

# HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday 12 May 2010

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

## STATUTES AMENDMENT (ELECTRICITY AND GAS—PRICE DETERMINATION PERIODS) BILL

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (11:02):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electricity Act 1996 and the Gas Act 1997. Read a first time.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (11:02):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

The Australian Energy Market Commission (AEMC) in its review of the South Australian energy market has indicated concern with the level of flexibility in existing energy price control frameworks.

The South Australian Government has no intention to remove energy price control mechanisms at this time, but has been prepared to examine ways of making the existing framework better.

The Essential Services Commission of South Australia (ESCOSA) has advised that while there is a degree of flexibility within the current regime, greater flexibility would be achieved if provisions in both the Electricity and Gas Acts allowed for a variation of an existing price determination in cases where special circumstances exist, without the need for a new three year determination to be made.

ESCOSA considers that special circumstances are generally events of a magnitude to disturb the fundamental basis of an existing Price Determination so much as to require a new determination to be made. So, if an unexpected event occurs which can be shown to have a material impact on the credibility of the existing price path determination, a review would be initiated pursuant to the 'special circumstances' provisions of the Acts to confirm or deny the existence of special circumstances. If the event was unable to be predicted, planned or reasonably insured against, then 'special circumstances' exist.

The current provisions allow a new price determination be made before the expiry of the preceding determination in cases where ESCOSA has determined that special circumstances exist. Under the current arrangements, any flexibility, however is lost due to the requirement that the new determination itself will need to be made for at least three years.

While this current provision is suitable if the existing price determination was nearing its completion, it would be more cost efficient and timely to make an adjustment to an existing price determination within its own life without the need to make a new determination of at least three years.

The Bill provides ESCOSA with the ability to determine whether making a new three year price determination or making an intra-period variation to the existing determination was the more efficient approach following the confirmation of the existence of special circumstances. This may depend on the timing of the pass-through proposal in relation to the age of the existing price determination. The Bill amendments provide the opportunity to deal with special circumstances in a more timely and less costly manner.

The practical effect of this amendment would be that if a significant change in input costs arose following the commencement of a three-year price path, then that existing price determination could be varied by a subsequent variation to the price determination.

Alternatively, if a significant change in input costs (i.e. special circumstances) arose towards the end of a three year path, ESCOSA could use its discretion and decide that making a new price determination at this time would be less onerous than revising the existing price determination and making a new one in the near future. This is already allowed under section 36AA(4a)(d)(i) of the *Electricity Act 1996* and section 34A(4a)(d)(i) of the *Gas Act 1997*.

I commend the Bill to Members.

### Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Electricity Act 1996*

3—Amendment of section 36AA—Provision for standing contract with small customers

This clause relates to the *Electricity Act 1996* and will allow the Essential Services Commission, in special circumstances, to make a determination that has the effect of varying an existing standing contract price determination for the balance of the term of the existing determination.

Part 3—Amendment of *Gas Act 1997*

4—Amendment of section 34A—Standing contracts

This clause relates to the *Gas Act 1997* and has a comparable effect to the amendment set out in clause 3.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Griffiths.

### ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 11 May 2010.)

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (11:03):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I believe that I have about 18 minutes to complete my speech. I have talked about the nice stuff that has occurred and said some complimentary words about the leader in the lead-up to the election, but I would now like to talk about some important issues which relate to the future of South Australia and which come from the Governor's speech delivered last week.

I will start on infrastructure. The obvious ones of which we are aware are roads, rail, water and electricity. I thought it was interesting that, as part of the election campaign, on 17 February, before the writs were issued, announcements were made by the opposition and the government about efforts to be made on the Southern Expressway. We were intending to announce that project. It was high on our priority list. The word now is that the government heard a whisper about the project and decided it, too, wanted to announce it.

The government suddenly came up with \$445 million. It is interesting that the public record will reflect the fact that on radio and in the media both the Premier and the Treasurer were quoted as saying that it had been provisioned for, it was in the estimates, it was in an unallocated capital fund. So, it was fair enough for me to assume in the role that I was occupying at that time that provision had been made for it and it was not necessarily an election commitment. That was proven to be very different two days before the election, of course, when the finances were announced and it was suddenly decided that the Treasurer had put that \$445 million in there.

It was somewhat of a tricky one for us. But, importantly for the people of the south, that project is being built. It was a commitment that the Liberal Party supported very strongly. It is pleasing that the Labor Party has been brought into supporting that now whereas, only some months before that, the Minister for Transport was saying that it was not going to happen. The member for Mawson was also saying that it was not going to occur, and it was interesting that the commitment we in opposition made to that project resulted in its coming forward, and it is pleasing that it is going to be delivered.

**Mr Pengilly:** Mawson-saver, it was!

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** It was the saver of Mawson, says the member for Finnis. We certainly did it in support of our candidate there but, importantly for the 30,000 people within that electorate and the hundreds of thousands of people who live in the south, it is an important bit of infrastructure for them and it has to occur.

However, it is very symptomatic of infrastructure needs around all of South Australia—not just in the metropolitan areas but also in the regional areas. That is why I am particularly pleased that it is again part of an election commitment that we made (and the Labor government has not supported) to fund completely the road backlog of \$200 million (identified by the RAA and quantified probably four or five years ago as being at that \$200 million figure, and no doubt it has grown to a much larger figure now) over a four year period. In the initial four years we would have put \$52 million into it, funding the remaining \$148 million over the following six years beyond the forward estimates.

It is a great frustration to me, and certainly to any person who drives on the roads around South Australia, that so many of our roads are of such poor quality. From the people of Yorke Peninsula, and the Goyder electorate in particular, I am constantly bombarded—and I mean bombarded—with calls and direct contact. People everywhere I go are saying they are sick of their

roads being in such poor condition. It is interesting that all members on this side can reflect upon the fact that they have sections of road within their electorates that are a disgrace.

**Ms Chapman:** Take the roundabout.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** The member for Bragg talks about the Britannia roundabout. Again, that was a commitment that the Liberal government would have fixed. But it is symptomatic of the fact that this government has no plan to fix infrastructure, and that is what South Australia needs. Taxpayers of this state put an enormous amount of revenue into the government coffers to ensure that services and infrastructure are provided, but it is just not transitioning to on-the-ground works, and that is what we need. We need to see a plan that actually addresses this, where people can have some hope and faith in the future that something is going to be done.

It does not eventuate from the other side, and that is what is necessary. If you are going to be in government, you need to ensure that the people of South Australia receive the infrastructure they need, and that is bridges, roads, an extension of our water network and ensuring water quality and supply. It is also ensuring that the airports are upgraded - it is everything. I am very frustrated by the number of contacts I have had in the short time I have been shadow minister for transport; there has been an expression of frustration that people in South Australia feel about the non-delivery of important infrastructure. It has to be fixed, and it has to be a priority. From the Liberal side of things it is, very differently, a priority, and we need to ensure that we get it right.

That is why I felt a kindred spirit with the member for Stuart when he indicated in his maiden speech that he is prepared to acknowledge when the right decision is made and compliment who makes that decision, no matter what political party they come from. I also believe in that, because I think it is important that politics are not completely negative when you are in opposition. You do need to recognise when good things are achieved, but you also need to ensure that you criticise when the work is not being done. In this case, infrastructure is sadly lacking and it is an important area for the state to perform in.

The Governor's speech also made what I think is a quite outrageous suggestion, that is, that South Australia is outperforming other states in a number of important indicators of economic activity. Sadly, in the relatively short time that I was shadow treasurer, the only area I can see that we are winning in is state taxation policies, because we are certainly the highest in the nation. Until we get our tax policies right and create an environment in which business is encouraged in this state (particularly small business, where there is the greatest risk of their falling over due to unfair and uncompetitive tax regimes), we are going to continually struggle to encourage a competitive nature in our businesses that want not only to do work in South Australia but also to see whether the opportunity exists for them to do work in other states in Australia.

We are constantly told that in larger projects such as the Northern Expressway, which is worth \$564 million, there are a number of interstate contractors working, and the contractors' federation has been talking to us and telling us it is because of the frustration of the tax regimes that are in place and the unfairness that exists. We need to ensure that we create an environment in South Australia where our businesses have an opportunity, where hard work will be rewarded and where enterprise will be rewarded; the opportunity for profit is there, the opportunity for increasing their employment opportunities is there and, importantly, they have an opportunity to grow their business and let it live to its fullest potential. We need this to happen very soon. Sadly, it is not.

