our electoral system and decide whether it is the best. For example, should we go for a Hare-Clark system or should we restrict posters on polling day? I know the Attorney is still using on his posters a picture taken at his school graduation.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No, that's not true. I got new ones last time, and it cost me a fortune.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I humbly apologise. I thought they were school graduation photos, but these were university graduation photos. I realise members are trying to get the youth vote, and that is important when it comes to considering the measure I introduced yesterday. Do we need posters on every Stobie pole? I know why Mr Stobie invented the pole; I do not believe that it was to put posters on. We know that they are ugly but, in my electorate, some parties had them on every pole down some streets.

Mr Hanna: If you ban Stobie poles, they will just go underground.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: The posters will, too, but that is another issue. Do we really need to spend all that money on posters? It might be important for the challenger; it may not be so important for the incumbent. That is what an independent reviewer would look at. Let's face it, there is a big advantage in being an incumbent. If you do not acknowledge that, you are not being honest. So, you need an independent person who will look at the issues, devoid of party politics, devoid of the interests of Independents or anyone else, and say, 'This is the system that is the most fair and democratic and able to serve the people of South Australia,' and make recommendations accordingly. I commend the motion to the house.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured adjournment of the debate.

HEALTH, MEN'S

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

That this house calls on the state and federal governments to give greater attention to research, screening and promotion of men's health issues, especially in relation to prostate cancer, in parallel with an increased focus on women's health issues, especially cervical and breast cancers.

Members would be well aware that almost exactly a year ago I was diagnosed with prostate cancer, which helped focus my mind not only on that issue but also on the longstanding issues of men's health and women's health. The reason I am probably here is that, for the last 15 years, I have been quite committed to regular check-ups by a GP, and that probably helped save my life. Therefore, I am passionate about trying to ensure that we do not see the unnecessary death of men or women through lack of awareness, lack of action, or lack of research.

I was the beneficiary of a machine at the Royal Adelaide that was donated by Gordon Pickard, by members of the Cooper family, by Rob Gerard and others. It was a very generous donation of \$3 million. Incidentally, that machine is still being used to do radical prostatectomies. It is also being used for heart surgery and gynaecological work, so it was a wonderful and generous donation. We are the only state in Australia where that da Vinci robot (nothing to do with Dan Brown) is available to anyone off the street, and it does not matter how much income you have. I think the fact that it was donated to a public hospital highlights even more the wisdom of those generous families, especially Gordon Pickard.

Prostate cancer is a killer and, sadly, men are often their own worst enemy in terms of having a check-up. We know that women tend to go to doctors and pharmacies more often because of their physiological make-up. They tend to be more aware (and this is a safe generalisation) of health issues than men. I will give some figures from 2002. There will be some more recent ones, but these are ones we got at the beginning of this year.

For 2002, 946 cases of prostate cancer were reported in South Australia, compared with 1 040 for breast cancer (almost the same); and 1 210 for cancer of the large bowel. Deaths from cancer were 222 in 2002 and 290 for breast cancer. My source for those figures is the South Australian Health Commission as at 16 January this year. Some people would say that you have to die of something, but you do not have to die earlier than is necessary. It really saddens me that a lot of men—and a lot of women—are dying when they do not need to.

Let us focus on men for a minute. Prostate cancer is the second most common cause of cancer deaths in men. I was talking to the Minister for Health the other day, and he said, 'Well, we spend a lot on men's health', and we do in terms of heart and lung problems, and so on. I think that the lung aspect will change, sadly, with women catching up in the very near future. We do spend a lot on men in terms of trying to deal with their problems later. What we need to be doing is to get them focused on prevention.

With respect to prostate cancer, people will tell you, 'Look, you can have a PSA.' We are not talking about the Public Service Association here: we are talking about the prostate specific antigen, which is a snapshot blood test and which indicates activity in the prostate. However, people should not be fooled, because it does not tell you a lot. It is a snapshot in time, as a time series, and it gives an indication of activity. It does not prove that—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: No, it is a blood test. It does not prove that you have or do not have prostate cancer. People should not be fooled by that. People have said to me, 'Oh, I've had a blood test, and I don't have cancer.' No, it does not tell you anything about that: it gives an indication of some activity in the prostate, which may or may not be cancer. Men can have a digital examination, and some men do not like this—someone putting a finger up the anus. It is not that drastic, but there is a sad consequence. I will not name the person, because he is known to someone who works in this parliament. A character in his 50s said, 'No poofter doctor is going to put his finger up my bum.'

Pardon the expression, but they were his words. He is dying now of prostate cancer. That silly attitude kills people. The other technique is an ultrasound, and that can show up sizeable tumours, and things like that. I had all those tests: the

PSA, the digital test and the ultrasound, and the specialist said, 'It looks fantastic.' He then did a biopsy; which, nowadays, is painless. You lie on your side and it takes about five minutes. They fire what sounds like a cap gun—Roy Rogers! You hear eight bangs. When he said, 'It will be a cap gun sound,' I thought that he was being silly, but that is what it is. It sounds like a cap gun.

This machine takes a sample of flesh from the prostate through your anal wall. About eight samples are taken now. Years ago about three samples were taken and often the cancer was missed. If they are suspicious, 14 samples or more will be taken. You lie on your side for about five minutes and bang, bang, bang. It is not painful; you do not feel a thing. The next day you are a little sore. Two days later he rang me and said, 'You've got cancer.' This was after the digital examination, the PSA test and the ultrasound all were looking good.

The PSA had been creeping up over time but, in itself, it does not tell you much. Then what do you do? I opted for the radical surgery to have it removed by the robot. It used to be a six or seven week recovery, but nowadays you can go in on a Thursday and walk out on a Sunday, which is amazing. In my case, however, there was a complication. I ended up having another operation. I must be a difficult person, but I was one of the 2 per cent of people who suffer a little complication. You can have the procedure the old-fashioned radical way where they make a big slit, and it takes about seven weeks minimum to recover. The robot is fantastic in terms of an option if you get the cancer early, and that is the key. Likewise for women, and this is where GPs come into it. It is part of this awareness aspect, because half the problem in the past has been that GPs have not taken men's health issues seriously enough.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: They have not; GPs have not. I know of many cases. A guy just near me committed suicide. He was a very intelligent, capable, professional guy who had been going to a doctor for years to have his blood pressure checked and at no time did the doctor ever say, 'I should check your prostate.' He found out when it was too late and ended driving into a truck at Murray Bridge and killing himself.

GPs need to be more aware, and they need to be more aware about women's health. I have a friend who has breast cancer and it has now gone into her bones. She went to a female doctor—and I am not saying it is because of the doctor's sex—and the doctor said, 'It is a muscle problem.' When the cancer was finally picked up, the specialist said, 'That doctor needs a good kick where it hurts.' If GPs do not take these issues seriously and if men do not go and get checked, they are heading for trouble.

I give the former minister (Hon. Lea Stevens) credit for being supportive of this, because she was not one of those silly people who used to say to me when I wanted men's health on the agenda in 1992, 'People will laugh.' Others said, 'If you support men's health, you must be against women's health.' That is absolutely illogical and nonsense. To her credit, the Hon. Lea Stevens was supportive of men's health awareness, but we still have a long way to go. Men themselves have to be responsible and not have this silly macho attitude of, 'Well, you are going to die of something.' That is a stupid attitude. Macho man is a dead man. Macho man does not live for as long as he could.

GPs need to be very proactive in terms of ensuring that, if there is some doubt about the diagnosis, for men or women,

they refer it on and get it checked out. My nephew, who was 26 years of age, died of bowel cancer. He was a palliative care nurse. He went to the medicos and they said, 'You are too young to have anything seriously wrong.' He was dead at the age of 26 years from bowel cancer. It comes back to the point that GPs have to be on the ball and, if they do not know or have a doubt, they have to refer to someone who may know. The lack of taking these issues seriously is a huge issue in the medical profession.

There is a group called the Prostate Cancer Foundation of Australia which supports 68 prostate support groups throughout Australia. I visited them recently. They are in Lane Cove. They do not get one cent of government funding—not one cent. Most of the people working in that foundation are widows of people who have had prostate cancer or have lost a father or someone to prostate cancer. So, governments need to do more in terms of awareness of prostate cancer, cervical cancer and breast cancer and to ensure that we have the research and treatment. But prevention is obviously a lot better than an attempted cure, because some of these things cannot be cured if they get to an advanced stage.

People have said, 'Old men die with prostate cancer; they do not die of it.' A lot do die with it, but I know of cases of men in their 30s who have prostate cancer. It is not common, but it still exists. So do not be fooled by the silly old idea that a lot of old men die with it. It kills young men, too. You will see it reported from time to time in the newspaper. Recently, someone from a pop band died of prostate cancer: I think he was 59 or 60 years of age. It is deadly once you get it: it spreads.

First, I would urge all the men in here to make sure they have regular check-ups. A check-up every two years is too long a gap. I would urge all women to have regular checks for breast and cervical cancer. I cannot believe, when I talk to some professional women, that they say, 'We'll wait till we get it.' Well, you are too late then, baby: too late. I ask members to support this motion. I do this out of a passion. I do not want to see anyone die unnecessarily, men or women, and women should make sure that the men in their life, whether it be their father, brother, husband, partner or whatever, have a check-up.

Do not be fooled by people saying, 'My PSA is okay: I don't have prostate cancer.' The only way you know is through a biopsy. I am not saying that everyone needs a biopsy, but that is the only foolproof test. I ask members to support generous, adequate funding for prevention, treatment and research of men's health issues, particularly prostate cancer, but also for women and, in so doing, increase the quality and length of life for men and women in our community. I commend the motion to the house.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

ADSL BROADBAND CONNECTION

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

That this house calls on federal, state and local governments to do all in their power to facilitate telecommunications infrastructure to residents in the Adelaide metropolitan area who are unable to connect to ADSL broadband.

I do not know about other members, but many people in my electorate cannot access broadband yet live only 15 kilometres from the GPO. The answer given to them is that they are too far away from the Reynella and Coromandel Valley telephone exchanges or that they do not have the correct

wiring, the technical term for which is 'pair gain'. According to Telstra, 15 or 20 years ago it used this technique in good faith, but it has now proven to be an impediment to providing a high speed internet connection to households. We have a situation where one person can get broadband but their neighbour cannot. The Reynella and Coromandel Valley exchanges are both equipped to provide ADSL, but you cannot provide ADSL generally further than 4.2 kilometres from the exchange.

For those wondering what ADSL stands for, it is a very good term to use at a dinner party and stands for a synchronous digital subscriber line. What it means is a high speed internet connection. What has happened in my area—and I will be interested to hear from other members, as it has been an enormous issue down our way—is that people cannot access it because they are just outside that 4.2-kilometre cable range. Because I have been giving Telstra a bit of curry—no rice, just curry—and lobbying the state and federal government, two of the senior people from Telstra came to see me last week and said, 'We will provide broadband to your electorate.' I thought that was great. It is going to offer a wireless service in Fisher at very reasonable rates if people sign up for a year, and I am very pleased about it.

Cynics say that Telstra says things but does not always deliver, but we will see. It has told me that its aim is by the end of this year to have virtually everyone in my electorate—Aberfoyle Park, Happy Valley, Reynella East, Chandler Hill and the southern part of Flagstaff Hill—accessing broadband. Traditionally, if you use satellite, broadband is very expensive to connect up, probably somewhere between \$700 and \$1 500, but Telstra is now saying that this wireless system is based on the CDMA network, which country members would probably be familiar with, rather than the digital system.

As I said, I have lobbied the federal minister and I have also written to the state minister, the Hon. Karlene Maywald, because the state government is, and has been, supporting a program still called, I think, Connect Australia. The federal government put in a lot of money, in response to Senator Barnaby Joyce I think—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: National Senator Barnaby Joyce, I am told. As part of Connect Australia I believe the federal government is putting in \$1 billion, \$50 million of which is for metropolitan area projects, and the state government is putting in \$500 000. I understand (and the minister may correct me) that Salisbury council was one of the first to be active in that area, and I have been in discussion with City Manager Jeff Tate and Mayor Ray Gilbert, both of Onkaparinga council, who are also very supportive. However, as I said, last Friday senior Telstra people came to see me and told me that they will act promptly to address that shortfall.

I have been quite surprised at the number of people who now work from home (small business and consultancies and so on) who want that high speed internet access and its greater capacity. There are also a number of retired people in my electorate who have held senior positions, and I have been amazed at the interest some of them take in issues such as the River Murray. They download maps from Google and access all sorts of things. They are thinking people and they want access to the latest technology. We also have a lot of students who want that access as well as, obviously, existing businesses.

It has been a big issue and it remains so, and I look forward to the day when Telstra provides that service. If you cannot be part of the modern telecommunications network

then you are obviously at a great disadvantage, and one of the problems for the south in particular (and not just in my area, but south of O'Halloran Hill) is that there has been a deficiency in terms of accessing high speed telecommunications. The northern suburbs have had the opportunity through greater transport linkages as well as good communications, and it is important that the southern region also has the opportunity to be a total player in the economic development of this state. I commend this motion to the house.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

NORTH TERRACE REDEVELOPMENT

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

That this house calls on the state government, in conjunction with the City of Adelaide, to ensure that any future redevelopment of North Terrace has a South Australian theme, including the planting of South Australian native trees, shrubs and grasses which (unlike exotic species) will not damage our riverine systems, and which will support native bird life and conserve water.

A lot of people will wonder why I am so focused (some might say obsessed) on this issue. I believe it is very important that on North Terrace, a showcase boulevard, we get it right. Not everything that was done in the upgrade—or, as I have called it in the past, the downgrade—of North Terrace has been bad, but one thing that has been wrong is the planting of inappropriate trees and shrubs.

I was fascinated to hear that the government was still relying on the advice of Dr Tim Flannery regarding greenhouse issues. I remind members that, on 23 July 2003, Tim Flannery criticised the proposal to plant exotics on North Terrace and supported the architect's original vision of white bark gums 'whose high broken canopy would provide shade without shutting out views of the architecture'. I trust that, if the government is going to listen to Tim Flannery on greenhouse gas and global warming issues, it might also listen to his advice about what to plant on North Terrace. The reason I am a little sceptical is because recently I wrote about this issue to a minister, who said, 'We will probably do the same thing on the rest of North Terrace.' God help us! In other words, 'We will do more of what we have just done near the museum', despite the advice of Tim Flannery, the head of the Botanic Gardens and the consultants and the architects, who all recommended that we not do what has been done in terms of planting.

On 29 July 2003, the Director of the Botanic Gardens made a point about planting native shade trees on North Terrace. He suggested a range of trees. He commented on such things as issues surrounding environment reconciliation should be governed from the city and the message that would be conveyed if exotics were to be planted on North Terrace. He noted that further reconciliation between Australians and their environment will be vital if we are to address critical issues such as biodiversity loss, salinity, water conservation and land degradation. Here are two of the top experts in the field (not only me) giving advice on what to plant, but that advice was not followed.

Plane trees, incidentally, are notorious creators of allergies. So, those who sniffle in spring might like to have a look at the plane trees. It is never mentioned here in Adelaide but, if one asks people in Sydney and the city council, they will tell you that plane trees are one of the worst trees for people who suffer from any sort of allergy. The reason given by the minister (Hon. J. Weatherill) on 10 October 2003 for continuing with the Europeanisation of North

Terrace (they are my words, not his) was that it was, essentially, a clear indication of public opinion.

I have a lot of respect for this minister in all areas of his portfolios, but he was duped; he was fooled. I have a complete copy of this survey, which is about 10 pages long. It was undertaken by McGregor Tan Research—you can call yourself whatever you like—and it is so biased. I have done a lot of survey work in my time, both creating and assessing. In this survey, community feedback question No. 5 states:

Trees are an important element of the redevelopment...which type of tree do you prefer...plane trees; spotted gums; other suggestions?

Most people would not know a spotted gum if they fell over one. They happen to have been in the Botanic Gardens for probably 100 years. Spotted gums (*eucalyptus maculata*) are some of the most beautiful gums. As far as I know, not many people have been killed by those trees in the Botanic Gardens—in fact, I have not heard any reports of anyone being killed. The average person would not know a spotted gum if they saw one. A lot of people would probably think they were talking about the lemon-scented gum (*citriodora*), which occasionally drops a limb, but *maculata* is not noted for that. The point is that this survey is so loaded. Before the question is asked it states:

The design proposes more plane trees on the south side and rows of spotted gums...interspersed between some magnificent existing exotic specimens.

If that is not a loaded introduction to the question, saying 'magnificent, existing exotics', then I would like to know what is. As I understand it, in this survey a lot of the people questioned were going into the library, and I think there was a phone survey as well. In answer to question 5, 76 per cent preferred something other than plane trees. If you look at the statistics here, 32 per cent wanted spotted gums, and 42 per cent suggested something else. Using my mathematics that adds up to 76 per cent. I do not know what else was suggested; they could have suggested other natives; they could have suggested other exotics. As I say, I have great respect for the minister, but I think a little bit of funny business went on with the city council and the bureaucrats. One councillor told me he was supporting exotics because his wife wanted them. I have great affection for my wife, but I do not seek to come in here to implement her views.

So, what we have on North Terrace is a fake, an imitation of Europe. It is not Australia. It might be Adelaide somewhere, but it is not Australia. It does not look anything like Australia. It does not look anything like South Australia. I am not suggesting the trees should have been *Eucalyptus maculata*, spotted gum. We have hundreds and hundreds of different species of eucalypts, and there are many other different species of natives—shrubs, grasses and all sorts of things. It reminds me of Sir Donald Bradman Drive. I thought he was an Australian, but coming down his driveway he is obviously a Londoner, because it is all London plane trees. If someone gets off the plane they must think they are in Chelsea or somewhere; that they are not in Adelaide, not in Australia—somewhere, but not Australia. There is the image aspect, but probably more important than that is the fact that the plane tree and those other exotics are cold climate trees. I am not against exotics in the right place; I have some in my backyard which are called fruit trees, and I have one or two other exotics. However, as cold climate trees their leaves have evolved to be part of a cold climate system, a riverine system which can handle them. Our riverine system, the River Torrens, is a warm climate river, and yet those leaves

go into streams like the Torrens and they kill it off, because they are alien to the warm weather riverine systems. The councils will tell you that they sweep up the leaves. They might sweep up some but the councils around Adelaide do not get them all up.

The other reason why we should not have planted those exotics and why we should not replicate them along the western part of North Terrace is that they require water in a way that the indigenous trees do not. The indigenous trees should preferably be South Australian, not Australian or indigenous to Queensland or New South Wales. They should be South Australian, to showcase them, but also because our trees are water conservers. The trees from Europe are not. The other thing that is very important is that plane trees do not provide any food or shelter, other than a temporary resting place where the birds can drop a sixpence on your car. They do not do anything for our native bird life at all.

My fruit trees do—they feed a few of them, the freeloaders who come around and pick my fruit—but plane trees do not do anything. Yet here we are facing the extinction of a lot of our native birds, particularly the smaller ones, and people say, ‘Oh, we’ve kept a few trees.’ Yes, we have kept a few, but we do not have any understorey. We do not have the little shrubs and trees, the prickly bushes where the little birds can live. What we have done on North Terrace is sent a message to locals and tourists that basically we are still suffering from an environmental cringe. I do not. I am very proud to be a nationalistic Australian and South Australian. I do not have any cultural or environmental cringe at all, even though my father came from England and my mother’s side came from Ireland. I am a proud South Australian and Australian who is passionate about this country.

I am concerned that here, on our showcase of North Terrace, we have replicated Europe. We cannot move away from the idea that we must have Europe on North Terrace. For goodness sake, when we do the next stage of the North Terrace upgrade, from the railway station to West Terrace, let us be a bit more innovative. Let us listen to people like Professor Tim Flannery, the director of the Botanic Gardens and the consultants. Even if you do not listen to me, listen to those people who say that it is important for the reasons of sending a message about biodiversity, for the reasons of water conservation and protecting birdlife. Let us make the showcase boulevard of Adelaide look like South Australia, not like some fake replication of Europe.

I have just been to England. England is beautiful. You see the hawthorn and the ivy everywhere, which you see in the Adelaide Hills. Parts of the Adelaide Hills look lovely in autumn but, if you look in the creeks and so on, it is an absolute environmental disgrace. We have raped this country; we have raped the landscape. We have butchered it in a way that is an absolute disgrace. Even our so-called national parks are infested with weeds. There is hardly an area of the state that we have not raped, butchered or destroyed. We should hang our heads in shame. One of the things that we could do to try to come to terms with our destructive behaviour in the past, by us and our predecessors, is to at least, in the heart of the city, have our main boulevards look like South Australia and not try to make every street look like some part of Europe. Europe is beautiful and so is England, but this is Australia, and our environment is at great risk because we are not getting the message across.

When you see that the city council and the state government do not understand water conservation or biodiversity, in terms of saving birds, or the pollution of our riverine

systems, who will understand it? How can you expect the average citizen to be committed to those things when the government, the Adelaide City Council, other councils and government agencies do not practise what they preach? It is fine to talk about greenhouse gas and so on, but we will not have much left in the way of native vegetation the way we are going. People will have to go to the museum to look at dried arrangements to see what South Australia was like a few years ago.

One of the few places—and this is an irony—where some of our rare plants can be found now is in the Adelaide cemetery, including plants like wild apricot. We have wiped them out. Black Forest was called Black Forest because we had a lot of grey box there. Few survive now. In fact, the City of Unley has just fenced off an area in Unley in order to protect a few of the remaining grey box there. Let us do better on North Terrace. The challenge for the state government and the council is to do better when they do the next stage of the North Terrace upgrade.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

PARLIAMENT OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

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

That this house acknowledges the contribution of former members of parliament and other contributors to the achievements of the South Australian parliament and, in particular, acknowledges the 150th anniversary of the parliament.

Members would be aware that this year and next year is the sesquicentenary of this parliament. It is a fancy word that, as we know, means 150th anniversary, and we need to celebrate it in a way which gives due recognition to those who have gone before us, the development of this parliament, and what this parliament and responsible government have given to this state.

I was saddened recently when I visited the New South Wales parliament (I was still the speaker then) and I met with the Speaker, Hon. John Aquilina, and he pointed out that they are not celebrating much at all over there, because a few years ago there was an outcry because, I am not sure whether it was the speaker or the president, got a bit carried away with a celebration relating to parliament, and they got a bit of a caning. So, they decided that their celebration—it would have just happened I think last week or the week before on 22 May—would be very low key because they did not want to upset anyone, and did not want to spend much. You do not have to spend a lot, but I cannot understand why people do not want to celebrate history and why they are not proud of what has been achieved over a lengthy period of time. I have spoken with our Speaker, and I am sure that he will be very supportive of this whole process. There are many key dates: 1855, introduction of responsible government into Australian colonies—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I think it is very unkind to say that the Hon. Graham Gunn was here then—not quite in 1855. On 2 January 1856, a bill was passed for an act to establish a constitution for South Australia and to grant a civil list to Her Majesty. On 19 May 1856, a constitution bill was laid upon the table of both houses of the imperial parliament and, in accordance with the provisions of the enabling imperial statute, remained at Westminster for 30 days. On 24 June 1856, at a meeting of Her Majesty’s council, held at the court at Buckingham Palace, in the presence of Her Majesty, His

Royal Highness Prince Albert, the Duke of Wellington, Viscount Palmerston and Sir George Grey, the act to establish a constitution for South Australia based on responsible government was assented to. On 24 October 1856, the steamer *White Lion* arrived in South Australia bearing the intelligence of Her Majesty's assent to the Constitution Act. The act was proclaimed by the Governor and took effect immediately. On 24 October 1856, His Excellency appointed the first ministry under responsible government, and it consisted of the chief secretary, the attorney-general, the treasurer, commissioner of public works, commissioner of crown lands and immigration. It looks like you must always have a treasurer—I am only joking, Kevin.

The new ministers had their enlarged powers, but the people could not confirm these appointments until an election had been held. The old Legislative Council continued until the issue of the first writs for the election under the Constitution Act. Prior to responsible government, the legislature of South Australia consisted of one house, the Legislative Council—maybe we might have that again. The council comprised four nominated official members, four nominated non-official members, and 16 elected members. On 25 October 1856, *The Constitution of South Australia* was proclaimed in the government *Gazette Extraordinary*. On page 1233, the *Hansard* of 25 October 1956 states that from 11 November to 11 December 1856:

[a] short session of the Legislative Council—
nothing has changed!—

was held and, although ministers were not yet legally responsible to the legislature or to the people, no minister who hoped to hold office in the new parliament was likely to do anything in the interval which might be opposed to the interests and wishes of the people.

In 1857, there was the grant of self-government; and on 2 February 1857, the old Legislative Council expired by law on the day on which writs for the general elections were first issued.

Now we get to the cruncher: on 22 April 1857, the Governor opened parliament as the site of the first parliament under responsible government in South Australia, consisting of both houses, the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council. On page 1233 the *Hansard* of 25 October 1956 states:

For the first time, the Governor opened parliament with an address. . . and in which was shadowed forth the policy of a Ministry depending for its power and its very existence upon a representative body, the House of Assembly. . . The government now held office subject to the people, as expressed through their representatives.

You can go on and celebrate other things such as granting the vote to women; the first woman elected to parliament in 1959, as I mentioned earlier today; the secret ballot; granting of the vote to adult males, including adult Aboriginal males in the 1860s; and the voting age reduced in 1972 from 21 to 18 years—that was pretty radical. The franchise of the upper house changed in 1973 when the franchise was widened. Then in 1985 voting for the Legislative Council was compulsory. The point is: which of these dates do you take as the one to celebrate? I would suspect the opening of parliament on 22 April 1857.

Mr Bignell interjecting:

The Hon. R.B. SUCH: I think the member for Mawson said, 'Celebrate all of them.' That is not a bad idea. We are, in effect, celebrating all of them because it is important. What we have in this parliament has evolved over hundreds of years. On my CPA trip a couple of weeks ago, I went to the Isle of Man. They have had 1 000 years of continuous

parliament. We have not been going quite that long, although we have evolved from probably about the 11th or 12th century. We take the system we have for granted; that is, we have guaranteed rights and protection for an opposition. As I tell students, in many countries the opposition is either in prison or in the cemetery. We have a system where we allow the alternative government not only to exist (and I am talking in general terms) but we have protection for them in the parliamentary system so that they can become the alternative government.

That seems a simple thing, but it took a long time and many lives to reach this point. Likewise, the position of Speaker. Nine speakers have lost their lives over time. I am hoping the current Speaker will not be sacrificed by the monarch. I think seven had their head taken off and the others were probably given a different dispatch. That was over a period when the parliament was exercising its authority. Now we know that the monarch, the Crown, is symbolic and does not govern on behalf of citizens. We represent the people and the monarch is a figurehead, although playing an important role.

Much work has gone into this. I tried to gather together what everyone else has done to celebrate their sesquicentenary. Someone suggested that we have a fireworks display. I said, 'I do not think that is appropriate. We do not want Guy Fawkes around.' Some of the things which we might like to consider include: obviously a special sitting day to commemorate the first sitting of the parliament on 22 April 1857—that was the opening day; people could visit the parliament on weekends; guided tours; and maybe a dinner in conjunction with Government House and some of the other organisations on North Terrace which are also celebrating their 150th, either this year or next year. I think that the Royal Society for the Arts is one. I think that we should be working in with them, as well.

The history of the parliament is underway at the moment. I think that is very important. In the past, some people have argued that all you need is a list of speakers and presidents—wrong. That is not a history of the parliament; that is just a list of names. The history of the parliament would have the colour, the flavour and the key activities. I would like to see an audio history made of all the members of parliament. What we should have done, and I do not believe was done—and I think it was very remiss that we did not do it—was interview people such as Des Corcoran and David Tonkin. We should interview not just premiers but current members so that we have a snapshot in time. The United States is doing a big audio history at the moment of the United States, and I think it is a great idea. Perhaps a photo essay about parliament, life in South Australia in 2006-07. Schoolchildren could be involved in that. We could have banners for Parliament House, King William Street, North Terrace and special paving stones out the front listing special events.

I like the idea of some tapestries in here. I personally do not think portraits should be in here because I do not think that the parliament itself belongs to Liberal or Labor and, in effect, you always have a problem with which hero you put up. I am quite happy for the suffrage tapestries to stay. I think they should stay but I think we can add to them with depictions of life in South Australia: agriculture and that sort of thing, like they do in some of the American parliaments. I think it would look magnificent if we hung tapestries in here. Commemorative artwork outside—I am hopeful that the Premier and the minister assisting in the arts would support

a sculpture or an image of a member of parliament, or something like that.

I think the garden in front of Parliament House needs a bit of excitement and a bit of attention in terms of indigenous plants. Special tours of parliament; activities for children; debating; art; photography; poetry; essays; special regional sittings of parliament; special sittings involving our indigenous people and people from a non-English speaking background; exhibitions celebrating the contribution of women to parliament; and the production of memorabilia (bottles of wine, postcards, pens and so on). The Victorian parliament has really gone in for this in a big way with the commissioning of a piece of porcelain with its emblem on it. It cost me a lot of money to buy all the memorabilia, which includes pens and all sorts of things. You do not have to do that but those are some of the options.

We are actually in a double year of celebration, and I think it would be very sad if we missed the opportunity to showcase our history, because we all know that a lot of people in South Australia do not really understand or appreciate parliament. They take it for granted. They do not realise that it was gained as a result of the loss of a lot of lives and a big struggle over time. It is a system that for too long too many of us have taken for granted.

We should acknowledge the contribution of clerks and support staff. I do not care what roles people play in parliament, they are all important. We cannot function without attendants, support staff, and so on. This is an opportunity for all of us to say that we are privileged and pleased to be in this place. We have a lot to celebrate in terms of achievements. We should be proud to celebrate many of the initiatives, including: giving the vote to women, women standing for parliament, Aboriginal men getting the vote in the 1860s, and the secret ballot—the list goes on. I am sure there is not only a lot of serious but humorous history that emanates from this place. I think we have become a lot more serious in recent years.

This year and next year is the time for us to celebrate. I ask members to join in the spirit of it, to offer ideas and, if they get a chance to be on the committee—which will be at the discretion of the Speaker and the President—I would urge members to consider being part of that.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

PRISONERS, NUMERACY AND LITERACY

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

That this house calls on the state government to implement policies and practices that require all prisoners to—

- (a) undertake appropriate and meaningful work; and
- (b) participate in productive training sessions, including basic literacy and numeracy programs.

Members should not take this the wrong way, but I have spent quite a bit of time in prison—visiting; they always let me leave. I do not believe that prisons achieve much at all. Some people who are a threat to the community have to be locked up, and I do not have any quibble about that. In fact, in relation to some of the penalties, when we say that someone gets life, they do not get life, because 11, 12 or 15 years is not a life sentence. But I think that, because of the way in which they are currently structured, prisons achieve very little. For many prisoners, prisons are basically a training ground for further crime. I do not think prisons rehabilitate; they just entrench antisocial behaviour in many ways. I do not

want people to think that I am arguing that we should not lock up certain people, because we should. In fact, I would lock up a lot more of those who pose a threat to the community. Our justice system, which I will address at a later date, is not delivering what the community really wants.