The global financial crisis has created a challenge, and I acknowledge that as much as anyone. It is interesting that the federal budget delivered last night talked about the additional rivers of gold of GST revenue that will flow through to South Australia—some \$782 million, I think, over the remainder of this financial year and the 2010-11 financial year, but, in essence, \$1.7 billion more in GST revenue from what was predicted as part of the Mid-Year Budget Review on 28 January.

That is an enormous quantum of sums. It will create the capacity for services and infrastructure to be provided, it will create the capacity for tax reform to exist and it will create an environment in which South Australia has a chance to grow. Let us indeed hope that those who control the Treasury benches have the vision and the foresight to use that initial GST revenue to ensure that South Australians get everything they need. It must happen. It is interesting because, when the Henry tax review was first launched, the Liberal Party in opposition had been very proactive on tax reform.

The member for Waite certainly espoused the virtues of the need for South Australia to reform its taxation situation. A tax summit had been held. We had been believers in tax reform in this state, but, when federal tax reform opportunities were announced (inclusive of the words, I believe from the Prime Minister, 'root and branch reform'), the Treasurer of South Australia chose to make only a 3½ page submission which talked about the fact that it was not necessary, and that just shows the complete lack of understanding I think he has for the difficulties facing South Australia. Let us hope that moves forward.

A lot of those 126 recommendations, obviously, will not be supported by any political party, and the member for Bragg pointed out to me that it proposes the introduction of land tax upon every property. That is certainly not something that the Liberal Party in South Australia supports. We want land tax reforms, certainly, but not the introduction of a broad blanket land tax regime across all properties.

I also wish to comment briefly on the 100,000 jobs that the Governor mentioned in his speech as being part of the vision for a Rann/Foley Labor government. I do have a recollection that, when the Treasurer and I had a Press Club debate a couple of weeks before the election, a lot of interesting things occurred that day.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** The member for Schubert was in attendance. The Treasurer made a statement about the fact that the 100,000 training positions were traineeships, and I tweaked at that. I said, 'Well, Treasurer, you are actually wrong there. Traineeships are jobs. They are 12 month jobs that are in place, whereas training places are an opportunity for people to get their training done.' Yes, I commend the fact that 100,000 places will be funded, and it is pleasing that the federal government has identified even more funds to go to training places because it is part of the necessity for ensuring that our future skilled workforce is there.

We do have a great challenge facing South Australia over the next 12 or so years with the baby boomers suddenly going into retirement. Over that period something like 200,000 people in the workforce will be retiring; plus, if economic opportunity becomes reality and the chances for so many industry and job opportunities are developed as part of the growth that South Australia will potentially receive if it gets the support it needs from the government, we will have probably another 130,000 jobs created from that.

The dilemma is to ensure that, certainly, our young people have the opportunity to enter the workforce (if their work ethic is there), but we need to ensure that the training is there for them and to make sure that the skills that are needed in the business opportunities that will be created through retirement and through development in the state are happening. So, training is an absolutely key point. I know that the member for Unley, as our shadow minister, is very dedicated to this, having in his own previous business experience before coming into the parliament trained some 20 young apprentices.

We need to make sure that the state is focusing on that, giving young people a chance for a future and ensuring that the business opportunities in this state have all the skills needed to grow and to be competitive on a national and international basis, and that is where I want to lead into the export frustrations that I think many people on this side of the chamber feel. No doubt other members will mention it also, and the leader spoke yesterday about the fact that only 9 per cent of South Australia's business is export and that the national average is something like 14 per cent. Exports within South Australia are down by significant levels in dollar terms compared with what they were in 2003, without allowing for inflation at all and real growth in dollars.

Yes, we have been hit by a variety of issues on a worldwide basis but, if you look at the underperformance of South Australia's export opportunities, we need to grow that enormously. We need to put an enormous effort into ensuring that our businesses, small and large, are export ready and that they have the chance to capitalise upon opportunities that exist outside South Australia and outside Australia. Let's hope that it becomes a focus of government because I know that, from our side of things, we have recognised for many years the challenges facing business and industry, and we want to ensure that it gets all the support that it can to grow and to reach its potential.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Goyder, can I interrupt for a minute? Could members please keep the noise down? I have had some complaints that people cannot hear and I am also trying to listen.

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** The member for Finniss does have a hearing issue, though. I thank you for your guidance, Madam Speaker. There are a lot of discussions going on. Land tax was a very interesting one, and it is part of the tax reform call that we have had. In October 2009, the Liberal Party released its land tax policy calling for an increase in the threshold. I have a very clear recollection that, at the time, the Treasurer called us irresponsible. It was framed in a difficult economic climate but it was framed with the understanding that investment in property is one of the basic rights of an Australian and, at the moment with the land tax regime that exists in this state, there is no encouragement to undertake that investment in property. We need to ensure that the regime is there, and that is why our proposal was to increase the threshold and to remove some 50,000-odd people from the need to pay land tax.

It was interesting that, as part of the Mid-Year Budget Review on 28 January, the Treasurer was finally dragged into the argument. No doubt pressure was being brought to bear by a lot of electorates in the eastern suburbs of Adelaide where people are under a lot of pressure and sick of paying land tax; they wanted something done about it and the Treasurer finally brought it into recognition. He has increased it to \$300,000. It removes 74,500 people from the land tax need. It shrinks the base for people who will pay it.

I find it interesting that, even though it comes at a cost of \$52 million per year, the forward estimates still show an increase in land tax revenue, and I think that is the fact that people need to be concerned about. There has been some adjustment to the threshold, some minor adjustment to the rate and middle threshold, but it is that top threshold above the million dollars which is the large-scale property investment that we need. I recognise that it is based upon the land value, but we have to have reform across all the areas to ensure that land tax becomes fair and equitable. In the 2008-09 financial year—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**Mr GRIFFITHS:** Yes; in the 2008-09 financial year, land tax revenue from private property investors went from \$220 million to \$330 million—a 50 per cent increase in one year. The member for Norwood quite rightly points out that it is a tax on jobs. It clearly is a tax on jobs. So many people expressed their frustration, talked about significant increases in land tax in the range of \$30,000 to \$40,000 for small businesses and talked about the fact that it created the need for them to get rid of people within their workplaces. That is not good enough. In difficult times a tax from a state government forcing people out of work is a disgrace. It needs to be fixed.

Payroll taxation is also an area where we think some reform opportunities need to exist. I recognise that the Governor's speech refers to the removal of payroll tax liability as it relates to apprentices and trainees. I would like some clarification on that because my understanding is that the wages paid to those apprentices and trainees in those businesses will still be included in the preliminary calculation but then the rate of payroll tax that would have been levied on that remuneration to trainees and apprentices is actually rebated back.

The Liberal proposal which we put out as part of the election was to remove that wage component completely from the calculation—therefore, in many cases, not tripping a business over the \$600,000 threshold and not making it responsible for payroll tax. Labor has the other side of the argument which is, as the member for Morphett points out, the tricky version of how you can do it because it still potentially creates a liability where, under our system, it would not have existed.

Communicating that message and making the people of South Australia understand that is the challenge but it is something that we continue to fight for. I also noted that the Governor's speech referred to a proposal for a small and medium-sized business investment development program to be established. I have done a quick search on that and I cannot find any reference to it so I would be very interested indeed to know how much it will be, how long it intends to run, how it will be rolled out and what targets are set for the program. Let us hope that small business opportunities in South Australia get the investment they need.

Small business is an enormous driver of the economy of South Australia and so many of them are family businesses. I recognise the member for Norwood who, I believe, is a previous chair of the Family Business Association of South Australia, and I commend him for that. The experience that he will bring to the chamber will help our debate enormously.

Obviously, mining is going to be a key player in the future and there will be many questions raised about that in the coming weeks as it relates to the super profit tax intended to be launched by the federal government. Members on this side of the chamber are very concerned about this.

We are worried that there are 11 mines operating in South Australia at the moment and the premier continually talks about 16 by the end of this year and another 20-odd in the pipeline.

How many of those mining companies are actually going to decide that it is too risky to invest in South Australia now and say, 'We are not interested and we are going to look at other opportunities offshore.' Indeed, media reports coming out of Canada were talking about seeing it as an opportunity for their country to grow through mining investment because large multinationals are going to say, 'No, Australia's tax regime is too much.' Joe Hockey, the shadow federal treasurer, talks about the fact that it is an effective tax rate of 57 per cent on mining now. That is disgraceful. How can we expect investors to come in and take enormous risk in mining which will drive the economy of our state in the future with such a draconian tax rate in place?