At the moment, some of our prisoners do meaningful work; at places such as Cadell the prisoners do some things. I wrote a letter to the former minister, the late Hon. Terry Roberts MLC, about work undertaken by prisoners. Sadly, Terry passed away, as we know, and that is a great loss, because he was not only a good minister but also a great bloke. As I have said, I wrote originally to Terry, but I received a letter on 5 April, signed by the Hon. Carmel Zollo on 5 April, which states:

It is recognised prisoners working is an important part of the rehabilitation process. Many prisoners are admitted to prison with little or no work ethic and few have skills that will see them re-employed when released back into the community.

I accept that; it is not an easy task. She goes on to say:

... the type of work available to prisoners must be carefully selected.

She goes on to say:

... prisoners cannot be given work that competes with the private sector or that reduces the employment opportunities for members of the community. This policy does restrict the amount of work available and correctional authorities are continually searching for suitable work opportunities for prisoners. Work that is suitable for prisoners to undertake generally includes work that would otherwise be done interstate or overseas or work that, for one reason or another, may not be attractive to the private sector.

She then goes on to say:

Typical work undertaken by prisoners within the prison grounds may include woodwork and carpentry, metal fabrication and assembling light fittings and equipment for the building trade. Prisoners also work in the department's dairy, orchards and bakery at Cadell, Mobilong and Port Lincoln Prisons, and undertake kitchen, laundry and cleaning duties in most prisons.

In addition to work undertaken in prisons, selected low-security prisoners are also involved in maintaining and developing the state's national parks and walking trails. Approximately 80 percent of eligible prisoners are involved in some form of work.

About 8 percent of eligible prisoners participate in full-time education and a further 25 per cent are involved in some form of part-time education and self development programs. Education may range from basic literacy and numeracy to degree level studies with most of the courses undertaken vocational based.

Yours sincerely
Hon. Carmel Zollo
5 April 2006

I acknowledge that, but I would urge the government to be even more vigorous in seeking to engage prisoners in meaningful work. I know trade unions also have a concern about work done in prisons. Realistically, if we want people re-entering the community as contributing citizens, not only do they need to have skills but they also have to be part of, understand and be committed to the work ethic. Part of the reason some prisoners are in prison is that they lack education and skills and they probably have not been part of the work ethic.

What sort of work can prisoners do? I have written to the minister suggesting that one activity would be for them to make numberplates. Some members might cynically say, 'Well, some of them are very good at making numberplates,' but in the United States of America it is a standard practice in many prisons for the prisoners to make numberplates. We do not make our own numberplates here in South Australia; I do not know whether members realise that. We used to

make them in Wright Street, but now they are imported. We import our numberplates. Prisoners could make those numberplates. They would not take away jobs from the private sector, because we import our numberplates from other states. That is one example of being more innovative; and it would create some work.

We have to go beyond traditional woodwork and metal fabrication because, unless that is relevant to today's industry, it will not be terribly helpful in terms of getting employment. Years ago people in prison used to crack rocks. I do not think that does a lot; it is not even an efficient way of cracking rock. I think we could be doing a lot more in terms of upskilling the prisoner population. That involves the training and education aspect in a more vigorous way. In fact, I would say that, if prisoners do not participate in work and education and training, I would be fairly tough in terms of saying, 'You will get basic rations: you will not get T-bone steaks if you are not prepared to put in.' I am not saying that we should starve prisoners or deny them adequate nutrition. I think our system in some ways has become a bit too sloppy in terms of incentives and the carrot and the stick.

Members would recall the minister said that 8 per cent of eligible prisoners participate in full-time education and a further 25 per cent in part-time education. That should be a requirement. People say, 'You can't make someone learn.' Well, we can create incentives and encourage people to improve their literacy and numeracy. If they come out of prison and they cannot read and write and do basic maths, then, before we know it, they will be back in the system.

I believe the government is looking at building another prison—and I would hope that it would not build a conventional type of prison. We can build less expensive detention areas, where people can do more meaningful activity rather than being locked up in a cage. The minister made the point about low security prisoners doing outside work in national parks. That has been an excellent scheme; I have seen some of the work. They have rehabilitated Minno Creek at Coromandel Valley, and they did a fantastic job removing hawthorn and ash and then replanting the area with other vegetation. The community needs to be assured that the people are genuinely low risk, but that is a worthwhile activity. It gets them out of their cage and into the community with fresh air and a bit of physical activity.

One of the problems in prison, especially for males, but also for women, is that they need physical activity. It is not good for their health and it is not good for the wellbeing of others to have people sitting around doing very little. In my experience of visiting prisons, very little real work is done. There is a lot of pretend work but there are so many restrictions, some of which are necessary because of things such as knives and chisels. It may be that we need to think in terms of activities that involve electronics and things such as that, rather than necessarily focusing on woodwork and metalwork, important as they may be in some areas. The information given to us from the department is that the average number of hours of work in our prisons is 25 to 30 hours per week. I do not think it is adequate or a desirable amount of time to be working. That is the average, so it means that some are working far less than that. Some of the prisoners do courses such as anger management, victim awareness and so on. But, as I understand it, our recidivism rate is still very high, and many of those who have been in return, because prison has not been a life-changing experience. For some of them it has made things worse.

My comments are rather general. Because people are locked away we tend to forget what goes on behind the walls. I do not think it is unreasonable for a community, government or parliament to say that we expect prisoners to work reasonable hours a week—no more than anyone else—be required to study and gain a reasonable standard of literacy and numeracy. If they do not want to cooperate or be part of that, I would then reduce their privileges and ensure that there was some incentive to help them change their attitude. I am not talking about hitting them or anything like that: I am talking about a range of incentives. In fact, I think it is a retrograde move not to allow for some reduction in sentence over time if a prisoner is prepared to in effect change their ways to work cooperatively, to improve their literacy, and so on. I think there should be some reward built into the system where you would get some time taken off the sentence. I commend the motion to the house.

I do not know how many members have actually visited prison. You hear people say that prisons are holiday camps: they are not holiday camps. They are not very nice places to be. I think that the way we operate them has not really changed much in decades, and it is time that we had a fundamental look to see whether we can do things better. That means providing more work, education and training opportunities, and insisting upon them so that people do not just kill time without any change in their level of skill, work attitude or work capability. I think there is scope for change and improvement. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr PICCOLO secured the adjournment of the debate.

STUDENT PROFESSIONAL TRAINING

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

That this house calls on the state and federal governments to ensure that more suitably qualified local students have the opportunity to train in various professions, including medicine, nursing, dentistry and pharmacy, as part of a wider commitment to enable all South Australians to be educated and trained to their full potential.

This is a very topical matter, which has been of concern for some time. Members will recall that (I think it was yesterday) the Minister for Health indicated that he and the Premier were lobbying the federal government to get an increased allocation of medical places at our universities. I think he mentioned the figure of 60. I wish him luck, because the Victorians claim that they totally missed out last time, and they got 140. Out of 400, if we got 60, that is 200 gone. So, if 200 are shared between New South Wales and the other states, I wish them luck, and I hope they succeed, but I think they are being optimistic. That is not their fault. The problem is that the allocation is not adequate.

We have brought in a lot of people from overseas to work as doctors. We bring in people to work as dentists. I do not have any problem with people. I do not care what colour skin they have, how tall or short they are, or their sex, as long as they are properly qualified. We have seen that some of them are not. I still hear harrowing tales from constituents who have had very unfortunate experiences with doctors who have come in from overseas. I had a constituent who died a couple of years ago from meningococcal disease. The local GP diagnosed suspected meningococcal infection. The lass, in her early 20s, went to the Flinders Medical Centre. The doctor, who had just arrived from overseas about three months earlier, said, 'You're not as sick as you think you are,' and also made a comment, 'Who's doing the treat-

ment—you or me?’ Sadly that girl died because she was sent home, and by the time the complete symptoms had emerged it was too late. It was a very sad case. That could happen with any doctor.

I had another constituent who had just had an amputation. He was asked by a foreign trained doctor, who had not been here long, ‘How are you feeling?’ He said, ‘Fantastic. I have had my leg off and it has saved my life.’ She thought he was mad. When he applied for a disability permit, as he is a one-legged person, she put him down as a psychopath and made a lot of other comments, if his report is accurate (and I have no reason to doubt him), that were quite disturbing.

I do not have a problem if the people are fully qualified. We know the case of Dr Patel, but it raises the issue of why we are not training our own first and foremost. Under the current arrangements, you are not allowed to give preference at your university for local students in medicine, dentistry or whatever as it is against the commonwealth funding provision. Many potential young medical students are going interstate. We have a system at Adelaide University called UMAT, where people are interviewed to see whether they have the skills to be a medico. It probably needs some refinement and they are looking at that issue. Talking to specialists in their 50s, they say that if they had been subjected to that test when they were young they would have failed as many said that they were smart alics or immature, but many of them have today grown into very good, competent doctors. Some people here are missing out on getting into medicine because they do not pass the UMAT test.

Flinders University has a different system where you have to do another degree first before you can do medicine. With dentistry they put you through an introductory session where many walk out because they say, ‘Do you mind if you have spit or blood on you?’ That is a good thing because how can you be a dentist or surgeon if you are worried about spit or blood? That is not the real issue either, but we have a problem in dentistry. One of the doctors involved in screening overseas dentists was appalled at the low level of competency. When he asked them to demonstrate what they would do for root canal treatment, he was appalled at their lack of knowledge. We need to train our own. The AMA is not in favour of bonding people, but I think we need to give them assistance during medical school and say, ‘We want you to serve for three years in Renmark, Loxton or Waikerie.’

I do not have a problem with that. We used to do it with teachers, and it worked well. What’s wrong with saying, ‘We’ll help you financially if you serve for three years in the southern or northern suburbs?’ My niece is a dentist in the Army, and it looked after her generously through university. She had better equipment than any other student. Now she is serving in the Army, and she loves it. She does not mind the fact that she has to serve for a few years; it helped put her through university, and she does not even have a HECS debt.

We should be looking at those sorts of options, including a bonding system—not forever but for, say, three or four years or so. Doctors are a very conservative lot, and the nature of their work tends to reinforce that. Dentists are probably even more conservative. We need them to move away from a resistance to the bonding of dentists, doctors, pharmacists, or whatever. There is a chronic shortage of dentists in rural areas. Owners of dental practices are closing their doors and walking away to retire because they are unable to get someone to take over their practice. I was given some locations in various parts of the state, although I will not mention them as I do not think it is necessary.

This information is from the CEO of the Australian Dental Association (SA Branch). In the metropolitan area, the eastern suburbs have a lot of dentists. I do not think it follows that their teeth are any worse than those of people in the western suburbs but, apparently, there is a shortage of dentists in the western suburbs. Research by Professor John Spencer, Director of the Australian Research Centre for Population Oral Health, has revealed that dental schools throughout Australia need to graduate at least 120 more dentists per year to meet the expected shortfall; that is over and above what has been programmed. In South Australia, the number who register has been falling. The latest figures I have, which are for 2005, state that probably eight or 10 will register to practise in South Australia out of the 50 who will graduate.

Adelaide University’s dental school has around 40 government-funded places and, under the commonwealth policy I referred to before, they are open to all Australians and not just South Australians. In South Australia, the number of dentists graduating and registering has been fewer than the necessary number. International students are full-fee paying, and the dental school needs them in order to be financially viable. This is over and above the 40 places funded by the commonwealth. These are the figures I obtained about a year ago: of 41 students graduating, 11 are from South Australia and the rest are from overseas or interstate, 14 are staying in South Australia, three are going to Port Augusta and Whyalla, one is going to Nuriootpa, and two are doing an honours degree.

As to medicine, we need a lot more GPs. You do not have to be a Rhodes scholar to understand that women medicos will sometimes have babies—surprise, surprise. They will want to spend time looking after their child or children, and this means they will work part-time for at least part of their career. Einstein would not have been required to predict that that would happen, because at least half our medical school students now are female. On that basis alone, you have to increase the number dramatically—at least double it—to cater for the fact that female doctors are going to be looking after their children and, therefore, working part-time. You have to adjust for that. We are not saying that they should not have children: we are saying that society and governments must realise that we will need more doctors if female doctors are going to take time off to have children.

Recently, I wrote to the Hon. Julie Bishop about medical student places in South Australia. In her letter of 31 March, the minister states:

Since 2000 the Australian government has been substantially increasing the number of medical places at Australian universities. By 2008 there will be an extra 2 195 medical places for commonwealth-supported students. South Australian universities have been allocated 117 of these places.

That is not many—117 places out of 2 195. In her letter, the minister goes on to talk about full-fee paying students and increasing the cap on fee-help loans for fee-paying medical students from \$50 000 to \$80 000. That scheme offers eligible students an income-contingent loan to pay their undergraduate or postgraduate fees in courses in public or eligible private institutions. The minister also reminds us that, on 14 November 2005, the University of Adelaide changed its admission requirements to increase the number of South Australian students likely to gain entry to the medicine course, and to help increase the number of qualified doctors staying in the state.

Things are starting to happen. It has taken a while to come, but more needs to be done. We need to keep focusing

on this issue. Another related aspect which stems from the inadequate numbers of general practitioners is the fact that we do not have enough specialists; and, to some extent, that is a deliberate creation by some of the specialties. They might be critical of me for saying it, but that is the reality. They do not want too many people in their specialty because that, through supply and demand, will affect what they can charge and their income. Not all specialists would say that, but some of their associations would take that line.

There is a chronic shortage of specialists in areas such as urology. Many other specialties just do not have enough people, because it takes a long time to train and to get the experience to be a specialist. If you think you have a problem now with doctors at the level of GPs, registrars and so on, you wait for a few years when people want a specialist. There will not be too many in the area of obstetrics, because it will be pushed out because of medical insurance claims. Members might have seen the recent media report in which one of our leading gynaecologists said that gynaecologists and obstetricians are blamed for things over which they have no control, where babies are born with a problem that is not the result of any medical treatment or lack thereof: it is just a quirk of nature.

This motion is important. We need more dentists and doctors. We need more specialists and pharmacists. We need all these professional groups, and I believe that it is an outrage that we are not training our own. Your first commitment is to your own, and we should be assisting financially those who want to train so that they can get a professional qualification so that we have the people here to look after our own people who need medical, dental and allied medical help. I commend the motion to the house.

Mrs GERAGHTY secured the adjournment of the debate.

[Sitting suspended from 12.30 to 2 p.m.]

VISITORS TO PARLIAMENT

The SPEAKER: I advise honourable members that in the gallery today are students and staff from Salisbury, Woodville and Fremont high schools, and the Metropolitan Aboriginal Youth Team and representatives from Reconciliation SA who are visiting Parliament House today as part of Reconciliation Week celebrations. I also advise the house that students from Mount Gambier High School are present in the chamber today as guests of the member for Mount Gambier.

Mrs REDMOND: And the students and staff of Heathfield High School, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I had not been advised of that, but I also call the attention of honourable members to the presence of students and staff from Heathfield High School, the Leader of the Opposition's old school.

The Hon. J.D. LOMAX-SMITH: I also point out that Christian Brothers College will be coming in in about five minutes.

The SPEAKER: Perhaps honourable members would like to let me know of the presence of students from schools and I would be happy to acknowledge their presence in the gallery.

PLAYGROUND FACILITIES

A petition signed by 93 residents of South Australia, requesting the house to urge the government to install a

larger, safer and more modern playground facility with amenities on the grounds at the corner of Yatala Vale Road and Panagari Drive, was presented by the Hon. L. Stevens. Petition received.

PAPERS TABLED

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Department of Education and Children's Services—Report 2005

Senior Secondary Assessment Board of South Australia—Report 2005.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN MINISTERIAL COUNCIL MEETING

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

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.A. MAYWALD: The Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. Gail Gago) and I attended the recent Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council in Melbourne on Friday 19 May as representatives of South Australia. I am happy to report that this council meeting was, I believe, a watershed event for the River Murray. The council meeting was marked by a new, more cooperative approach, partly fuelled by the federal government's commitment of \$500 million to ensure the 500 billion litre Living Murray Initiative target was back on track to deliver by 2009; and the fact that, preceding the meeting, in-principle agreements between New South Wales, South Australia and Victoria to achieve interim permanent trade arrangements had been achieved. I am pleased to report that the council agreed to fast-track part of South Australia's \$35 billion litre package of measures towards the Living Murray Initiative, which will see up to 13 billion litres of water returned to the river almost immediately.

The council also agreed to address the issue of the so-called surplus or unregulated flows which threaten to undermine the achievements of the Living Murray Initiative. This is a major step in securing the future of the river. In addition, the council agreed to Parliamentary Secretary Malcolm Turnbull's proposal to buy back environmental water through tendering for water savings achieved by on-farm efficiency measures. While South Australia does not expect this proposal to secure large amounts of water, it means that the federal government, which at last council meeting opposed the purchase of water for the Living Murray, has now become a proponent of water buy-back measures.

Following the Melbourne council meeting, South Australia committed to investing in one of Victoria's Living Murray water recovery projects, committing \$12 million towards Victoria's \$93 million Goulburn Murray Water Recovery package. This will return 145 billion litres of water to the Murray and the Goulburn, Loddon and Campaspe rivers. This is another important step forward for a vital project that will breathe new life into one of Australia's greatest rivers. It will benefit the environment, farmers and regional communities. South Australia's commitment to a Victorian project indicates how seriously the state government regards saving the Murray.

We recognise that South Australians working alone will not be able restore the health of the river and we are prepared

to commit to projects in other states that will help restore the health of the Murray. This is a particularly important gesture towards a national approach to the Murray, as the money for this has been provided by the people of South Australia through the Save the Murray Fund. I would also like to report to the house that, immediately prior to the ministerial council meeting on Thursday, I met with the Victorian and New South Wales water ministers and agreed in principle to a mechanism that will enable permanent water trading between the states to start within weeks.

South Australia and Victoria had already established an exchange rate mechanism to allow interim permanent trade between our states back in February. We moved further, reaching an agreement with New South Wales last Friday. The new in-principle agreement between South Australia and New South Wales agrees to move to a pilot form of tagged trading, which will allow water users in South Australia to own a share of water in New South Wales and be bound by the water conditions in New South Wales and vice versa. In order to allow this pilot trade to proceed, New South Wales agreed to change its conversion rates for low to high security water to make them competitively neutral.

South Australia was opposed to the tag system being put forward by New South Wales whilst there were significant barriers to trade within New South Wales, and they have agreed to deal with those issues. New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia have also agreed that exit fees and other institutional arrangements in jurisdictions should be examined by the ACCC to ensure that they are competitively neutral. These include competitively neutral and fair exit fees and institutional arrangements across jurisdictions; agreements to allow effective trade between all three states; and finalising process, administrative and technical arrangements, including achieving sufficient consistency in measures for dealing with salinity impacts.

Once these matters are agreed, the government will consult with stakeholders to ensure that the proposed market arrangements are practical and commercial. Trading could start this year, depending on resolving all issues satisfactorily. This expansion in trade, which is in line with South Australia's commitment to the National Water Initiative, which seeks to ensure that our precious water is used for the most productive outcomes, is another example of South Australia's commitment to the future sustainability of our great River Murray.

QUESTION TIME

TRANSPORT PROJECTS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer inform the house when he or his office first received advice regarding the cost blow-outs for the South Road underpass projects and the Northern Expressway project?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Gee, that question was a long time coming!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is because the Leader of the Opposition likes to skip out half way through question time to deal with media. I remember that, whenever the Premier might have been absent for important business, the opposition would make great moment of that. The leader's

new tactic is two or three questions and then sneak out and do the media. This is the Leader of the Opposition.

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the Treasurer has made his point, if he gets on with his answer.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The member for Heysen is the person who would love to be leader and is part of this very unhappy leadership team. As to when I was first aware, I do recall attending a meeting with the Minister for Transport and his former chief executive officer James Horne on Friday 21 April of this year. At that meeting—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I named him: weren't you listening? I said 'James Horne.' It is very important that you listen in this place. You ask questions, you get answers. You have to listen to them. At that meeting, Dr Horne discussed the probable increased estimate for transport projects, including the Northern Expressway and the Bakewell Bridge. I am advised that, following the appointment of Jim Hallion, work is being undertaken to refine the project scope, in particular for the Northern Expressway. As the Minister for Transport has advised the house, this may involve some change of scope for the Northern Expressway project. Once that is resolved, it will be incorporated into the budget project. As always, this government is committed to the strictest budget disciplines. The only extra comment I would make is this. Never before has the state embarked upon such a large-scale road project. The reality is—

An honourable member: What about the South-Eastern Freeway?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Funded by Paul Keating, from memory.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The tunnels?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you. The 19—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Try Playford.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Oh, Playford, sorry.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: It was put through Alexander Downer's front yard—

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is right. Crikey, the old Liberals are not bad, are they, sir. They will throw back to Sir Thomas Playford. At the end of the day—

Ms Chapman: You can't even build a bridge.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I can't even build a bridge!

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: She's classic, isn't she? You know what I love about this job? Even when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition does not ask me a question, you know that she will have some inane interjection. The Liberal opposition members just cannot help themselves. Honestly, you should hear what they are saying about the Deputy Leader of the Opposition around the halls of Canberra.

BLOOD PLASMA SUPPLIES

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): My question is to the Minister for Health. Given the federal review of Australia's plasma fractionation arrangements, does the state government support the self-sustainability of Australia's blood plasma supplies?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): The federal government is currently conducting a review of Australia's

blood plasma fractionation arrangements. This review, which will conclude on 31 December this year, has been established because of Australia's requirements under the free trade agreement with the United States. The plasma fractionation review will examine existing and possible future arrangements for the supply of products processed from plasma collected by the Australian Red Cross Blood Service. One outcome of the review could be that Australia moves to a more competitive tendering process for fractionation services, and this could result in plasma being processed overseas.

An honourable member: What is fractionation?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Fractionation is the breaking down of the plasma into various component parts. What happens is that the blood is collected by Red Cross from citizens in Australia and is sent across to Melbourne, where it is broken down into component parts and supplied back to hospitals and doctors. That is fractionation. What is being contemplated at the moment is that this plasma be sent to the United States, or some other country, for fractionation.

The South Australian government, I can assure the house, does not support sending Australian blood to be fractionated in the United States—or anywhere else in the world, for that matter. For many years, Australia has had one of the safest blood systems in the world. It is built on the support of Australia's thousands and thousands of volunteer donors, such as the member for Norwood, the Attorney-General, the Premier and others. So, it has been built on the supply of blood from volunteer donors, and Australia is one of the handful of countries in the world considered free of the deadly BSE.

Currently in Australia the majority of the blood collected by the Red Cross is separated into red blood cells and blood plasma. For over 50 years the Red Cross has sent all the plasma to CSL Bioplasma in Melbourne for processing (and I visited CSL in Melbourne just a few weeks ago). CSL's plasma processing plant was built to meet Australia's needs for blood plasma products, and it is a fine plant. The 12 plasma products produced are used to treat people with a range of serious medical conditions, including auto-immune diseases, blood disorders, a range of severe infections, serious burns and in trauma situations. The Australian blood at the CSL plant is segregated to ensure that it does not come into contact with any overseas plasma.

South Australia believes that there are safety and quality advantages in regulating a fractionator located within Australia. Processes are tightly regulated by the Therapeutic Goods Administration, which has the capacity to undertake impromptu audits of the Broadmeadows plant. At the most recent health ministers' meeting, a motion was passed supporting the policy of blood self-sustainability. The South Australian government has sent a submission to the federal government's review. The government submission expresses preference for blood plasma to continue to be fractionated in Australia to ensure the security of our blood supplies. Already the Red Cross has been vocal in its opposition to any moves to process blood overseas, and its chief executive has written to every donor voicing opposition to the proposal.

I have two main concerns. First, I believe South Australian donors would be less likely to donate if they knew that their blood was likely to go overseas and could potentially be mixed with the blood of donors from other countries. Secondly, we know that the laws of the United States are such that if there were a disaster there then the American government could take control of the fractionation process and the blood contained therein for use in its own emergency. That

means that Australia may not necessarily get its blood or plasma back, and that could put us at risk.

The security of Australia's blood supplies is more important than the trading of commodities and this blood should not be seen as a commodity. I hope that the commonwealth government, when it makes its decision, adopts the position being taken by South Australia.

TRANSPORT PROJECTS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): My question is again to the Treasurer. Was the meeting of 21 April 2006, mentioned by the Treasurer in his last answer, the first time that the Treasurer was advised, or became aware, that there were blow-outs in the cost of the South Road underpass project and/or the Northern Expressway project?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): The honourable member may be referring to some other advice, but I will get that checked. My recollection (and, again, I stand to be corrected if I am not right on this) is that numbers were not actually spoken about at the meeting of 21 April. There may have been some general numbers, but I do not think the numbers really started to firm up. They are not even firm yet; we are still having further work done. Let us wait to see what the final scope and costings are.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Listen to the opposition. We are going through the single largest construction boom in this nation's history. The Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have a situation where members of the opposition ask a question and the minister is answering it but, within a short time of the minister beginning his fairly straightforward answer, members of the opposition are interjecting or heckling him. Of course, this starts the minister down the line of argument or debate on the question, and then a member of the opposition is standing up and demanding that I pull the minister into order for debating the question. Either we do this in an orderly way or we do not, and as long as I am in the chair I am determined that question time will proceed in an orderly manner.

I am tired of members of the opposition interjecting within a few moments of the minister beginning his answer to a question. All interjections are out of order, but they should be only occasional; there should not be a barrage of sound coming from the benches on my left directed at the minister. I call the minister to order. He is starting to debate the question and I ask him to please ignore the interjections from members on my left and proceed with the quite straightforward answer he was giving.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Thank you, sir. I will get it checked. I have lost my train of thought after all that, but I was giving some commentary on the difficulties of construction costs. When the Liberals were in office just about every major project they did ran over budget, and I believe that if you look at most governments, getting quality estimation and advice and getting projects delivered on time are great challenges—for any organisation, particularly government. When the Liberals were in government they had just as much difficulty in taking through to completion a price that was first entered into in the budget process. I recall the Convention Centre. From memory, the Convention Centre was significantly over budget. That might have been scope change.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: If it wasn't right, I stand to be corrected. The point is that it is a difficult exercise in taking from the initial number that one puts into a budget through to completion, and I am more than happy to put on the public record that we need to do better in our government on that. We need to do better, and that is a reality. We are doing a lot of work to ensure that that occurs. I remember the 21 July meeting, in particular. I remember making some comment about some people talking gobbledegook to me at that meeting from the public sector.

An honourable member: 21 April.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: 21 April, sorry. They were talking gobbledegook to me at that meeting, quite frankly. Some public servants were giving us some advice and it was a frustrating meeting, as you would expect it to be, if you had been told that some errors had been made. One thing that needs to be understood in all of this is that, under this government, we have delivered four surplus budgets. We have lived within our means. We have restored a AAA credit rating. We are spending \$1 billion more on health. We are cutting \$1.5 billion by the end of the decade in taxes. We will continue to balance the budgets. I emphasise that: we will continue to balance the budgets.

Mrs REDMOND: On a point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I think I know your point of order.

Mrs REDMOND: On relevance, sir.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This is very relevant, sir, because, at the end of the day, as long as I am the Treasurer of this state, we only have a certain amount of money to spend.

Mrs REDMOND: On a point of order, Mr Speaker, I raise the point of relevance.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I was going to say something—

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer must not argue the point. It is a tricky one. It is related to budget. The Treasurer is talking about things in relation to the budget. I think he is answering the substance of the question, but I invite him to wrap up.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Actually, sir, I was going to say something in that sentence that I would have thought the opposition would have seized upon and used in the next question. You will never know what it was.

CANNES FILM FESTIVAL

Ms CICCARELLO (Norwood): My question is to the Premier. Can he advise the house about how successful South Australian films were at the Cannes Film Festival this year?

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): Thank you very much. I recognise that the honourable member for Norwood represents what is known nationally as Norrywood, because much of the film industry is actually based in her electorate. I am pleased to report that South Australian films have excelled in Cannes this year, highlighting the tremendous creative talents we have here in our state. National and international press—I am sure people here read *Le Figaro* and *Paris Match*—commented that Australia has again emerged as a hotbed of international cinema with the inclusion of eight films at Cannes. It was the largest contingent of Australian films at Cannes in 20 years. Of the eight Australian films, five were features and three of these were made in South Australia. One is called *2:37*, another is *Ten Canoes* and the third is *Look Both Ways*. This is a great result for a small but significant industry. Most importantly, having

so many films appear at Cannes is a wonderful indication of South Australia's capacity and potential in the screen sector of which film content can be seen as a cornerstone.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Port Adelaidewood.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Port Adelaidewood, that's right. South Australia is intent on creating and attracting an exciting new generation of filmmakers and producers of creative screen content, while maintaining investment to keep established ones in the state. Indeed, South Australia's Strategic Plan has a target to expand South Australia's share of the national feature film industry to match our population share. The recent success at Cannes is a signal that we are heading in the right direction. Screening in the 'Un Certain Regard' category at Cannes was creative stalwart Rolf de Heer's 14th film *Ten Canoes*. People would remember Rolf as the director of *Tracker* and many other—

An honourable member: *Bad Boy Bubby*.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: *Bad Boy Bubby* and others. Of course, Murali Thalluri's debut film *2:37* about teen suicide also screened. I was fortunate enough to have been able to attend the screening of *Ten Canoes*, and I can report that it was met with a very warm standing ovation—that is the film, not me.

I am very excited to be able to advise the house that *Ten Canoes* went on to do exceptionally well at the festival and has been awarded the Special Jury Prize. The broader international filmmaking community has responded enthusiastically to the film, as reflected by the widespread critical acclaim it is receiving in the press. *The Hollywood Reporter* has labelled the offering a 'richly layered film' and 'an enchanting fable rich in authenticity and shot through with unexpected humour'. London's *TimeOut* magazine described the film as being 'funny, touching, deliciously ironic and sincerely felt all at the same time'. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Rolf and his team on such an excellent production, and to wish them well in their future work.

Ten Canoes was the second feature film to receive financial backing through the Adelaide International Film Festival Special Investment Fund which I established in 2002, and it is greatly encouraging to see that the fund is paying dividends so quickly. I understand that Rolf de Heer has embarked on another film called *Dr Plonk*, which will be shot in black and white, and will be a silent film. I understand that this parliament will feature in it, and it is likely to feature some of the best and most outstanding film talent ever seen in an Australian film, and we will talk about that on another day.

Look Both Ways, which has already won so many national and international awards, screened in International Critics' Week and Directors' Fortnight as part of the Cannes Film Festival. This interstate production, but filmed in South Australia, made use of the state's unique locations and its world-class crews, talents and services. *Look Both Ways* was the first feature to be funded by the Adelaide Film Festival Investment Fund—like *Ten Canoes*, backed by the South Australian Film Corporation and by the Adelaide Film Festival, one of the only film festivals in the world not only to screen films passively but also to invest in them at every stage from creative inception through to screening.