Kevin Foley needs to be out there fighting and banging on tables about this. He tells us he has had briefings, he tells us he has had two conversations with the federal Treasurer (Wayne Swan) but it has not resulted in changes yet. Swan and Rudd are out there talking about it being fair and equitable: it is not.

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (11:21):** Thank you, Madam Chair—I beg your pardon, Madam Speaker. I should have read the paper a bit more intensively this morning: no sex in the chair!

Madam Speaker, may I congratulate you on your elevation to this prestigious position in this parliament. May I point out that my seat of Morphett was named after Sir John Morphett who was an early Speaker in this parliament. He had the distinguished position of also being the President of the Legislative Council. Whether or not you should try for the president's position or not, ma'am, we are not sure!

Sir John Morphett was elected in 1851 as the Speaker of the Legislative Council (as it was then) and in 1865 he was appointed President of the Legislative Council. The position of Speaker in this house is one that is very trying at times for the person occupying the seat and we hope that members on this side will do all in their power to assist you in your deliberations. We hope that members opposite will do that as well.

The history of the Speaker's position is a long one. In 1376 (in what was known as the Good Parliament in Westminster) Sir Peter de la Mare, who was steward to the Earl of March and a representative of Herefordshire county, was appointed as Speaker. His speeches were so well advised and reported on that the government asked him to be their first official Speaker. He did this with courage and passion for the parliament. I know that is something, ma'am, that you will be doing.

In 1642, when Charles I was trying to assert his position of ultimate power as the monarch, he entered Parliament House in Westminster and confronted the then Speaker. On 4 January the Commons sat in St Stephen's with five members in there who the king was after. The king crossed Westminster Hall and entered the chamber, leaving the doors open so that members could see the troops making much of their pistols.

Charles removed his hat and walked towards the Speaker's chair. The members stood in silence, all bare-headed. The king said, 'Mr Speaker, I must for a time make bold with your chair.' Speaker Lenthall (as he was then) vacated the chair. In silence the Commons waited. The king asked if the five named members he was seeking were present, and the Speaker replied:

May it please Your Majesty, I have neither eyes to see, nor tongue to speak in this place, but as the House is pleased to direct me, whose servant I am here...

That was a very brave act on behalf of Speaker Lenthall back in 1642. Since that day no reigning monarch or monarch's representative can enter this place whilst the house is sitting. We proudly point out that, as members of this house, we are invited by the Black Rod to go around to the other place where the monarch, or the monarch's representative, opens the parliament. When Speaker Lenthall defied the king back in 1642, it was the first time a Speaker had declared his allegiance for the liberty of the parliament rather than the will of the monarch, and I hope that never changes.

We heard you, ma'am, speak about women in parliament and the suffragette movement. I have done a bit of reading on this and discovered that back in the early 1900s a gallery for the ladies was provided above the Speaker's chair. I quote:

Diehards thought the Commons a most unsuitable place for ladies, and even the radical Harriet Martineau felt that the gallery would attract the wrong sort who would provide 'a nuisance to the legislature and a serious

disadvantage to the wiser of their own sex.' So, by a triumphant British compromise, a metal grille had been fixed to the front of the gallery, so that each side appeared to the other as if in a cage.

Because of continuing disturbances the gallery was closed. The militant response was to charter a steam launch and moor it close to the terrace to harangue members taking tea. We see then that the women's suffragette movement (the militants) were doing their very best to influence members of parliament. We are very proud, in this place, to know that we led the world in giving women their rightful place in this parliament. We see Joyce Steel on the wall opposite, we know other members are well represented in this place and, ma'am, it is wonderful to see you in the chair.

I am very concerned that the changes that are going on in politics will be testing of not only you, Madam Speaker, but also of this place. I have been quoting from *The Story of Parliament in the Palace of Westminster* by John Field. If the library does not have this book I would recommend that it get it because it is a very good read. I bought my copy while on a study tour to London—and I will speak about study tours and the value of study tours to members in this place a bit later. On page 280, on the role of members, it states:

Politics has become more professional, at least in terms of careerism. Many, if not most members of the Commons cherish hopes of eventual promotion to government; fewer than in the past are content to be good legislators and good representatives of their constituencies. If the Commons is seen as a waiting room for advancement, the healthy independence of legislature from executive is undermined. There has also been a centralisation of power in all parties, which further inhibits the independence of members. Party discipline, intolerant of dissent, has devised means of deselection mavericks, or of not selecting them in the first place; the crusader is under pressure to become pliant lobby fodder. [As members] 'Our duty...is to speak and vote as we believe to be right, within the framework of loyalty to our party, to our constituents and to our conscience.

All members in this place, particularly new members, should take note of that. The role of the Speaker has changed little; however, there are continuing disappointments expressed in this book as we see in this place. Madam Speaker, I note that you will allow debate in question time to continue, although it is really out of order. We need to have some continued expression of the sincerity and enthusiasm by which we represent our constituencies in this place. The book states further:

...the accountability of the executive can be subverted at question times. The former Speaker's impatience at political point-scoring which obscures the real issues, and long-windedness which reduces the number of questions that can be answered was sometimes palpable.

This is referring to the British parliament, and we have seen it here in the past, too. We have fixed question times and questions here, which has improved things, but we do get long-winded answers to Dorothy Dixers. In 1999, the Speaker at the time was a woman—I cannot remember her name—and her motto was, 'I speak to serve', but it did not always prevail. Madam Speaker, I wish you well in your endeavours in this place.

The member for Bright has been appointed Deputy Speaker. I congratulate the member for Bright on her appointment. I see that she has a new man in her life. I know that man will give her undying love and devotion, and that is her new son, Theo. I congratulate her on being a mother and I hope that this place, which is one of the most family unfriendly places ever that you could be involved with, is able to allow her some degree of flexibility to continue her relationship with her new son.

The pomp and ceremony we have when we open parliament is something I enjoy seeing. We should all acknowledge and appreciate the history of this place and never let go of it. I congratulate the Governor on the way he presented the Governor's speech, with all the sincerity required of that occasion. However, I will not spend a lot of time on the speech as there was not a lot in it: it was pretty much the same old same old, and it is disappointing to see we have a tired government that is really not doing a service, not only to this place but also to the people of South Australia.

The good thing we see in this parliament is a number of new members. I am very proud of the new members of the Liberal Party. The member for Adelaide runs a business and was an accountant, a lady who I know will add a lot of personality and brain to this place, as well as looks. The member for Norwood has been working in commerce, a very intelligent young man who I know will be a credit to the Norwood constituency. The new member for Morialta is a young man who has been involved in politics, business and the legal professions. He will be a very good member for Morialta.

The new member for Stuart said he first met you, Madam Speaker, in 1979 at Pimba: you must have been a very young girl at the time. Graham Gunn was probably out kissing babes at that time and you may have been one of those young babes.

**The SPEAKER:** 1999.

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** Was it 1999? I thought he said 1979. I am sure Graham Gunn was around in 1979 kissing the babes! The new member for Stuart already has the name 'Big Bird': he is a very tall man and also a very wise man, who comes from a business and tourism background. The new member for Chaffey—and people said that we would never get that seat—is another intelligent man and another good addition to this place. He is an irrigator and horticulturalist involved in business and in working for the community. These new members are a significant addition to the Liberal Party. While they may not be tree huggers, they are real environmentalists, and nobody can take away their environmental credentials, with the triple bottom line approach these members will take to legislation in this place—the social and environmental bottom lines and not just the political and financial bottom line.

The one member I have not mentioned has taken over from a lady who served in this place for a long time and did a lot of work and was always a thorn in the side of the Labor Party: I refer to the new member for Flinders. He comes to this place from a business and farming background and will be another exceptional addition to the team on this side. The background of the new members of the Liberal Party is diverse, interesting and certainly one that will add some expertise and experience to this place. I am disappointed that the new members on the other side, while being wonderful individuals and family people themselves—I have not heard the new member for Little Para speak, but certainly the members for Taylor and Mitchell have spoken—spent a lot of time thanking their union buddies for getting them here. I hope that in this place they move on from that background and become terrific representatives for their constituencies, because this place is a wonderful place to develop your ability to stand up and be a leader.

The new member for Mount Gambier I congratulate on his election to this place. He is a fine chap: I knew him when he was Mayor of the District Council of Grant down there and I look forward to working with him. I tell all new members in this place: use every opportunity to take every advantage of every issue and use every allowance that comes your way, because you need to broaden your experience and travels and need to broaden your contacts and your knowledge.

No-one out there will thank you for not using your travel allowance, no-one out there will thank you for not using all your electorate allowance and no-one out there will thank you for not going to conferences, so make sure that you do that. Use every opportunity to serve your constituency and this parliament to the best of your ability. Use every opportunity—do not forget that.