Murali K. Thalluri's film *2:37* is a debut feature from a young director. It is a teen suicide story and stars actor Gary Sweet's son, and up-and-coming actor Teresa Palmer. Murali's film was entirely privately funded, an indication that the state is beginning to produce young entrepreneurially

spirited filmmakers able to attract non-government funds to their projects. It is a rare tribute, indeed, that a debut director would have their feature selected for the Cannes Film Festival. Murali is sure to be a South Australian director to watch in the future. In 2006 at Cannes, South Australia made a major new breakthrough on the international filmmaking stage, promoting the state's talent, expertise and locations. I was very pleased to attend and to signal South Australia's commitment to becoming a significant centre of screen production. I am looking forward to returning and, maybe next time, spending a little bit longer there, and next time maybe inviting the media to join me so that they don't have to hire paparazzi in Cannes.

TRANSPORT PROJECTS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer outline for the house what reporting mechanism he put in place, and how regularly he was briefed on the progress of the South Road and Northern Expressway projects? The Treasurer claimed today on radio that the state government is putting forward the largest infrastructure spend in the state's history. Minister Conlon described it yesterday as the most ambitious infrastructure program that the state has ever seen. Both the Treasurer and minister Conlon have claimed that it is not unusual to have blow-outs in the capital works projects. There must have been some reporting mechanism.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Correct me if I am wrong, but I don't think these projects have started.

An honourable member: No.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No. What reporting process do I have if a project hasn't—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, the emphasis of the question was—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: How much it is likely to cost.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Yes, and that is what we are doing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I do not understand the question. I mean, the projects haven't started. How can I be monitoring a project that hasn't started? What we are doing, unlike the Liberals, is we accept an estimation from our department, we put it into our budget process—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Honestly, sir, if they do not want to listen I will go back to reading the *Financial Review*.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Do you want to listen, deputy leader, or are you going to interject with those bizarre interjections as you do every day?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, unlike the last government, we do a lot of due diligence, a lot of work before these projects start, and that is where the problems have been identified. As far as I am aware we have not gone to tender—we may well have done on the Bakewell Bridge, obviously, but certainly Northern Expressway is still being scoped. This is the work you do. This is the work I require, as the Treasurer, of ministers, of CEOs, before we finally kick these projects off—that we actually get the right price. That is the

mechanism. That is the process we are going through and, hello, that is how the problems have been identified. We are now working them through.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Exactly. So what we don't do, like the Liberals, is just start the project, have the projects blow out and then be forced into a position—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: And then go into a process of having to find the money after the event. This is the proper, diligent work I would expect of government. Should we have had better estimates when we started this process? Absolutely. As I would have thought the former ministers opposite would know, that is the lot of being in government, that is the lot of being a minister in any government, namely, that you rely on the best quality advice that you are given. Of course we would have liked those estimates to have been better. What we are now doing is we are refining these estimates, improving the processes. We have a new chief executive officer. We are doing all the sorts of things that governments should do and must do when confronted with these challenges in government—eminently appropriate, the right thing to do, sir, and the sign of a good government.

RECONCILIATION EVENT, PARLIAMENT HOUSE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation. Can the minister tell the chamber about the reconciliation event held at Parliament House today and the importance of reconciliation for young people?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I thank the honourable member for her question and acknowledge her long-standing commitment to reconciliation. Indeed, her participation in Reconciliation SA, a council which is dedicated to bringing Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people together, has spawned an event that was held in Parliament House today. Students from a number of schools—Salisbury High School and Fremont and also Woodville High School—participated in an event where the young people learnt about Aboriginal history and shared their own observations about what it meant to engage in a process of reconciliation.

Reconciliation, as I think we all understand, means acknowledging past injustices leading to a better understanding about what the present is for Aboriginal South Australians. Can I acknowledge that we now this week fly the Aboriginal flag on Parliament House, and that indeed is an important sign of our acknowledgment and respect for Aboriginal culture. The young people today participated in an event which was a very valuable one. Reconciliation SA, through the Salisbury High School, has developed a scheme called Young Ambassadors. A group of non-indigenous South Australians, young people and correspondingly Aboriginal young people, were here today and we celebrated an event. A number of members of parliament came along to that event.

I spoke at that event and one of the things that I think was important to acknowledge at this time was that Aboriginal young people are entitled to be proud of their culture. It is crucial that they are proud of their culture and it is no part of the policy of this government—and indeed I think I speak for all members of this house to say that it is no policy of any

party—to suggest that they should turn their back on their culture, and that reconciliation is a process, an ongoing process, that we all commit ourselves to. Indeed, I think this parliament was one of the first parliaments that acknowledged our sorrow in relation to those things that were drawn to our attention arising out of the ‘Bringing Them Home’ report.

As we deal with some of the most difficult issues that confront Aboriginal communities, it is crucial that we do not simply slip into some unfortunate language about portraying Aboriginal culture as immoral or somehow debased in a way which should not be respected. That is a debate which is likely to undermine any attempt at reconciliation, so it is crucial that we do not head down that path. I was at pains to make that point to the young people today. The young people who were at this function understood and respected, in an implicit way without there really being a need to explain it, the need to respect one another. It was very heartening to see, and I think it was an important step in this long path to reconciliation.

TRANSPORT PROJECTS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Leader of the Opposition): Will the Treasurer inform the house when Treasury first became aware or received advice regarding cost blow-outs for the South Road underpass project and the Northern Expressway project? The Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure has an account manager from Treasury overseeing the department’s budget. The role of the Treasury account manager is to provide advice to senior management in Treasury and ultimately the Treasurer on matters associated with the department’s finances and budget situation.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): Sir, if the Leader of the Opposition thinks I am lying to this parliament, he should come forward with a motion and move that I have misled the house.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker. The question was not about whether the Deputy Premier is lying. He raised that, not me. The question is about when Treasury first knew.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition will take his seat. How the Treasurer decides to approach a question is entirely up to him.

EDUCATION, INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

The Hon. L. STEVENS (Little Para): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. Is Adelaide’s international student growth on the way to achieving the state’s Strategic Plan target of doubling our state’s share of the overseas student market by 2013?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am pleased that the honourable member asked me that question because I am able to reply with an emphatic yes. Yes, Mr Speaker, South Australia’s international student growth is on the way to achieving the state’s Strategic Plan target of doubling our state’s share of the overseas student market by 2013. The target for international students was set in order to reflect the growing importance of the sector for the state’s economic and cultural life. In fact, I am able to report that, in the first three months of this year, South Australia has recorded a 13.5 per cent rise in student numbers over the corresponding months for 2005.

This is well ahead of the national average rise of 8 per cent and follows a consistent upward trend since 2002.

Indeed, South Australia’s increased student enrolment growth has led to an increase in market share. This remarkable growth is in no small part due to the excellent work done by Education Adelaide, which is charged with developing and expanding South Australia’s share of the national education export market. The state government funds Education Adelaide through the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology. Principal funding is also provided through the Adelaide City Council and South Australia’s universities—the University of Adelaide, Flinders University at the University of South Australia.

Through Education Adelaide, the government promotes South Australia internationally as a distinct and specialised education destination. We are working closely with the tourism industry as well as other organisations, including other government agencies and the Adelaide City Council to raise South Australia’s profile in fast-growing and newly emerging markets, such as India and China. The internationalisation of the student market, while expanding the cultural landscape, also has the capacity for increased global exchange in terms of education and business. The addition of the newly established Carnegie Mellon University and the potential for other overseas universities to establish in South Australia are part of the Premier’s vision for Adelaide as a University city, and it will also support the achievement of the state target.

The Social Development Committee report on the impact of international education activities in South Australia was tabled on Tuesday and strongly supports the work and goals of Education Adelaide and our three existing universities in increasing the number of international students and believes that the state has the capacity to achieve these targets.

I conclude by highlighting Adelaide’s strengths as a university city. Adelaide is accessible and affordable, with one of the best cost of living rates in the country. The quality of our distinct education institutions is high, with flexible pathways between institutions and excellent research facilities. The state government is committed to ensuring that international students have the best educational experience possible in a safe and supportive environment. More than 20 000 international students are expected to study in Adelaide this year, injecting an estimated \$400 million into the South Australian economy. International education accounts for at least 2 500 local jobs and is now the state’s largest service sector export and the fifth largest overall export. It is, therefore, vital that South Australians maintain their strong support for international students as the state continues to outstrip the national enrolment growth rate.

TRANSPORT, CHIEF EXECUTIVE

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite): Did the Treasurer have any meeting or discussion with the former chief executive officer of the Department of Transport, Energy and Infrastructure (Dr James Horne) before he was dumped as CEO at which he told Dr Horne that he should dismiss senior officers in his department, and did Dr Horne refuse to follow the Treasurer’s request?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Treasurer): That is a very interesting question. Just alluding to the earlier question as well, I have already said that the first recollection I have of being briefed on this was 21 April. I also then said if there was any earlier advice to me I will check and come back to

the house. What I will not say is when an account manager of the Treasury was made aware of it. I am accountable to this parliament and am giving an honest answer to the best of my knowledge and recollection and, if there are any inaccuracies in what I have said, I will come back to the house. As to the question, yes, I was in a meeting with Dr James Horne on 21 April, and I thought that he talked absolute gobbledegook when I asked him questions about this particular issue. I was less than impressed with Dr Horne's ability to manage this issue, to be perfectly honest. Whether or not I said that certain public servants should be sacked, I do not recall. I may have said it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What are you laughing it? I said I do not recall it but I may have said it. I was pretty angry and pretty annoyed. Do you think that, as Treasurer and infrastructure minister, we would have sat there and said, 'Jolly good, someone has made some mistakes. Oh, well, let's move on'? We run government a little differently. We expect ability, responsibility, accountability and service to the taxpayer. If we are held accountable in this parliament, we expect chief executive officers and senior management within government to be accountable to this elected government. If members opposite want to cuddle up to a former chief executive officer, if that is the case, or if they want to reward poor performance, allow them to do that. I will say that Dr James Horne spoke gobbledegook to me in that meeting. I did not have confidence in his ability to manage that portfolio, and I think we did the right thing and brought someone in who can.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: My supplementary question is again to the Treasurer.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Was the meeting at which he spoke to Dr Horne regarding the dismissal of senior departmental officers the same meeting on 21 April to which he has referred? Who else was present, and were notes taken at the meeting?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Here we go—the socialist party of South Australia standing up for the workers!

Ms Chapman: Tell the truth!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sir, the deputy leader has just said to this parliament that I am not telling the truth. I ask her to withdraw. Fancy that coming from someone such as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: How could that politician get it so wrong?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I attended a meeting on 21 April, and the Minister for Infrastructure was there. From memory, the Under Treasurer was there. I do not recall saying we should sack someone, but it was probably how I was feeling so, if I did, it would be consistent with my inner thoughts, to be honest.

That is a funny reaction from a Treasurer and a Minister for Infrastructure: 'Hello: some significant errors have been made. Well, let's shoot out and have a cup of tea and a scone and chat about that.' We are a disciplined government, a competent government, that expects people paid close to \$300 000 a year to perform. If they do not, we move them on and put in people who can. That is what good governments do. That is what good governance is all about. As to whether notes were taken, we cannot be any more up front on this than

we have been. Members opposite are really listening to too many disenchanted voices coming out of the transport department or wherever they may be.

I make no apology on behalf of this government for expecting and requiring senior management within our government to perform. All in all, they do a very good job, but we would not be a good government if we did—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Sorry?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will not respond to interjections.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: But Mr Speaker, let us think about some of the people employed when this lot was in government, such as John Cambridge. Let us think about some of the people who were moved out into other government jobs because they were not performing very well. Anyway, that could be for another day.

HOSPITALS, LOCUM SERVICES

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): My question is to the Minister for Health, assuming we still have one. Why is Wudinna Hospital, located some 200 kilometres from the nearest town with a hospital and on a main highway servicing some 400 000 cars a year, still without adequate locum services? Last Sunday morning there was a major road accident about 30 kilometres from Wudinna in which three young women were seriously injured, including having head injuries and a severed limb. Because the nearest hospital, Wudinna Hospital, had no doctor at the time of the accident, the doctor from Kimba had to drive 100 kilometres to Wudinna to treat the patients prior to the arrival of the Royal Flying Doctor Service retrieval team.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I am glad the honourable member is getting out in the country. She was out last week while we were having a country conference. All the people from country health were in Adelaide and the deputy leader was out in the country trying to stir up trouble amongst people in rural South Australia. We are in the process of reforming country health in South Australia. At the moment, the responsibility to ensure locum services at Wudinna Hospital resides with the Wudinna board. I am trying to change that so that the Department of Health of South Australia is responsible for supplying services to people in country South Australia. We need an integrated health service in South Australia.

The anecdote that the honourable member just gave highlights the need for reform. The big problem we have, of course, is that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is opposed implacably to the reform process that we are going through. There are difficulties in staffing country hospitals and providing GPs, and providing locums to replace them. We do what we can through the work force arrangements that we have in place, but we want to do more. The best thing we can do is have an integrated country health service so that we can properly manage, properly employ and properly place doctors, including locums, in country areas where they are required.

HOSPITALS, QUEEN ELIZABETH

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Will the Minister for Health now confirm that there will never be babies born again at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital? On 19 May 2004, when birthing services at the Queen Elizabeth

Hospital were terminated, the then minister said, 'We are not closing it. It is suspended for the time being.' At the same time, the Deputy Premier said that the closure was only temporary and that a worldwide search was under way to find replacement obstetricians. This was two years ago and the women of the western suburbs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: The Public Works Committee reported to the parliament on 8 November 2005 in respect of the stage 2 QEH redevelopment, and that report now confirms that the maternity wing will no longer be used as an obstetrics facility. The report states:

The refurbishment of the maternity wing will include non-clinical, educational and administrative functions and no provision for maternity services.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I thank the member for her question, because it highlights a significant issue for South Australia, which was the point of an answer I gave to a question yesterday. One of the biggest issues we face in managing the health system in South Australia is trying to obtain sufficient doctors to provide the services for our needs. As I indicated to the house yesterday, something like 25 per cent of the doctors in our public hospitals come from overseas. We do not have enough people coming through our university training system to provide the services we need, and that is particularly so in some of the specialities—and obstetrics, in particular, is one of those. That is a problem that has been building for a number of years.

We are working as hard as we can, not with the other states, as the member suggested yesterday, but with the commonwealth government to provide extra places so that we can train people here in South Australia. The arrangements that have been put in place now for a couple of years to provide birthing services to the people in the western suburbs is through the Women's and Children's Hospital, and that is working extremely well. We do have a shortage of obstetrics, but the days when we can expect every hospital in every location to provide every service at every minute of every day all the time free of charge are over.

CONSUMERS' SA

Mrs PENFOLD (Flinders): Will the Minister for Consumer Affairs guarantee that volunteer consumer watchdog Consumers' SA will receive the \$38 000 it has requested before 30 June or, at the very least, provide it with interim funding if it is to be delayed because of the unprecedented four-month delay in the budget?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Minister for Consumer Affairs): I thank the member for Flinders for her question. I know that she is an incredibly busy shadow member, and it is pleasing to receive a question from her about consumer affairs. I understand that the member had a briefing this week with the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, when she indicated how overloaded she is with her portfolio responsibilities, and I know that this one (as I think she remarked to one of my staff members) is fairly low on her priorities. So, clearly, this has been lifted, and I am pleased to have the question from her. I have received a submission—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: No, I did not say it. The member for Flinders said it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will get on with her answer. The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I have a request before me that is being considered in relation to funding for that organisation. We are working through the issues with respect to that matter, and the organisation will be advised as soon as possible.