At the same time, and as I said about the member for Bright, this is one of the most family-unfriendly places there is. I was very fortunate when I came in here that my children were grown up, as I do not know how members in this place with young families cope. When I first came in here I went home one morning and the horses were working down at the Morphettville track; it was about five o'clock. That is ridiculous. We are past that now, but we still have commitments and obligations to this place that take a heavy toll on members, particularly those with young families. So, I tell members to look after their families; no-one in this place from either side will speak badly of you if you have to leave because of a health or a family matter, because they are so important.

This is my third term as the member for Morphett, but I remember my maiden speech. I had the lectern there, and I had a speech that was supposed to last an hour, but I think I took a bit over 30 minutes. Hansard will note that I have slowed down somewhat, and I thank them for their patience. I did get the nickname 'machine gun McFetridge, the fastest mouth in the south' at that time and—

*Mr Kenyon interjecting:*

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** I have just been told that I am now a semiautomatic. However, I do hope I have slowed down somewhat.

Geographically, the electorate of Morphett is tiny. It is about 12 kilometres square and, if you take out Morphettville racecourse, it is even smaller than that, but I still have about 23,000 electors, the same as every other electorate in this place. Compared with your electorate, ma'am, and that of the member for Stuart, my electorate is just a pimple in terms of the size of the



state, but it is a very important one, and it would be a very painful one if it were not represented well in this place, and I hope to do that in continuing years.

In 2002, when I came into this place (I took over from the Hon. John Oswald), I had a margin of 10.1 per cent. I was in government for two hours and 55 minutes, and let me tell you that those two hours and 55 minutes, before Peter Lewis sided with the Labor Party, were much more pleasant than the years I spent in opposition. We came very close this time (and I will talk a bit more about that in a moment), and there is no way I would desert the Liberal Party—the party I think should be in government today.

In 2006, we had a very disappointing result; I think it was about an 8 per cent swing against the Liberal Party. Fortunately, I held that swing in Morphett. I had one of the smallest swings in the state: my margin went from 10.1 down to about 5.4 per cent. It appears that the harder you work in this place and the harder you work with your constituencies, the more you are penalised in the redistribution. I lost 2 per cent into the seat of Bright in the redistribution and ended up with a 3.5 per cent seat. Everybody said, 'Oh, Duncan's gone, 3.5 per cent; the Labor Party is going to come in here.' However, let me tell every member in this place, particularly the new members: work your patch, talk to your people. You may not be as lucky as I am in having a very concentrated area to work around, but make sure that you do never neglect your patch.

This time around, in 2010 there was a 7.8 per cent swing back, not the 11 and 12 per cent swings we saw in some seats, or in Adelaide, where it was nearly 15 per cent, which was a fantastic swing. The 7.8 per cent swing was great, but I am not quite back to the heady days of 13 per cent at the 1993 State Bank election, but I am more than happy to cope with an 11.2 per cent. I understand that there are some issues with the redistribution and that there is the possibility that Morphett might actually be abolished but, at the other end, I might increase my margin. It is somewhere in between all that, and I will be working very carefully to make sure that Morphett has its rightful place in this parliament for many years to come.

I thank the people I have thanked in the past and the reason I am here, that is, my office staff—Kate, Heidi, Sam and Lauren. They work so hard for me to make sure that I am in the right place at the right time. As members of parliament, we all appreciate our staff almost as much as we appreciate our family. Certainly, my family—my wife, Johanna, my son Lachlan and my daughter, Sahara—have been with me for a long time, encouraging and helping all the way. They still do not understand why I went into politics, as they would never go into politics knowing what they know now, and that is very disappointing. The sad part about this life is that we are knocked, disparaged and maligned and it is completely wrong. My brother, Stewart, is a great guy and a lot of help during an election campaign, and I thank him very much for that.

One particular person in Morphett to whom I would like to pay tribute and who was the Labor Party's candidate is Tim Looker. Tim Looker is a really decent guy. Tim ran a very straight campaign. He did not get involved in any dodgy how-to-vote cards. He did not do anything underhanded and he was always straight with me. He always spoke to me. We have a very friendly relationship, and I thank him for his efforts because you do need somebody to stand up for every political party—even if I think you are badly advised standing for the other side, Tim. He is a decent guy and I wish him well in his role in local government.

As I mentioned, the redistribution that is about to hit us is going to be a really interesting one. How is the Electoral Commission going to predict how people are thinking in 2014? How is it going to cope with the massive swings that we saw to the Liberal Party and the other way? It is going to be a very interesting exercise for them and I wish them well.

The 8.4 per cent swing to the Liberal Party in the 2010 election result is largely due to one person and that is Isobel 'Taser' Redmond. Isobel Redmond is a remarkable woman. You are never left in any doubt about what Isobel is thinking, but not in a bad way. She is straight down the line. To the best of my knowledge, she has never told a lie, which is a remarkable thing.

For her birthday a few years ago, I gave her a magnifying glass and a fine toothcomb, and that depicts what Isobel is like. She looks at things carefully and she goes through things very carefully.

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** Cheapskate!

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** It was a very expensive magnifying glass and a very good comb! The fact that we got so close yet so far is such a disappointment, not only for every member on this side but, I think, for South Australians.

Yesterday, I had the opportunity to speak to Malcolm Mackerras, the renowned psephologist. (I think that is the correct term for one who studies voting patterns.) Mr Mackerras gave me a couple of documents and one of those shows that, in relation to the South Australian percentage of 2010 votes and seats, the Liberal Party got 41.7 per cent of the first preference votes, yet we only got 38.3 per cent of the seats. We are under represented by 3.4 per cent. The Labor Party got 37.5 per cent of the votes and 55.3 per cent of the seats. They are 17.8 per cent over represented in this place.

The swing to the Liberal Party of 8.4 per cent is a very good result. The bottom line for the Labor Party is that, on the Mackerras pendulum which I was given yesterday, there are 10 Labor seats that are under 5 per cent—sorry, Light is 5.4 per cent. Let me read those. We will start with my good friend, the member for Ashford: Ashford, 4.9; Wright, 4.7; Mawson, 4.4; Colton, 4 per cent; Elder, 3.7 per cent; Florey 3.6 per cent; Hartley, 2.4; Newland, 2.3; Mitchell, 2.2; and Bright, 0.4.

There are 10 seats under 5 per cent and, according to Mr Mackerras after discussion with the Electoral Commission, some of those seats will become notionally Liberal so there will be more seats. That pendulum is going to come around. It is going to be a very interesting next four years for members on the other side. They are going to have to get out and actually work their patches, and they are going to make sure that the arrogance and the hubris which you have already seen in the smirks on the faces of 'The Three Amigos' down the front is not allowed to continue. These guys really need to pull their heads in and decide why they are here.

**Mr Pengilly:** They won't be here next time.

**Dr McFETRIDGE:** They will not be here next time, as the member for Finniss says. That is quite right. I remind the house that the recent ranking of professions has been put out by the *Reader's Digest*, which is a wonderful reference journal. Let me just point out that veterinarians are at No.7 and I am a proud veterinarian, but of the 38 professions, politicians were equal bottom with car salesmen. We were two below sex workers, three below real estate agents and only four below journalists. We have a long way to go. We really do need to restore confidence in the professional approach that we as members of parliament take. Unfortunately, the theatrics in question time is what a lot of school kids see and what a lot of people out there see. I just wish they would come in here, or even visit their local member of parliament, and understand what we are going on about.

I just have to mention the media. In my maiden speech I said that Russia has two newspapers: *Pravda* (the truth) and *Izvestia* (the news). The Russians say, 'The truth is not the news and the news is not the truth', and that is a real issue for us in this place. The news cycle, even in my short time in here, has shortened so much that we really do need to make sure that we are able to resource members of parliament so that they can continue to keep up with the news cycle. We do need to make sure that the people out in voter land are being given the information as they should be given it. Unfortunately, *The Advertiser* is printed at an 11 year old comprehension age, a sad reflection on what newspaper proprietors think they need to put out there.

I have to mention Twitter. Our Thinker in Residence, Baroness Susan Greenfield, described Twitter as 'the world of the inane and the banal,' and it is. I do not have a Twitter account. I have only ever looked at Twitter once, and that is when the Premier made some announcement about Aboriginal affairs funding, and I just needed to check that. I must say that the United Kingdom parliament, which I referred to before, did actually put out a 19-page booklet for members of parliament on how to use Twitter. I think that is an indictment on parliament.