CROSSBOWS

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): Can the Attorney-General explain what constitutes 'lawful excuse' with respect to crossbows in South Australia? The Attorney-General today announced the commencement of new regulations under the Summary Offences (Dangerous Articles and Prohibited Weapons) Act, which make it illegal for crossbows to be manufactured, sold or even possessed without lawful excuse.

The SPEAKER: I think the question comes very close to asking the Attorney for a legal opinion, or what constitutes legality—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: —Order!—which would normally be out of order. I will let the Attorney respond. I will listen to his answer.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I did not know that my staff had shot this question around to the member for Heysen, but I thank her for asking it anyway. I am pleased that a regulation to change the Summary Offences (Dangerous Articles and Prohibited Weapons) Regulations came into effect today to declare crossbows dangerous articles. The background to this regulation is that in 2003 in New South Wales a 16 year old schoolboy threw a molotov cocktail and then fired a sharpened crossbow bolt at his former girlfriend from a distance of 2.5 metres, injuring her and another girl. It was alleged that the boy obtained the crossbow used in the offence over the internet from a South Australian manufacturer. The then premier of New South Wales reacted swiftly, calling for all states and territories to prohibit possession of all types of crossbow, and on 11 November 2003 the Australasian Police Ministers' Council passed a resolution to amend the uniform prohibited weapons list to include crossbows. There was also a resolution about possible commonwealth action on this.

The boy was charged with attempted murder. He was found not guilty of that charge but convicted of two offences of malicious wounding with intent and with an offence of using a prohibited weapon. Mr Speaker, if that New South Wales incident had occurred in South Australia the lesser summary offence of carrying an offensive weapon without lawful excuse contrary to section 15 of the Summary Offences Act might have applied.

When the South Australian regulations were made in 2000 by the Hon. K.T. Griffin (of blessed memory), pistol crossbows were declared to be prohibited weapons: not crossbows, just pistol crossbows. A pistol crossbow is a crossbow which has a stock like a pistol. The member for Heysen's hand gestures are exactly correct and I am sorry that *Hansard* cannot record that.

Mrs Redmond: A trigger mechanism.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: A trigger mechanism, thank you. They are designed or adapted for aiming and discharging from the hand an arrow, dart, bolt or similar projectile. They are not firearms but are like a pistol in that they can be shot with one hand, as demonstrated by the member for Heysen.

The government has decided that as from today it will be an offence to possess or use an ordinary crossbow without lawful excuse. It will also be an offence to manufacture, sell,

distribute or supply an ordinary crossbow or to deal in any way with ordinary crossbows without a lawful excuse.

The Hon. M.D. Rann: Like making a film of the crusades.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: As the Premier says, if you were making, in Port Adelaide or some other place, a film of the crusades—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Port Adelaide would.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Port Adelaide would. The onus of proving lawful excuse—

Mr Koutsantonis: Which crusade?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Not the crusade where Byzantium was so shockingly sacked by Roman Catholics. Fancy doing it to a fellow Christian city; the member for West Torrens has never got over it. Indeed, I was at a holy liturgy on Sunday to mark the fall of Constantinople.

The onus of proving lawful excuse as a defence is on the accused person—and I know the member for Heysen will say that is a violation of civil liberties, it is reversing onus of proof, it is back to ‘Griffinism’. In other words, if a person is apprehended or reported for one of these offences it is up to the person who has been charged to satisfy the police that he had a lawful excuse. That is where the government stands on this matter. If the member for Heysen wants to know, that is the answer to her question. If the person is prosecuted in court, he will have to satisfy the court that he had a lawful excuse.

The Hon. J.D. Hill: Or she.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I just don’t think many ladies will be committing this offence—just experience on my part. I think that it will be mainly blokes. When I say ‘he’ in this parliament, it always embraces ‘she’. An example of a person who would have a lawful excuse—and this is what the member for Heysen wants to know—is a member of an archery club who uses an ordinary crossbow in archery competitions. That will give us some clue. The maximum penalty for possessing an ordinary crossbow is a fine of \$7 500 or imprisonment for 18 months. Of course, if a person had a crossbow of any type for an offensive purpose or used it to threaten or hurt someone, a more serious offence would be committed. I hope I am not giving legal advice here, Mr Speaker; it is just my humble opinion. My department has consulted industry about these changes, and the commencement of the regulation was delayed to allow for necessary changes to comply with the law. I would have hoped that Liberals approved of that administrative process, even those who are growing old in opposition such as the member for Waite—losing booths in his electorate along the way.

An honourable member: How many?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I will tell you how many booths the member for Waite lost on another occasion.

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: But it takes a special Liberal to lose booths in Waite. The new law will not stop businesses that make a living selling their products to legitimate archery competitors. Although they will be held responsible, if they were to sell a crossbow to someone who had no lawful use for a crossbow. It will also apply to backyarders who manufacture their own crossbows and sell them to someone else for criminal purposes and to anyone who has lent a crossbow knowing that it was going to be used for a crime. I thank the member for Heysen for the question.

Mrs REDMOND: I do not know if I am brave enough to ask another question on this topic, and I do not seek legal

advice, but my question is again to the Attorney-General. Why did he not respond to concerns raised by the then member for Finnis, the Hon. Dean Brown, in October 2005, and by Ausbow Industries in September 2005, in letters addressed to him? Ausbow Industries, which manufactures crossbows, wrote directly to the Attorney-General and approached the local member, who also wrote to the Attorney-General, raising questions and pointing out that, firstly, the majority of crossbow hunters who assist in keeping down feral animal numbers do not belong to any archery club and, secondly, dealers are unable to access police checks and cannot reasonably be held responsible to ensure the bona fides of every potential purchaser of a crossbow. The Attorney-General acknowledged receipt of those letters but never responded to the substance of them.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: We gave those representations our earnest consideration in framing the regulations.

URANIUM MINING

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Will the Premier support new uranium mines in South Australia regardless of federal Labor Party policy in order to ensure the state’s economic booms throughout the next three decades? If not, why not? Yesterday, in this house, the Premier said:

The boom in mining, especially uranium mining, will in the second, third and fourth decades of this century become as significant to our state’s economy as the mining industry has been to Western Australia and Queensland.

Proponents of South Australia’s newest Honeymoon uranium mine have stated that the uranium ore at Honeymoon is expected to be depleted within six to eight years.

The Hon. M.D. RANN (Premier): I was hoping that the honourable member would be asking me about the difference between U308, UF6 and U235 and, of course, where uranium—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I do. Would you like to explain about it? Which one is uranium hexafluoride of those three? Do you know?

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I may need to explain that on another day, because of my expertise in this area, having written about it so copiously over many years.

Yesterday I was asked about uranium enrichment, and I can reveal to the parliament that I have been involved in detailed discussions on uranium enrichment—from my memory on 29 or 30 January 1979—which shows you my passion for this industry. It was 27½ years ago—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: The Speaker wasn’t born.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: The Speaker wasn’t born, I am told. I remember visiting Urenco-Centec and also, I think, Cogema and others. I am very happy to discuss that interest because, as you can see, it is long standing, and I know it is a long time between visits, but I hope that maybe in 27½ years from now I might once again have the opportunity to visit the fast breeder reactor near Marcoule in France, or maybe even the vitrification facility. I am more than happy on another date to discuss those issues. However, there is no impediment to Honeymoon proceeding, as I have already made clear. In fact, I was looking back on a brilliantly written answer to a question by the Hon. D.A. Dunstan—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Who wrote it?

The Hon. M.D. RANN: I am not sure. It states:

I said quite specifically that it has never been the policy of the Labor Party, and it is not, that uranium is left in the ground forever.

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order, Mr Speaker, one of relevance. The question was—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: It might be history and it might be interesting but the question is whether he will support new mines now, not years ago.

The SPEAKER: The Premier is answering the substance of the question.

The Hon. M.D. RANN: Former premier Don Dunstan stated:

... it has never been the policy of the Labor Party, and it is not—and he was the person who formulated the policy—

that uranium is left in the ground forever. Our position is that uranium may not be mined or developed until it is safe, and that is what the honourable member voted for in this House.

He was replying to a question from Roger Goldsworthy. Don Dunstan goes on to state:

The position is that we believe that it is proper for us to step out the exploration of our uranium supplies, to proceed with our uranium studies to keep up with the technology in which we are ahead of the rest of Australia, but to ensure that no commercial commitment is made until the necessary preconditions are met.

What has happened subsequently is that we have a no new mines policy, which allows the expansion of Roxby Downs, Beverley and Honeymoon to proceed. So, I am more than happy to go into more of the science of this issue at a later stage, given that I did have discussions with Urenco-Centec on uranium enrichment in late January 1979. May I suggest that I have probably visited more reactors, more waste disposal facilities and more uranium enrichment facilities than any other member of any Australian parliament, and that is why I have a certain glow about me.

MENTAL HEALTH

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I lay on the table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to mental health made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

HOSPITALS, QUEEN ELIZABETH

Ms CHAPMAN (Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Clearly, today we have the confirmation that there will be no more babies at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. The birthing services at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital were closed in 2004 and, at that time, I recall that at the opening of stage 1 of the QEH redevelopment on 5 May 2004 the Premier announced that the funding commitment to further redevelopment of the site had been increased from \$60 million to \$120 million. We now know that on 19 May 2004, the fact that maternity services would be terminated from the package was excluded. Even if the government considered that it was an option for the future, it has now clearly made no provision for it in its \$120 million redevelopment.

We received the report of the Public Works Committee in November 2005 and that report stated:

... projects that comprise the construction of a new three level in-patient building linked to the north of Stage 1 in-patient building and including the refurbishment of the maternity wing to accommodate non-clinical education and administration functions.

There is no provision anywhere in this redevelopment for maternity services to be accommodated. So, this confirms that there will be nowhere at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital—a hospital which services the western part of metropolitan South Australia—for all those services. It, in fact, has been a hospital with some 350-odd beds, which opened in 1954 and which services a population of some 250 000 people.

We heard the Minister for Health tell us today that these people can have their children at the Women's and Children's Hospital, and that is it. There were all the claims by the former minister and the Treasurer in relation to this being a facility which would not be closing but would just be suspended for the time being. There was the Deputy Premier's confirmation that it was temporary and that they were looking, under a world-wide search, to find replacement obstetricians. They pretended that this was a facility that would just simply have a suspension of services. What is interesting to note is the Premier's announcement—shortly prior to the closure of this facility—of the \$120 million option. It was clear at that stage that the government had no intention whatsoever of providing maternity services at the time of closing down or, as they called it, suspending, because they knew at that time that the \$120 million development did not include anywhere for anyone to have any babies.

So they knew at that time—when the Premier went out there and made his usual big announcement about what they were going to do—that there was absolutely no place for women to have babies. The irony is that this is a hospital which is going to have expanded facilities for pregnancy advice privatised out to that wonderful institution, SHineSA, which is going to be relocated from Kensington to the brand-new facility out at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, and the pregnancy advisory line. So we are going to have an abortion clinic and we are going to have \$4.5 million a year worth of advice of how to not get pregnant and you cannot, on the other hand, have a baby at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital. That is the position of this government, what they are promoting. It is ironic because they are the ones who set the target in the State Strategic Plan for the increasing of South Australia's population. We are supposed to be having 2 million South Australians here by 2050. This is an objective not only for which we going in the wrong direction at the moment but which will be impossible to achieve, unless, of course, we have a major change in relation to our immigration policy, because at the moment our baby numbers are going down and our death rate is still there to exceed and we do not have any opportunity to increase population numbers.

Time expired.

STATE STRATEGIC PLAN

Mr O'BRIEN (Napier): When the Premier launched the South Australian Strategic Plan in March 2004, he made it clear that it would be reviewed and reassessed within two years. This process is currently underway and an updated plan is due in October. The plan is being reviewed in consultation with councils, community groups, businesses, and the broader public. Engaging the public is essential because the government cannot meet many of the targets without the collaboration of these groups. People will only contribute to the plan when they feel a sense of ownership over it. As a govern-

ment, we are primarily responsible for meeting some targets, but in other areas our role is one of facilitation. The South Australian Strategic Plan is a plan for all South Australians and hence requires the participation of all South Australians for it to be successful.

The government is only one of many players involved in this process. As part of the process of consultation, nine regional planning days are being held around the state to identify local priorities and needs. The planning days are supplemented by widely publicised evening community forums, which are open to anyone who cannot spare the full day. Furthermore, all South Australians are being given the opportunity to participate and contribute by providing suggestions via the website, a telephone hotline, and even via SMS. The updating of the plan is transparent, and every conceivable step has been taken to allow any interested party to contribute to the plan.

One of these regional planning days was held on Wednesday 17 May at Mawson Lakes. Community leaders came together to review the existing targets and to discuss establishing new targets that are specific to the needs of the outer northern metropolitan region. The Outer North is essentially the area north of Grand Junction Road. Participants were optimistic about the future of the north, and this optimism is in part due to the enormous and recent investment in the industrial hubs at Edinburgh Park and at Elizabeth West in my electorate. While there was a great deal of optimism expressed at the planning day, there remained concerns about education, training and employment. These concerns are, of course, not unique to the north, but they are keenly felt in this area because it has historically suffered from poor educational outcomes. The update team certainly has a challenging and difficult job ahead of it, incorporating the many suggestions that were made on the day in the Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan has been a real blessing for South Australia. Strategic planning is undertaken by all successful organisations, whether they are businesses, government organisations or community groups. A strategic plan ensures that all sections of an organisation are heading towards the same aims and targets, and it would seem logical that a state would have a strategic plan. South Australia is leading the nation in this endeavour, and I have a feeling that other states will soon follow.

In the realm of politics, where change is often implemented by legislation that is extremely difficult for people other than lawyers to follow, the Strategic Plan has the further benefit of outlining the intended directions and ambitions of the state in a manner that is easily understood by the community. The Strategic Plan is growing stronger. The willingness of the community to engage with the plan, as was demonstrated at the regional planning day at Mawson Lakes, secures the plan's future as a document that unites South Australians. The relevance of the plan is maintained by the recognition that it must be flexible enough to meet the changing needs and priorities of the state. I would like to offer my congratulations to the South Australian Strategic Plan update leadership team and all those who took time to participate in the regional planning day at Mawson Lakes. The update team has an enormous job incorporating the many suggestions it has received through the process, and I particularly await the outcome.

ADELAIDE AIRPORT

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss): I would like to endorse, assist and support the comments made by the member for Giles yesterday in relation to regional passengers at Adelaide

Airport. It is high time that airport management, and in particular Mr Phil Baker, stop firing off barbed shots at Geoff Bruce, the Managing Director of Rex. And it is high time that regional passengers were given some commonsense solutions to the disaster that is affecting them at Adelaide Airport on their arrival from ports such as Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Kangaroo Island and Mount Gambier. The member for Giles indicated that she has difficulty traversing the 300 metres, and I can understand that. I have spoken to a number of elderly passengers who are in far worse condition than the member for Giles who have all the trouble in the world and need assistance along those lines.

I raised this issue in another capacity many months ago. My former colleagues, Mayor Peter Davis of Port Lincoln and the Mayor of Whyalla, have raised it. Mayor Peter Davis is a quiet, unassuming fellow, but he is running out of patience quite quickly on this issue and no-one seems to be doing anything about it. I urged the Minister for Transport to do something about it weeks ago and nothing has happened. All we hear is a continuing diatribe between Mr Bruce and Mr Baker and nothing is getting done to fix the problem.

The problem, in the first instance, is the 300 metre walk from the furthest arrival or departure port for Rex aircraft, and it is anywhere between 300 and about 100 metres into the terminal. Mr Baker has been made aware of this on numerous occasions. There were plans to put in place a bus, but that has not happened. I also raised with him the fact that the second travelator was never put in, something that he denied but later picked up on, and he admitted that there is the capacity to put another travelator inside.

Country people are entitled to have a fair and decent go and reasonable access to the metropolitan area when they arrive at Adelaide Airport, and they are simply not getting that. Instead of being treated like decent human beings, they are required to put up with the ongoing fire and brimstone from airport management, and the problem is not getting fixed. I wholeheartedly support the comments of the member for Giles yesterday. Unfortunately, I was not in the house when she made them but I have read them today and endorse every word. No doubt the Mayor of Whyalla has also talked to the member for Giles about the subject.

If we cannot get this thing solved by some commonsense and practical diatribe between airport management and the airline companies, hopefully someone from the government might step in and belt together some heads (and I can think of one person who is not here today who can probably quite successfully do it) and draw this matter to a sensible conclusion. I and, I am sure, the member for Giles can see that there is no point in endlessly raising it in parliament and putting it on the record when no-one will do anything about it. Mayor Davis, in particular, has been vocal, but not as vocal as he might be, but I think he is running out of patience very quickly. There are now 88 flights each week in and out of Port Lincoln and the Treasurer knows what times they go.

Mr Venning: Why?

Mr PENGILLY: Why, you may well ask. He was not invited last weekend: he was told he was not allowed to go. But, hopefully, the member for Giles and I may get something happening out of this. I intend to take up the matter with her again outside of this chamber and see if we can get Mr Baker to come to his senses and deal with the problem and sort it out once and for all for regional passengers so that they have a decent experience when they arrive at or depart from Adelaide Airport.

Ms Breuer: Hear, hear!

RECONCILIATION WEEK

Ms SIMMONS (Morialta): I rise today to speak in support of a very important recognition given this week to Aboriginal reconciliation, and I add my comments to those of the minister and also the member for Florey, who has long been involved in this area, as have I. Reconciliation is the process of all Australian citizens recognising the impact that policies of forceful removal of indigenous children have had on Aboriginal communities. This impact continues to be felt throughout the community today.

It is not, as some would have us believe, a historical issue. Many of the children taken from their parents are still in their 40s and 50s and are living among us in the community. They are our colleagues and friends. For reconciliation to be successful, we need not only to recognise this travesty but also to ensure that justice is now served so that a period of healing can proceed. This week, which is dedicated to reconciliation, is about Australian citizens having a better understanding of the past and how the past still affects the lives of indigenous people today. This is a 24/7 effect, 52 weeks of the year for those who are involved. It is important that we remember that, even though we only recognise it for this one week.

On Saturday, I was privileged to attend a Reconciliation Week barbecue celebration at Thorndon Park in my electorate. It was run by the Campbelltown council's Reconciliation Advisory Council, and I congratulate the City of Campbelltown on this initiative. I offer my particular congratulations to Mia Fantasia-Copley, who was the principal organiser of this event, ably assisted by Frank Wanganeen and Ivan Copley. There was not a huge crowd present, which was a great pity, because we enjoyed a very special demonstration by the Kurna Plains Primary School led by its cultural youth adviser, Carroll Bright. Carroll is also a talented yidaki player. 'Yidaki' is the Aboriginal word for didgeridoo. It is not called a didgeridoo by the people themselves. He made this instrument resonate with the traditional sounds of the bush. He was accompanied by his daughter Keeja and one of the best young male dancers that I have seen for a long time, Kaiya.

Eight-year-old Kaiya told me proudly that his name means 'strong spear'. Kaiya's pride in his performance and his respect for his culture came alive in his traditional representation of the hunter, the emu and the kangaroo. It was a wonderful sight to see in one so young. This event is something to be built on. It is the start we need in a city council like Campbelltown to raise the awareness and importance of reconciliation within the community. I particularly congratulate Carroll on the work he is doing not only to educate the children at the Kurna Plains Primary School about their heritage culture and history but also on his efforts to widen this education to the rest of the community so that we, too, can start to understand the sorrow still felt, and express our pride and solidarity with our indigenous brothers and sisters.

TRAMLINE EXTENSION

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I rise again with a very important issue, that of our new tram extension, the massive amounts of money it will cost and the huge bungle that is confronting us. I have said before and will say again that we bought the wrong tram for all the wrong reasons. We bought the narrowest, the hottest and the most inflexible, but it was

the one that we could have on the tracks before the last state election. How cynical is that? That is an absolute disgrace that we are all going to remember and pay for for many years to come. I do not think we can get over a problem like that. If you make a decision like that, you are stuck with it for the life of the tram system. The government has made a right royal hash of this and I put all this on the record because I am going to delight in saying, 'I told you so.'

Or will I? No, I will not, because it is a sick joke. I feel sick to the core, realising what is going to happen. Yes, it is sad, and it hard to realise how this happened. Who chose this tram? Was it the hapless Dr James Horne, who has now been sacked, gone, replaced? Does he get the blame for this, too? Who is responsible for ticking off on this tram when three or four other options would have been better, especially the French Alston tram. The minister is sitting at the bench, and I congratulate him again on his elevation. He was the chairman of the last Public Works Committee. I was on that committee and enjoyed my work there.

We know that some of the people making these decisions were not qualified to make them. They made them for all the wrong reasons and now we are stuck with this. We should have brought the French Alston trams. No doubt they were dearer: they were probably three times dearer but 10 times better. They are so much more suitable for what we are trying to do with these trams here. We bought the narrowest trams so then we built the narrowest tramway on the widest tram easement in Australia. We locked ourselves out from ever being able to buy and operate the more popular, wider trams. Our stations, our crossings etc. have all been reconstructed as narrow.

To top it all off, the right-angle turn from King William Street into North Terrace will be the only turn like this on our entire tram network. Will these Bombardier trams—the 'Bay Bombers' I call them—turn in the space provided? Will someone mark the road with line-marking paint to show us the arc required for these trams to turn? To make it worse, it will be a double turning track, so you cannot cut the corner, nor can you have trams of this type passing each other on this bend. What does that do to timetabling?

If we must have the tram extension, we have to consider a different route option. As I said in my speech last week, we should keep out of King William Street and come down Gawler Place, for example, to North Terrace, cross North Terrace and return to Victoria Square via Morphett Street. We can also pick up the university and the new bus station on the way. That is commonsense, is it not? If we must come down King William Street, we should make it a single track and then return via the western option, Morphett Street to Victoria Square. I note that there has been a huge changeover in personnel in Transport SA. I also note that Mr Rod Hook has now been put in charge of this operation.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I am rather surprised that the member for Schubert, who has been here since the year 1990, would anticipate debate on Order of the Day No. 2.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order.

SCHOOLS, HALLETT COVE EAST PRIMARY

Ms FOX (Bright): I rise today to speak in support of an outstanding leadership program running in one of our southern suburbs schools. Of course, and there are many different models of student leadership, they all have their merits, but I was particularly impressed by the work of students, staff

and parents at Hallett Cove East Primary School when I visited last week. Hallett Cove East Primary School runs a student leadership program called The Lighthouse Keepers. It is so named because of the proximity of a lighthouse to the school and its use as a school logo.

I was privileged to attend the swearing in of this year's Lighthouse Keepers, and I was struck by the obvious pride that students took in becoming Lighthouse Keepers. At morning tea in the library afterwards a number of children talked to me about what it meant to them. They knew that they had a responsibility to represent their peers, to listen to them, to be role models and to provide a voice for others who might be too nervous or frightened to speak up for themselves. The Lighthouse Keepers were impressive, young, enthusiastic and very well informed. I would like to commend the principal, Mr Ian Filer, and the teacher in charge of the program, Nicole Gully, for their obvious dedication and, indeed, delight in these young people's achievements.

With the leave of the house, I will briefly explain how this program works. There are 44 Lighthouse Keepers: 38 class representatives and six executive members. Each class has two representatives who attend fortnightly meetings. These students are elected by their class. Each Lighthouse Keeper represents their class at Lighthouse Keeper meetings and makes decisions on behalf of their class, communicates information and upholds school values. The stated values of the school are collaboration, honesty, equity, responsibility and respect, and I believe that the Lighthouse Keepers are true proponents of those values.

During the meetings students talk about issues that have arisen from class meetings as well as whole school issues, such as litter in the yard, fundraising and safe play. But they are not just meetings. Students also to get to 'do'; to participate in activities that develop leadership skills such as cooperation, listening, effective communication and problem solving. There is an authentic student voice operating at Hallett Cove East Primary School, and I am very proud to have seen first-hand this example of strong youth leadership developing in the south.

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

A quorum having been formed:

OBESITY AND FAST FOODS

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Minister for Health): I move:

That this house requests that the Social Development Committee inquire into and report upon the link between obesity and fast foods, and in particular—

- a) the recent trends in fast food and beverage consumption in South Australia;
- b) the impact of fast foods on obesity and the health of South Australians;
- c) the marketing of fast foods and its impact on particular groups, especially children; and
- d) the measures, including regulatory, which can be taken to reduce any negative impact from fast foods at the government, community, corporate and family levels.

I am very pleased to move this motion, which requests that the Social Development Committee inquire into and report on the link between obesity and fast foods. The spiralling epidemic of obesity in our community is a problem that both sides of politics acknowledge needs to be tackled. This

problem is especially an issue when it comes to children, and the government is working hard with schools and communities to promote healthy eating choices. There is a growing body of evidence that suggests that obesity amongst children is increasing and that the main cause of this is what children are eating.

The Social Development Committee has previously inquired into obesity. Its report in May 2004 provided valuable recommendations for government and the community which are now being acted upon. The committee report did contain recommendations which touched on the issue of fast food, but since that time we have gained greater knowledge of the impact of overweight and obesity in the community. International experts are also advocating the need for multiple strategies to halt the obesity epidemic, supporting individuals to choose healthy foods as well as making this easy through policies and regulations such as limiting food advertising to children.

Since the obesity inquiry in 2003 there has been increasing evidence that links fast food and sweet drinks with obesity and unhealthy eating. Recent survey data from Victoria found that nearly 80 per cent of Victorian teenagers are drinking high calorie sugar drinks at alarming levels. The study also found that more than one-third of teenagers are consuming nearly two cans of high sugar content drinks each day, and nearly one in 10 are drinking more than one litre of high calorie sweet drinks each day. The survey follows recent US research which found that teenagers who consume a can of sugary drink a day are likely to be up to 6.4 kg heavier after just one year compared to those drinking unsweetened drinks. A recent study of 5 407 students from 90 public schools in New South Wales, commissioned by the state government, contradicts the urban myth that children are increasingly inactive and hooked on sedentary pastimes. They are, in fact, exercising much harder than the 1990s yet they are still putting on weight. Over-eating is seen as the main cause.

Michael Booth, the University of Sydney doctor who conducted the state-wide survey, had this to say:

Television advertising and toy give-aways should be regulated—and firms that promote high calorie foods with limited nutritional value should be banned from sponsorship of junior sport. . .

I believe that we need to take regulatory action to stop fast food advertising during children's television hours. Some other state health ministers share my view, but not all. The federal health minister, Tony Abbott, does not support that position and believes that it is up to the families, not the government, to take action. Since the federal government controls communications legislation we cannot do much about this, so I want this committee to work in a bipartisan way to build a case that we can put to the federal government. I hope that the committee will hear from doctors, scientists, teachers and parents, as well as the fast food companies that produce these goods to question these companies about what steps they are taking to combat obesity. Interestingly enough, some of the companies are doing something. I understand that Coca-Cola is withdrawing its Coca-Cola products from sale in schools on a voluntary basis.

Mrs Redmond: Will Macca's do the same?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: McDonald's have done certain things. Although, I understand anecdotally that what happens when McDonald's sells salads is that it makes them more attractive to the mothers to come in. They eat the salads and the dads and the kids eat the other food. So, it may have the reverse effect on the outcomes that might have been expected.

I am informed that, in 2001, McDonald's spent up to \$57 million on media advertising.

Mrs Redmond: Just in Australia?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Just in Australia. In that climate, it is difficult for healthy food messages to get through to our children. Junk food advertising also predominantly contains images of healthy, attractive young people. To young overweight children, these ads link personal happiness and enhancement through food consumption.

I have recently received a report from the Coalition on Food Advertising to Children. This group includes the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, the Cancer Council of Australia, Nutrition Australia, the Women's and Children's Hospital, and Dr Rosemary Stanton, among others. A study of 13 OECD countries showed that Australia had the highest number of television food advertisements per hour. In Australia, 12 food advertisements screened per hour during children's programming compared with Sweden and Austria, where only one food ad was screened per hour. A New South Wales study shows that the average child sees 77 ads for fast food each and every week. The same study shows that children's television shows three times as much fast food advertising than general television.

Countries such as Sweden, Belgium, Denmark and Italy place restrictions on advertising during children's programs. The types of food ads being shown to our children are also important. Over three-quarters of food advertisements during children's programming times are for fast food meals and foods high in sugar and fat. With this level of fast food ads on our screens it is difficult for parents to deal with the pestering of their children. Anybody who has had children understands this. Today I attended the Central Northern Adelaide Health Service's Healthy Weight Forum where I heard evidence from Dr Colin Bell of Deakin University that 73 per cent of children demand food products which they have seen advertised. When parents say no, 80 per cent of these children persist with their demands.

Mrs Redmond: Only 83 per cent!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: That's right; it is amazing. No wonder the companies want to keep advertising. They know that it works. They target the kids, who target the parents, putting the parents under pressure, and they give in—not always but regularly. We all know it. We all did it. Those of us who have had children, and those of us who still have young children, understand the enormous pressure that it places on families.

Fast food is promoted in a wide range of ways, both by direct and indirect advertising. While direct advertising includes television, magazines and the internet, indirect advertising takes place through sports sponsorships, free samples and tie-ins with TV shows and movies. Already we are trying to tackle obesity and overweight in schools through the move to ban junk food in school canteens by 2008 and the Premier's Be Active Challenge for school students.

Another area of increasing knowledge and concern is the high level of trans-fatty acids in many of the fast foods. These facts do not add any flavour to the food but allow fast food companies to store their food for longer periods of time. A high consumption of these fats has been linked with high rates of heart disease. I am aware of a study where a survey was undertaken to compare the volume of trans-fatty acids in a sample meal taken from a fast food chain in the United States, France and Denmark. It was the same meal—chicken nuggets and french fries. I am not sure which company it was from.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: The bloke who invented the chicken nugget only recently died.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Excellent. It was the same meal in three countries. In the United States, that meal contained over 10 grams of trans-fatty acids. In France—it tasted exactly the same—it was just over five grams, and in Denmark it was 0.33 grams of trans-fatty acids. It was lower in Denmark because they have regulations about the quantity of trans-fatty acids that you can have in food. The food tastes exactly the same; the difference is, you cannot leave it on the shelf for as long. So, the company is transferring the cost onto the health system by keeping their products on the shelves longer, because if you eat a certain quantity of trans-fatty acids in your diet you are much more likely to have heart disease, and that means the state and the taxpayers have to pay for it. In Denmark the government has taken action to regulate the level of trans-fatty acids in food. Essentially, they have stopped the fast food companies from passing their costs onto the health system. So I would like this inquiry to investigate regulatory steps—such as Denmark's legislation—which the South Australian government or the commonwealth government may take.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: A new gym for Parliament House. This inquiry will provide us with further information on what other actions we need to take to minimise the negative impact of fast foods on healthy outcomes in our community. I believe that this inquiry will add to the parliament's knowledge and help us tackle the social problem in a bipartisan way. It is timely to review this issue and consider options to ensure that South Australians are supported to eat a healthy diet. Some may suggest—and I think the shadow minister suggested that this inquiry was not broad enough—that other lifestyle issues should be considered. I want this to be a narrow inquiry to look at fast foods and, in particular, to look at the advertising of fast foods, and the impact that these foods and the advertising of them is having on our children. I think I know the answers, I think most of us intuitively understand the issue, but, if we can build up a body of knowledge, and create a platform for the public and others to come in, say what they think and get the message out there and, hopefully, get a bipartisan or multi-partisan approach in South Australia, that will help us to mount a campaign to get the commonwealth government to make appropriate changes to protect the health of our children.