My role and what I would like to see in this place has changed over the years. I have had volunteers—and this is Volunteers Week; we should not forget our volunteers—local government, science and information technology, consumer affairs, education, transport, industrial relations and Aboriginal affairs. I love Aboriginal affairs, but I have decided, in consultation with our leader, to hand it over to Terry Stephens in the upper house so that I can concentrate on the trifecta of portfolios: health, mental health (which includes substance abuse), and veterans affairs, because they are massive issues. Actually, there are a lot of Aboriginal affairs issues involved in those.

When I look at that range of portfolios, I see that I am just a humble veterinarian, just trying to do a job. I do not see myself as an important person; I just see myself as an ordinary bloke trying to do an important job. There is one fellow, the member for Napier, who is a good friend of mine, who left himself wide open when he said that he is the most experienced and qualified person in this place to be the Minister for Agriculture. Well, I am more than happy to help him at any stage.

I have three science degrees, one in agricultural science in crops and soils, including agricultural economics; I have a science degree in veterinary biology, including farm management and agricultural marketing; and I have a Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine and Surgery, including public health and epidemiology. I am happy to help you at any time, Michael O'Brien, Minister for Agriculture. Any time you like, just come on over. We have Hendra virus and the bats in the eastern suburbs (possibly): PIRSA put out a release on that the other day, and we have equine influenza vaccine (that is an issue that the minister wants to know about). I am happy to help at any time. I certainly would not say that I am the most qualified person in this place for any of these roles, but I will do everything I possibly can to contribute in every possible way.

The contribution that I make in this place is dependent in many ways on what we are up against at the time, and what we are up against this time is a government that prepared a speech for the Governor that really in many ways was a nothing of a speech—same old, same old. In terms of reconnecting, which was talked about in the speech, you should never have been disconnected, Mike Rann. Re-engaging: we know you have a long history, from Cora Barclay right through to country health to many other things, of not consulting.

The State Strategic Plan is great, but its targets have been revised down; we have seen that in the past. Any critics have been sidelined and pilloried. Ask Warren McCann; where is he now? The state's economy remains strong, but we are way below where we should be, and we have heard other members speak about that. Of the 100,000 new jobs that the Premier promised, we know that 70,000 were going to happen anyway; so there are 30,000 jobs over six years. That is not something I would be really proud of if I were the premier of a state that has had rivers of gold. We heard just this morning that more GST is coming into this place. We have heard that there are billions of dollars worth of new major projects being put in place. Most of that is private money.

In my last couple of minutes, I will talk about the role of this place, what has been happening to it and what is happening in many parliaments around the world and certainly in the states of Australia. I will go back to the *Story of Parliament in the Palace of Westminster* by John Field:

The function of Parliament has also been undermined, and its clear legitimacy muddled, by devolution in its many forms. The European Commission and Parliament, the International Monetary Fund and other multinational organisations, public and commercial, have limited the remit of Westminster's authority.

We are seeing that with the national health plans, where there is fudging of where states and feds finish. We are seeing that in many other areas with national legislation. I will leave members with this last note:

The product of these tendencies is a Parliament uncertain about how to use its power and its freedom, and one that appears to be sinking both in public esteem and under the burden of legislative work it is asked to undertake. Representative democracy needs its champions, both within and beyond Parliament. It has to adapt to a world in which the nation state is no longer the primary unit. It needs to attract the most talented men and women, with an independence nourished by wide experience, to serve it.

I commend the Address in Reply.

**Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (11:51):** Madam Speaker, may I join in the congratulations to you upon your elevation to the role of Speaker. It is great to see women taking over more roles, not only in the house but also in cabinet and other areas. I note that that is something that the Rann government, since 2002, has been really driving home. It is something that does not necessarily happen by accident. People sit back and think that it will happen just because it is a good idea and it is the right thing when we consider that 51 per cent of our population are women. It does not always work that way. Having worked as a minister's chief-of-staff, the premier was writing to us all the time to ensure that we had equality on government boards and that there were a fair share of women not only on boards but in chair roles as well. So, I offer my congratulations to you, Madam Speaker, and to the member for Bright in her new role as the Deputy Speaker.

I would like to thank the Governor for his speech and for outlining the government's bold vision for the next four years. I would like to thank the people of Mawson for putting their faith in me for a further four years. I would particularly like to thank those people who voted Labor for the very first time on 20 March, and I know there are many. I have text messages from people I have met over the past four years, for whom I have gone in to bat, who actually said, 'Biggles, I voted Labor for the first time today. Good luck.' This was before they knew the result. They were good, genuine people of the electorate with whom I have come into contact over the past four years.

When I made my maiden speech here just over four years ago, one of the things I said was that I was brought up on a dairy farm down in the South-East, in a place called Glencoe, and that our local member was Des Corcoran. My dad would always hand-out for the Country Party and go canvassing for them. He pretty much voted for the Country Party or the Liberal Party for most of his life. He said he always voted for Des Corcoran, because Des put his area and the people of his area before his party. He said, 'Sometimes in life, you have to put the person before the party', and that is what my dad did for Des Corcoran.

That is the way I have wanted to represent the people of Mawson for the past four years. It has meant going in and having fights with my own government, and sometimes it feels like there is a bit of pressure, a bit of push back from the government on certain things, but we did win the fights. What was important was that the people down there saw me actually doing things, not just saying things. That was some of the feedback that I received time and time again: that they saw that I was prepared to stick up for the area.

I look at it this way: Mike Rann is not my boss; I have 22,000 bosses, and they all live in the electorate of Mawson, and I am there to serve each and every one of those people. It does not matter whether they voted Labor, Liberal, Nationals, Greens or Family First, if they live in the electorate of Mawson and they want me to go in and fight for them, that is what I will do.

Neil Kerley, the great football coach who coached South Adelaide to its last premiership way back in 1964, had a saying, 'The only place success comes before work is in the dictionary.' I reckon Kerls is right on that. The harder you work, the luckier you get. Nothing in politics replaces that face-to-face communication with the people you represent, whether that is doorknocking, attending community forums or having street corner meetings. It is basically the only game when you are in politics. It has been proved over and over that nothing else will work. Eventually, you have to go out there and listen to what people want, not giving them lip service but actually going into bat for them and winning the fights for them—and it is not always the big things.

I know that we are delivering an \$18 million overpass out of McLaren Vale, which is really going to increase the safety down there; we are fixing the South Road/Victor Harbor Road intersection; we are going to duplicate the Southern Expressway, with funding of \$445 million; the rail line will be extended to Seaford, with federal government money, and it will be electrified with state government money. All that infrastructure is fantastic, but sometimes it is the little things.

When you go out doorknocking, and you find out that someone is concerned that the limb of a big gum tree is overhanging their child's trampoline and it is a council tree, and they say, 'We've been worried about this for six months. We don't know what to do about it,' it is a pretty simple fix. I go back to the office and get onto the council, and the council fixes it. They are the real one percenters that actually make a difference to people's life. Those things mean more to those people as individuals than all the hundreds of millions of dollars we spend on the infrastructure because you have had a direct influence on that person's life, particularly when they have kids and you help make their kids' life safer.

Again, a really important part of this job is to be involved with the local schools and to go into bat for them to make sure that they get their fair share of the education pie. Also, I think our role is to be involved in the school communities as leaders and role models to the students, whether that is attending assemblies and making speeches and passing on our life experiences to those students, or bringing them here into Parliament House and showing them how democracy works.

I know that my first introduction to this chamber was with Kevin Hamilton. As a school student, I was brought into Parliament House on a school excursion when I was in grade 7, and I was fascinated by the place. Then, later on in life, we had Lynn Arnold come to the school, and we had various interactions with politicians. So, we should never underestimate the role we play in the life of younger South Australians. If we can set the right example for them, they will go places. If we show that we believe in them, they will believe in themselves.

In Mawson, we have a lot of low socioeconomic areas, and there are kids there who do remarkable things. They might not always get the most positive reinforcement at home, but I know they do at their school because we have fantastic teachers and principals, who really do believe in our kids, and they give those kids the very best chance they can to get along in life and get ahead. I refer to places such as Hackham East Primary, where we have had students in here to sing for the Premier and some of the cabinet ministers. I saw them—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr BIGNELL:** And they did the haka as well. I saw them at a school assembly, and they were just fantastic. I thought, 'This shouldn't just stay in Hackham East', because these kids need to be exposed. So, we brought them in here. A few months later, the Premier came to me and said, 'Those students from Hackham East, do you think they would want to come in here and sing *Advance Australia Fair* and a couple of other songs for the Governor-General when she comes to Adelaide?' I said, 'That would be fantastic.'