Mr VENNING secured the adjournment of the debate.

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COURT (JURISDICTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.
(Continued from 10 May. Page 223.)

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen): I indicate that I will lead the debate for the opposition on the bill, and I am pleased to indicate that not only do we support the bill but I do not think we will be delaying the house very long in an extensive debate.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Unless I taunt you unmercifully.

Mrs REDMOND: That's right, unless the Attorney taunts me during my contribution unmercifully, in which case I may have to continue for some hours, but I am sure the member

for Little Para will make sure that he does not do that so that people who are not well can go home. The reason that we are able to support this, Madam Deputy Speaker, is that it is a relatively straightforward piece of legislation which is designed to correct a slight anomaly, or catch 22, which currently exists. The Environment, Resources and Development Court usually hears civil cases, that is, cases brought by one person or organisation against another person or organisation in matters of an environmental nature. That is predominantly the jurisdiction which it exercises, but it does have a small criminal jurisdiction, and it may try and sentence minor indictable environmental offences.

Offences can be either summary—that is, those with a maximum fine of no more than currently \$120 000, and a maximum, if there is a period of imprisonment, of two years' imprisonment—or minor indictable, which will be either not punishable by imprisonment at all but with a maximum fine of more than \$120 000, or they might have a maximum term of imprisonment of up to five years. The jurisdiction of the Environment, Resources and Development Court is shared with the Magistrates Court, even though most of the cases in the criminal jurisdiction of that court are heard in the Environment, Resources and Development Court.

The problem begins with the fact that a person charged with a minor indictable offence in the Magistrates Court may elect to be tried in the District Court and if they take that option it will be trial by jury. But if they do not take that option, if they do not elect for a trial in the District Court, then the case will be heard summarily either before a magistrate or a judge sitting alone. The problem arises because summary criminal courts, such as the Environment, Resources and Development Court, must sentence minor indictable offences as if they are summary offences. There are limits set on the sentences that a summary court can impose for a minor indictable offence. So, in the case of the Environment, Resources and Development Court, the maximum penalties which may be imposed, if the matter is heard as a summary offence, are a maximum two years' imprisonment or a maximum of a \$120 000 fine. In fact, part of the anomaly that we are trying to correct with this legislation—or rather that the government is trying to correct—is that in the Magistrates Court the maximum fine is \$150 000, whereas in the Environment, Resources and Development Court the maximum fine is \$120 000.

If the matter is heard in the Magistrates Court summarily and at the conclusion of the matter the magistrate thinks that the offending merits a higher penalty than what the magistrate is authorised to impose—that is, higher than the Magistrates Court limit—the magistrate can remand the offender to be sentenced in the District Court. That removes the jurisdictional limit for that sentencing. But the same situation does not apply if the matter is heard in the Environment, Resources and Development Court. So the outcome of that is that the choice of jurisdiction is going to be made by the prosecutor and the prosecutor—if they elected to take it into the Magistrates Court—the person gets the election of a trial by jury and the magistrate has the ability to send it up to the District Court for sentencing without the usual summary offence jurisdictional limits. But if they go into the Environment, Resources and Development Court, they do not get that option. They cannot request the trial in the District Court and nor can the Environment, Resources and Development Court judge refer the matter for sentencing to the District Court.

So the result of that in practice, of course, is that people who are found guilty of an offence—because of those limits

and because most of the matters are heard in the Environment, Resources and Development Court—the limits are such that people who are convicted will often, in that court, not be eligible to have the maximum offences applied to them. That really is the nub of the problem that is aimed at with this legislation. But, as I said, it also deals with the issue of the option to have a trial by jury, which you have if you start in the Magistrates Court but you do not have if you start in the Environment, Resources and Development Court.

So, the effect of the bill, as I understand it, will be essentially four-fold. Firstly, the Magistrates Court will no longer have the jurisdiction at all for offences under the Environment, Resources and Development Court Act. Those cases will only be able to be brought in that court, that specialist court set up specifically to hear those cases. The monetary jurisdiction of the Environment, Resources and Development Court will be raised to \$300 000, which is significantly higher, but the limit of the maximum two years' imprisonment will remain. But the Environment, Resources and Development Court will also be able to remand for sentence into the District Court. So, if the judge in that court thinks that the offending is so serious that the offender should be subjected to higher penalties, there is the potential to do what currently the magistrate can do but the judge in the Environment, Resources and Development Court cannot do, and that is to remand the matter for sentence into the District Court where you do not have that limit on the maximum term of imprisonment.

The fourth way in which it will be changed is that the defendant in the Environment, Resources and Development Court may elect a trial by jury in the District Court. So, that part of the jurisdiction has effectively been moved from the Magistrates Court, and what the Magistrates Court had has been moved up to the Environment, Resources and Development Court with this increased limit to \$300 000, which, I am advised, has no particular origin other than that the bill was widely consulted upon. Indeed, the changes are being made at the request of at least the Chief Judge and, I think, the other judges of the Environment, Resources and Development Court, and the figure was one which those consulted upon thought was appropriate. It was certainly high enough to give the court the level of jurisdiction which it feels it needs.

It is understood that these changes were requested by the court, because there have been these differences with the effect that, of course, a police prosecutor could elect to put someone into the Magistrates Court rather than the Environment, Resources and Development Court with different consequences in terms of the penalty that can be imposed if they elected, and deprive them, if they put them into the Environment, Resources and Development Court, of the option of having a trial by jury. All of that gets removed by this amendment. The jurisdictional limit is increased to what is considered to be a realistic level, and we still take care of the issue that, where someone has done some environmental offending which is so serious that those limits within the Environment, Resources and Development Court are not considered to be sufficient, the judge of that court can remand the matter for sentence in the District Court.

As I said, the bill is relatively straightforward. It seeks to address some current anomalies, and I think it will do so successfully at the request of the court, and should lead to a better administration of justice regarding the issues of the environment and actions brought for those offending under Environment, Resources and Development Court legislation.

With those few comments, I indicate that the opposition will be supporting the bill.

Mr HANNA (Mitchell): I am pleased to support the Environment, Resources and Development Court (Jurisdiction) Amendment Bill. To appreciate the history of the matter, I refer any interested parties to the debate in the House of Assembly on 22 March 2004. At that time, I was speaking about a government proposal, the Statutes Amendments (Courts) Bill, which made a variety of amendments, and I specifically referred to the difficulties in appropriate sentencing faced by the Environment, Resources and Development Court. Because I was not satisfied with the state of that particular bill, on 1 April 2004, I moved an amendment to allow the ERD Court to impose fines of up to \$2 million. That amendment was based on considerations of the judgment in *Circelli and Southcorp Wines*, a judgment delivered by Her Honour Judge Trenorden, in the court on 18 December 2000. In that judgment Her Honour carefully goes through the limitations of the ERD Court sentencing and contrasts that with the capacity of the Magistrates Court in comparable matters.

I made the comment that, if the government was not going to make changes to the ERD Court's ability to sentence in appropriately severe cases, it could be considered soft on crime—soft on environmental crime at least. I made the point that the ERD Court has a role to play in sentencing beyond that which other citizens might expect if they were directly affected by pollution or some serious environmental offence. In other words, the suburban residents who were upset by toxic pollution allowed in a suburban setting or those who were affected by a dramatic oil spill off the coast would no doubt have a civil action against the polluter, but we all have an interest in maintaining the environment, which is why we have the environmental protection laws that we have, and therefore we also consider it sufficiently serious to make it a crime to pollute in the ways that are proscribed by legislation.

The end result of that debate back in 2004 was that the government opposed the amendment, but I concluded my remarks with the following comments:

If not on this occasion, I would hope that the Attorney would give serious consideration to giving the ERD Court a proper criminal jurisdiction to deal with offences that are peculiarly environmental in nature. They are there in the Environment Protection Act, the ERD court is set up to deal with them, let it have the powers to do it. If it is not, as I said, the government is being soft on crime, soft on environmental crime.

I am pleased to see that, although the government has not taken up precisely the suggestion I put forward then, it has obviously considered the matter, and I am pleased that the Attorney and his advisers have come back with improvements to the ability of the ERD Court to sentence appropriately—or, to be precise, to have a serious matter removed to the District Court for an appropriately severe sentence.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I am grateful for the member for Heysen and the member for Mitchell's support and thoughtful contributions to the debate, and I also express my thanks to the public servant whose patience and thoroughness has brought this wise bill before us.

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

WATTLE RANGE PAR

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Attorney-General): I lay on the table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Wattle Range PAR made in another place by the Minister for Urban Development and Planning.

ADJOURNMENT DEBATE

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

That the house do now adjourn.

Mr VENNING (Schubert): I cannot believe that it is five minutes past four and we are on our way home after three very short days. After all the criticism that there has been in the last couple of weeks about the house not sitting enough, we sit and we are on our way home at a little bit after 4 o'clock. We are heading for the state's next milestone in 2036—the state's bicentenary, which is 30 years from now. I realise there could be some members here who could still be in this house to experience it in 2036.

Mr Pengilly: 27 July.

Mr VENNING: 27 July in 2036. I intend to be alive and well. I will be 90 years of age. I have a good friend here who is almost that age and, if I am as fit as she is, I will be very pleased. I intend to be alive and well at 90 years so I can say, 'I told you.' I do not think I will still be here in this place, although I have not said I am going to retire yet, but I think at the age of 90 I might have left.

The question is: what will our state be like in 2036? How will the Rann Labor government be remembered on our 200th birthday? How will it be remembered? Let us be realistic and sensible about this. Our state is falling apart while the government swims in money. It is totally inept. I did have the word 'corrupt' in mind, but that is not fair. But it is inept totally. How can we now have the worst roads in the nation when just 30 years ago we had the best roads in the nation? Our water delivery services, sewerage and public transport system have all come to a point of public condemnation. Other states have had the Olympic Games, the Commonwealth Games and their international expos which have meant huge investment in infrastructure, and they have all reaped huge benefits and we have not been able to reap that benefit.

South Australia now trails all other states. We have the worst roads and we spend the least on them of any state in Australia per capita, and that is a disgrace. Queensland is spending \$10 billion over five years on its roads, and look at how many roads it has. We spend paltry amounts, and we all know that. How can it be when today we are absolutely swimming in resources? We have money coming out of our ears, a huge resources boom with millions of royalties to the state. These resource industries are booming all across Australia, and the states are all doing very well because of it. What are we doing with our royalties that are coming into the state, the massive GST payments, the record high income, the record high property taxes, and the new taxes bringing in millions and millions of dollars? These taxes are multiplying, but what do we have to show for them? What is coming out the other end of our government processes? What do we have to show for all these massive government collections and supposed expenditures, and what do we do when the resources boom comes to an end?

We have just had the leanest four years on record in relation to public works: four years of practically nothing. I

know, because I was on the Public Works Committee for those four years. Infrastructure designed and built today will be paramount in the year 2036. A lot of these big projects will be in the middle of their design lives. The Rann Labor government spends most of its money promoting itself. It has a huge public relations expenditure, the largest per capita in Australia, telling us how good it is. Just check the size of the Premier's public relations and media outfit. The Premier's Department and a conglomerate of other allied departments are all there, despite any of the real facts, to put a positive spin on anything and everything and make the Premier and the government look good.

They know they prey on an unsuspecting, lethargic and apathetic public. That is what compulsory voting does: we have no interest; nobody cares; they just get totally swept away by this huge PR campaign, the 'Rann Gets it Done' campaign, which was paid for largely by the government purse, and the unsuspecting public got totally sucked in. Premier Rann is nothing but a perceptual politician, and history will show that he will be remembered as the man who sank South Australia. On the farm when you have a good year, as I think some members opposite would understand, you plough the money back into the farm because you know that there is nothing surer than that the next drought is one year closer.

Here we have the prodigal son: the prodigal perceptual Premier who is wasting our inheritance and laying the future to waste, and nobody can see it; nobody understands it; nobody cares. Yes, we have a few iconic projects to appease the public, such as the trams, which we spoke about a few moments ago, illegally, and the lifting bridges. We saw \$100 million thrown away on the world's largest lifting bridges, which I tell members now will be welded shut, because I do not think they can work. Why do we have these lifting bridges? So that Tommy the tug boat can make his grand entrance through them occasionally. I doubt whether he ever will.

Members interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I am in opposition, remember. I do not like being negative, but it is my job. You also made me the whip, to boot, so I am doubly grumpy. Who makes these decisions? It is just like the tram decision. Those in government appoint people who are able to make the right decisions for us, the people of South Australia. You have public servants who think they know but who make all the wrong decisions for all the wrong reasons. We have these dubious projects now that none of us are going to be very proud of. It is a very serious situation. I am only a humble backbencher, but very senior public servants say to me, 'Where has all the money gone? Where is all the money going?'

Again, the Premier wants to surround himself with a huge entourage of highly paid PR people and media experts. Yes,

they work well: just check the state election result and the 'Rann Gets Results' campaign. Nothing is happening, and the people voted for them in droves. They were absolutely conned all the way. This government has lost control of its public service. One estimate told to me, whether true or not, was that 4 000 extra people got jobs and the government did not even realise it. It did not know where they were. It is estimated that the government's wage bill increased by over \$100 million in the last four years, and, worse, that very few of them are nurses, policemen or school teachers.

It is all in the bureaucracy of government: the consultants, the designers, the architects, the department boffins, the project officers, the equal opportunity officers, the planners, etc. They are all admin people, all paper shufflers, the payers, and the government pushes on blindly, promising to fix the roads, but it does nothing. It is following the federal government's guidelines. When the grants come out, the government matches them with bare funds. I give the government some credit: it did put unders and overs on that wonderful expressway on the way to Port Adelaide, but that was paid for largely with federal funds. Going back to the trams—and I got bombed out earlier for that—we push on with them against public opposition.

We just keep on going, because when can a government decide it has got this wrong and back off and say, 'Look, we'll do something else'? With the trams I am putting up an alternative. The government can do what it likes: it could do nothing or save face. I am on the record in 1991 talking about trams. We, the elected opposition, were not able to get our message across at the election because of a lack of resources and because we are up against a huge machine. Premier Rann will be remembered for the 'Rann ruined' regime. But what about our prophets in the media? What are they saying about it? What about the Kevin Naughtons, the Bevans and Abrahams, the Rex Jorys, the Greg Keltons and Bildsteins of the world saying about it? What do they write about it?

These are the prophets. These are the people who are supposed to be telling people how it is. It is not a joke: it is serious; and we pay the price of having only one daily paper in this town. I am not very proud of that, either. All spend more time attacking the perceived opposition ineptitudes and let the Rann government continue scot-free. Let me assure members opposite that in 2036 they will be remembered, too. I am very cognisant that I, too, will not be covered in gloss when the celebrating masses of 2036 consider what happened 30 years ago in this parliament. I am a member of this parliament and I will wear it too, and I am quite anxious about that. It's not too late—we can turn all this around—and we should, now.

Time expired; motion carried.

At 4.15 p.m. the house adjourned until Monday 5 June at 2 p.m.