Isn't it great that we give all the schools an opportunity! It is not necessarily those with world renowned choirs; we have had a bunch of grade 6 and 7 kids from Hackham East come into Parliament House. For those kids, their life will be changed by that experience because not only are we showing them that we believe in them but they can go anywhere in the world—and that is the message we need to deliver to the kids. As the new member for Taylor said, 'Your demographic is not your destiny'—and I think the member for Goyder repeated that as well—and that is exactly right. Something we need to remember is that we do have an important role, and that is one of the roles we play in this place.

You cannot win an election on your own, and I really want to thank my office staff—Kerry Treuel, Jane Backhouse, Lyn Royans—who have done a magnificent job. They have put in many, many hours—well above what the job specifies—to help retain Mawson. I really want to thank those three people; they were fantastic.

I also thank Bec Roy, who has been a trainee in the office for the past year and who also became really involved. I felt a bit sorry for Bec as she had to be hospitalised in the last week; it was like she had trained all year for the Grand Final. She rang me at the celebration party just to make sure that what she was seeing on TV was actually happening. To Bec, I wish you all the very best in your future because you have done a very good job, and I hope you have learnt a lot during the past year as a trainee.

It is important that, as members of parliament, we use the role of trainees in our offices because not only does it help us out to have an extra person in the office but we can really teach people, help them along and give them skills, because they go to TAFE one day a week and they spend the other four days in the office. When I am picking trainees, I look at the people who might not have got a job, because I think that, if I can take them from where they are now and help them improve themselves over the ensuing year, they are going to be in a better place 12 months down the track to get a job, and I think that is a really important thing to do. So, to Bec, Tiffany and Emma, the three trainees who have been in my office over the past three years, I say thank you very much.

I also thank other supporters: the Minister for Transport, Patrick Conlon; the now Minister for Education, Jay Weatherill; and the Premier of course—everyone in cabinet, but those two in particular, for all their support and advice not only over the past four years but over the past eight years. I thank Patrick and Jay and the rest of the team for their support.

I thank Dave Gray and Dave Di Troia at the LHMU, and Katrine Hildyard and Ian Steel at the ASU for all their support, as well as the scores of volunteers who helped out in so many different ways. We all know that there is a lot to do during election campaigns, and to the people who came on board for either the final week, just for election day itself or for the three or four weeks out, whether it was putting up posters or doing anything else, I thank each and every one of them. There are probably far too many to go through and name individually, but I would like to thank them.

I thank my parliamentary colleagues here and also some interstate. It is good, if you get around and are involved in committees that involve interstate MPs coming here, to actually meet up with other people when we go interstate. Steve Herbert, a Victorian MP, has been very good. He is in a marginal seat in Victoria, and we touch base quite often. I really want to thank Steve for some of his input and some of the ideas that he has come up with, and I wish him all the very best for his election campaign later this year.

I also thank my colleagues for putting their faith in me with my elevation to parliamentary secretary. I will be parliamentary secretary to the Minister for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure, and there are some quite specific and exciting roles that the minister wants me to play; one is on the consultation for the Southern Expressway duplication and to be involved in the community. The aim is to get half of the 1,400 jobs for people in the south, and that is something we have already begun to try to push along—going out into the trade schools and engaging with them and engaging with associations like the Civil Contractors Federation. The more work that we do now, when the

contracts are about to be let, when the successful tenderer is named we will be able to go to them and say, 'Look, we've already got all this in place. Please employ these local people,' and that is going to be a great thing for the south.

There will also be a lot more jobs in the pipeline once we have the Tonsley Park redevelopment, and I know the new member for Mitchell has a very close and long-term association with that site. I think it will be a really good thing and will help reinstate the high esteem the manufacturing industry has always held in this state. It has been a very important part of our economy.

The loss of Mitsubishi was very sad for the people in the south but, if you look at how we have come out of it a couple of years on, we have probably done a lot better than many people would have predicted at the time. That is obviously something that did not happen by accident: it was the federal government and the state government working together to ensure that people had training before those jobs were lost and then afterwards, so that people could transition into other jobs. I think the Tonsley Park precinct, with its focus on green jobs, will be a great thing for the people of the south, and I know that, from getting around and doorknocking, there is a lot of excitement about that.

The other area I will be assisting with in the role of parliamentary secretary is consultation with the community and entities like councils about the Darlington interchange. This is something that needs to be sorted out in the south because it is such a bottleneck. It is like an hourglass figure where it all comes in at a point; that is, you have two or three roads coming from the south, converging into one road, then going back out into three or four roads—South Road obviously continues on and then you have Ayliffes Road. We really need to make sure that the planning of that is done well and consideration is given not just to the local community but also to important institutions like the Flinders Medical Centre and Flinders University. That will involve not only road infrastructure but also light rail.

One of the other roles I will have is to work with the regions and to consult with groups within regional South Australia on the State Infrastructure Plan. This is something I know a little about because, as Patrick Conlon's chief of staff, we worked on the infrastructure plan of 2005. That involved a lot of consultation to find out what people wanted in the plan, because again, things do not happen by accident. Not everything is going to be possible in the first year which is why you have longer term goals and short-term goals in order to work out what communities and the state need. You work out whether that is going to be delivered by the private sector or the public sector, or a combination of both. That is the process that we went through in 2005. It was a painstaking process that took a lot of time and effort. You need the cooperation of all the different government departments and agencies to come together.

So, one of the things that I will be doing this year is going out to the regions and sitting around the table with councils, regional development boards and other interested parties to make sure that we get the priorities down on paper. I am pleased that 80 per cent of the things that we came up with for the original State Infrastructure Plan for the regions either are completed or underway. That is a pretty good success rate and I am hoping that we can emulate that in the infrastructure plan mark II.

During the next four years, I want to continue my hard work in the electorate. As I have said before, it is a very diverse electorate. We have one of the world's great wine regions in McLaren Vale. I want to make sure that I continue to promote and protect the McLaren Vale wineries—the grape growers and the winemakers—because it is a fantastic area and they need all the help they can get at the moment. Some of that stuff can be done locally and some can be done at a state level, but there are also other things that require federal help. There is a massive wine glut at the moment—not just in Australia but right around the world—and we really need to start thinking outside of the square.

Not all of the answers will come locally. It is going to need a national approach to some things and a change to how people do things. That is going to be something that will have to apply up the river as well, for instance, in places like Griffith on the Murrumbidgee and the Riverina area. I think we really need to look at the output from water in, the amount of jobs that are created at the end and the amount of money that can come out at the other end. There is no point in our wasting water and selling wine for less than what that water is worth to us.

That is something that needs almost a satellite view of Australia. That is to say, if you own and have control over all the water in Australia, you can get this much output and this many jobs in

this area, while in another area you can get a lot more output, money and jobs into your economy. We need to work out the best place to do that. That is not going to be an easy thing to do, because people are very parochial about their own areas. It needs to be something that is done with consultation and with mechanisms put in place whereby people can change to other forms of agriculture perhaps or other land use. It is not going to be an easy thing to do, but it is going to be a necessary thing to do. Otherwise, it is simply not sustainable to continue going down the track that we are going down.

Madam Deputy Speaker, you were not here earlier when I was passing on my congratulations but, now that you are, I would like to end my speech by offering you my congratulations on your elevation to your new role.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Mawson. The member for Waite.

**Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (12:10):** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I congratulate the Governor on his address and also you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and Madam Speaker; it is great to see two women at the helm of the parliament.

On reading the Governor's address, which spells out the government's agenda, it is clear that it contains little that is bold and visionary, nothing that defines South Australia's place in the nation or the world, nothing that seems to suggest that this third term will be any different from the first and second terms—it is really a case of treading water.

I will begin by talking about the seat of Waite. I thank the Labor Party for running a campaign in Waite for the first time. On this occasion, I believe the government spent an extraordinary amount of money in Waite. It picked a very good candidate and I had the biggest swing to me in the 13 years since I have been the member for Waite, well above the state swing. It was an outstanding result, and I thank the people of Waite for their renewed endorsement of me.

It was fantastic to visit the schools, community groups, homes, community centres and businesses throughout the campaign. I ran a very local campaign and it was great to be re-elected. I thank Jane, Cheryl, and Meghan at my office. I say to all the volunteers in the local branch of the party, 'You did such a splendid job during this election.' I also note the efforts of Adrian Tisato, the Labor candidate in Waite. He ran a very good, honourable, decent and clean campaign. He is a very good candidate and I urge the government to consider him again in the future. He did a very good job. There was a swing on and we are where we are.

After the 2006 election, our Address in Reply speeches were criticised by the media for failing to reflect meaningfully on the lessons learnt from the previous session of the parliament and lessons learnt from the election that might point to the future and the session ahead. The media commented at the time that there was a lack of frankness. The Address in Reply provides an opportunity to reflect on the four years that have passed and also to look in a positive way to the next four years and what we might be able to achieve.

I would say most earnestly to my colleagues on this side of the house: I think the Opposition can make a difference from opposition. The last four years demonstrated that we can show leadership, that we can force change, that we can have the government respond to us, and that we can get results from opposition, even though we would all rather be in government. In fact, over the last four years, I think we did exactly that.

As we all know, the 2006 election was not good for the state Liberals. We were delivered a Labor government that was arrogant and overconfident. We all remember that the result was nearly 57 per cent to the ALP and 43 per cent to the Liberals. In the year that followed that election (March 2006 to March 2007), we actually fell further off the pace. There was a Newspoll in December that showed that the ALP had risen to 58 per cent and that we had fallen a further point to 42 per cent.

In March 2007, a year after the election, we had a stunning news poll showing Labor at 61 per cent on a two-party preferred basis and the state Liberals at 39 per cent on a two-party preferred basis, our primary vote having fallen well down into the 20s. It was the worst result the state Liberal Party has ever had since World War II, and it reflected serious concerns. These were dark days for the state Liberal Party.

I commend the former leader, the member for Davenport, on his stewardship during this difficult period. The leader commented yesterday that he had announced the policy of desalination, which is quite correct. After a long six month debate in our party room, championed by the Hon. David Ridgway, the member for MacKillop, me and others, he did announce that policy and staked

our claim on the desalination issue. We also need to commend the member for Davenport for another important decision; that is, the decision to raise a levy amongst the parliamentary party to guarantee we had some funds to run an advertising campaign at the outset of the 2010 election. He is to be commended for both those initiatives.

In April 2007 I became the leader. I remember an address to both the joint party room and state council at which I made three points; that is, there were three things we needed to do in order to win the election in 2010. First, we could no longer be a low profile, small target opposition. We needed to be bold, courageous and visionary, and come out with some policies of our own. Some mistakes would be made, but we needed to take some calculated risks in order to do it. We could control that. We then went on to do just that.

The second thing which we needed to do and which we could control was to remain disciplined and united, particularly if there were any setbacks. We could control that. The third thing we needed was some bloody good luck. We could not control that. In the end we got two out of three—which is not too bad.

I want to talk about our policy achievements in that four year period. Our parliamentary tactics and our attitude as an opposition changed. We were more aggressive. We defined the ALP as we saw them. We reset the definition of ourselves and how we were perceived. We reorganised ourselves on policy. We held a tax summit that heralded changes we took to the election in the way of tax reform. We developed a policy on an independent commission against corruption and we took it to the people of South Australia. This was opposed by some members of our party room but, to our great credit as a party room, we ultimately agreed to have an ICAC and it is now part of our core agenda.

I announced a master plan for Adelaide at the Press Club. It was agreed to and accepted by the media and the people of South Australia with great enthusiasm. We announced that we would be opposing the railyards hospital. Again, it was a decision disagreed with by many people in our party room who said, 'How could you oppose a new hospital?' But, when we thought it through, we knew that the right thing to do was to rebuild the Royal Adelaide Hospital on its present site. We had the courage as a party room to take that stand and it turned out to be the right position.

I announced at a police conference 18 months ago that we would be introducing Tasers to the police force. We also took our position on a new stadium to the people of South Australia. Again, it was a decision that crystallised debate and brought new voters to the Liberal Party—people we had not heard from for years. Young sports enthusiasts and teenagers were suddenly listening to the state Liberals and, in the end, it was such a compelling debate that we forced the government to concede from its initial position—that footy would be staying at AAMI Stadium; they ran down there with a cheque—to what we have today—an Adelaide Oval proposal on which I will not dwell at the moment but which cannot proceed.

We also developed policies on stormwater. Under my leadership we announced our \$400 million stormwater plan and policies on the River Murray. By the way, our policies on the River Murray, which set the national agenda and which resulted in a number of meetings between me and federal MPs, had a significant role to play in setting the federal Liberal Party's agenda on the river. It set the standard and the course for the river. We defined the so-called historic agreement as nothing but a scrap of paper.

Those decisions we took during that period were brave, courageous and out there. We did not know whether or not we would win but they turned out to be winning ideas. They became the agenda we took to the election. It is a credit to our party room that we were able to change the culture of the way in which we worked. It resulted in the quality of our work improving significantly.

Our policy papers were well written, thoroughly footnoted, thoroughly researched and well presented for the first time in six years. The presentation of everything we did took a step up, from shadow cabinet meetings and joint party meetings through to responses to budgets and auditors-general reports. Our responses were very professional, written in detail, produced in a timely fashion on the night of either the budget or the Auditor-General's Report being tabled, and provided the most thorough and comprehensive analyses of budgets and auditors-general reports this party has ever produced and I have seen in the 13 years I have been a member of parliament, including when we were in government.

We also completely reorganised the Liberal Party's fundraising machinery. The president (Sean Edwards) and I conceived the idea of Future SA and took it to the state executive. It now is



the fundraising vehicle for the party. It raised an enormous amount of money for us and provided the vehicle for us to succeed in 2010.

These changes were not easy to make, but they were made, and I commend the party room and the party for having made them—and the results were reflected in the polling we started to get. In March 2007, as I said, the polling was at 61 Labor and 39 Liberal, the worst result since World War II. By June we had jumped four points: 57 for Labor and 43 for Liberal. By December we had jumped seven points: 54 for Labor and 46 for Liberal. By March 2008 we had jumped eight points, 53 for Labor and 47 for Liberal. By September 2008 we had jumped a massive 11 points—50-50: we were in a position to win, and it was 18 months to the next election. The Newspoll was 50-50, a result not to be beaten until the election day Newspoll that was published on the day. It was a spectacular effort from the party room, and I commend every member of it for the effort they put in during that period.

Then came some challenges. First was the global financial crisis, which put the spotlight onto incumbent governments, both state and federal, as they worked to deal with the problem. We had the Rudd popularity issue to deal with, which washed over to the state ALP. We also, sadly, were forced into a by-election in Frome—a self-inflicted problem which resulted in the loss of the seat of Frome and, sadly, some leaking and disunity which bubbled through into the media and created some negativity for the media and public to pick up on. Then, of course, in April we had the dodgy documents affair, where we asked some questions about some material that turned out to be forged. In itself, that is not the end of the world but, again, that resulted in some disunity and backgrounding which created significant problems for the Liberal Party. I will not dwell on that: those who were ringing the media during that time can dwell on that themselves.

However, I will say this, and this is a credit to the Labor Party. When the Labor Party was faced with the Ashbourne crisis and the Koutsantonis speeding issues, and when the Chantelois scandal came along, I did not see a single comment from a Labor MP turning up in the media. That is a credit to the Labor Party. When they hit an obstacle over the last four years, they were tight. When we hit an obstacle, two or three people decided to fall over. That is an important story from the last four years. I would say this: if two or three Labor members had used the Chantelois sex scandal to run stories to the media about the fact that the Labor Party was in disarray—the Premier had to go, etc.—we would be over on that side of the chamber right now and you would be over here. Instead, you were disciplined and tight and, as a result, the issue was contained.

As a result of the events of July 2007, I stepped aside in the best interests of the party, believing that the damage had been done. I could easily have hung on—I had won a vote. In spite of what had happened, I could have hung on for dear life, but I did not. I stepped aside so that Isobel could ascend to the leadership and, having seen her outstanding performance, I know that I made the right decision. I supported Isobel for leader. I voted for her and encouraged others to vote for her, and I can see that it was the right decision. We cauterised the leadership issue. It was the circuit breaker that we needed and, as a result, we put ourselves in a position to do the best we could in the 2010 election.

Sadly, the change of leaders brought with it some disruption. There was a replacement almost completely of the leader's office staff. This is the first opportunity I have had since then—because it was not appropriate in the lead-up to the election—to thank some of those staff for their service: Kevin Naughton, one of the best people in the business; Craig Clark, assistant media adviser, an outstanding professional; John Lewis, my chief of staff; and Nicole Flint, one of the best policy people this Liberal Party of Australia has ever had on its staff. They all lost their jobs, and I thank them for their service to the party.

They are terrific professionals. I have not had an opportunity to do that before; I do so now as we deal with the last four years. We also replaced the state director, and I commend John Burston for his service to the party, he is an outstanding professional. There were other departures. Can I also say that these changes cost us a lot of money, both from the state leader's budget and from the party, and it is a credit to Andrew Coombe, given that we were not able to hire the two or three media people that I wanted to hire three or four months out from the election, that he did so well as media adviser to the leader; and also to Julian Sheezel who I think did an outstanding job as director in very difficult circumstances and who played a very significant role in our success under Isobel's leadership.

Another regret that I have, if you like, is that a lot of the policy ideas that I had prepared I was not able to proceed with. I had a complete draft of a plan for the north-south access from Wingfield to Victor Harbor, including the Southern Expressway in first draft form (it would have

been nice to get that policy out in late 2009); ring-roads around Adelaide were part of the master plan for Adelaide; a master plan for regional South Australia—a city of sea-side villages; a master plan for each electorate which spelt out a vision for each electorate candidates could take to the campaign; a 20 year infrastructure plan and program of work (better than the Queensland program of work and infrastructure plan), which I was not able to proceed with; and detailed plans for industry, trade and manufacturing and economic development which I thought were quite revolutionary and quite innovative and which would have transformed the local economy.

However, the policies that we had established did become our agenda for the election. They were good policies, and it is an absolute credit to Isobel as leader that she did not walk away from them. It would have been possible to run. Some members in the party room were not that enthusiastic about one or two of them, but with great courage she picked up those policies, continued with them and made some changes to a couple of them (stormwater and the hospital), but, in effect, they became our policies, and I think she argued them outstandingly.

It was a difficult time, but we recovered extremely well. At the initial polls, as everyone knows, in August, 56 ALP, 44 Liberal, and then a *Sunday Mail* poll—56 Labour, 44 Liberal—on 20 September showed that we had made no gain, that we really had not improved at all. But then Rick Phillips walked into the wine centre and went 'whack' 10 days later, and the election changed. An *Advertiser* poll of 11 December still had Labor at 57 and Liberal at 43. There we were, three months out, looking like we were not making any traction. The Newspoll in December had 53 Labor, 47 Liberal. But then on 26 January there was the Australia Day art gallery event involving Ms Chantelois and the Premier, and then on 3 February the lie detector incident. From those two events onwards things moved.

The point that I make is simply this, because we need to recognise it in looking at the election that has just occurred: that event did change the nature of the campaign. The vote for premier Rann collapsed and it collapsed soundly (which has been well reported and well commented upon), and with it the ALP campaign, to a degree, also collapsed. It was interesting watching Labor try to get its message out. They would have a big setpiece play planned for the day, and then something would happen to do with the Chantelois issue and it would be completely knocked off the agenda, and that was the story that led the news reports that evening.

It was a transforming event. For an opposition like us, it was the good luck I referred to earlier in that it was a scandal that changed the election campaign. It is sobering for us on this side to recognise that this was an important issue which will not be there in 2014, so we need to work very hard between now and then. The electorate, as a result of largely those events, looked at the alternatives. They saw Isobel and they liked what they saw. They saw the state Liberals and they liked what they saw. There was quite a contrast. There was the Premier embroiled in this issue and there was Isobel Redmond—a female, straight-talking, plain-shooting, matter-of-fact person. There was a complete contrast of styles.

I think, too, that people then looked at us and our policies and said, 'Tell me about that stormwater policy again, tell me about your plans for the stadium, tell me about your plans for the hospital' and they started to listen to us. The reason principally that occurred—and I do not think any commentator on political life in this state can deny it—was the Chantelois issue which had a transformational effect on this entire campaign.

Suddenly, people could see that the state Liberals had a lot to offer. I think the role of the media was also important. I think the media were desperate for a contest; they were very keen for a contest. When all these events unfolded, they gave us a fair go—some would argue for the first time in a very long time—because I can tell you how hard it was during the long hard years of opposition to get your stories up every day. It is all right in the context of a campaign but it is not easy in year 2 and year 3 to get your issues up; you have to work very hard at it. Suddenly, they were keen.

In many ways, the Labor government faced a perfect storm—one they could not have anticipated. They had a Liberal Party that was properly funded in comparison to the 2006 campaign when we had no money at all and we ran a decent advertising campaign. They had a state Liberal Party that had done the hard yards on policy over many years thanks to Isobel, thanks to the previous two leaders and thanks to a joint party room that was prepared to have a go and not be a small target. They faced a female leader who was not only credible but very well regarded against the bullyboys of Labor. The usual bullyboy tactics that they had used against me and against the member for Davenport when he was the leader did not quite work against a female leader, and I am not quite sure they knew how to handle it. On top of that, they were dealing with a scandal.

All those things came together to create the perfect storm. No-one could have predicted what would happen. I think what did happen was that the Labor Party lost the popular vote and won the election in the marginal seats. I can tell you I was very pleased with the decision I made in July when I saw the outcome on polling night. It was the right decision, and I commend Isobel for her efforts.

There are some lessons that we can learn from this election. First of all, for the Liberal Party, I think you can influence the future of this state and lead to a degree from opposition if you are brave and you have something to offer. I think being a small target does not inspire people and generally does not work. You need to be prepared to have opinions; you need to be prepared to argue them to the people. Another lesson is that disunity is death. We were very lucky that we got away with it. We were looking into an abyss in July and we were very lucky.

I think another lesson is that our marginal seat campaigning must simply be improved. We cannot afford to like or not like a particular marginal seat candidate because he or she is not one of our buddies. Whoever is elected in a marginal seat must have the full and undivided support of everyone. Some marginal seat members were well supported, others were not. We cannot fund marginal seats with campaign funding of around \$30,000 when you need 10 times that. We must do better on fundraising. You cannot afford the luxury, in my view, of spending time and effort raising funds for an upper house campaign when your marginal seat campaigns are underfunded. We worked the existing seats but we did not work hard enough in the marginal seats.

We won Norwood, Adelaide, Morialta and Chaffey—and these people who have come in here are absolutely fantastic new members. I was at all their preselections, and can I say that they were bloody marvellous. The best people won on the night, let me tell you. It is an absolute credit to this party that in very difficult times we were able to attract the sort of talent that we find on the bench behind me right now. I will not go through them all one by one and blow wind in their ears—they probably think they are hot bananas already—but they are bloody good.

I want to mention one member in particular (who is not here) and that is the fabulous Jing Lee in the other house. If you want to see what is coming in the Liberal Party have a look at the state council's decision to select that fantastic human being as our candidate in the upper house. It shows you the depth of support in the community that the Liberal Party is enjoying.

However, the fact is that we lost six seats that we needed to win: Hartley, Bright, Newland, Mount Gambier, Mawson and Light. You will not get any moralising from me about the fact that we won the popular vote but did not win government. We need to do better—plain and simple: we need to win the marginals. Our candidates were excellent and, during the preselection process, there were no factional brawls—unlike the previous term when there were a couple of real doozies—and, therefore, unfortunate bad publicity.

May I commend Joe Scalzi and Trish Draper. I do not agree that the so-called recycling of former members is always a negative—they are good people and there were many factors at play in those two seats. Most of the negativity about them I think came from Liberals. They could well have won those seats if things had gone differently. They were the preselected candidates; they won their preselection on the night, and they were the best candidates on the night. I think we might have preselected too early which is something for state executive to reflect on.

There were also some lessons for Labor—the arrogance and the hubris; playing the man and not the issue; not building things for eight years and leaving it for promises at the cusp of the 2010 election; and a complete and utter lack of vision. In summary, Labor started the session talking about health, police and education but they were dragged to our ground: water, tax, transport and infrastructure, and a vision for the future. We set the agenda.

The future is interesting. South Australia is in a difficult budget position. I have some advice for the government: do not build the rail yards hospital; build a new stadium, not a tart-up of Adelaide Oval; look beyond mining and defence and look at our basic industries; develop 20-year plans, not glossy brochures; and contain the unbridled growth in government.

I think Mr Rann will be here until June 2012 and I say that for the following reason: Don Dunstan was premier for nine years and four months; John Bannon was premier for nine years and 11 months; Mike Rann will have hit 10 years in March 2012, and I think he will wait until after the June budget cycle and leave in mid—2012 as the longest-serving Labor premier in history. So, get ready for the announcement in June 2012. I do not think the post of ambassador to Rome will be available at that time but I am sure there will be another position.

I think we will face one of two leadership line-ups: either a Weatherill/Rau line-up, if the left gets its way, or a Foley/Weatherill line-up (or possibly a Foley/Conlon line-up) if the right gets its way. I do not think the Treasurer will be able to contain himself if he has the numbers and an opportunity to be premier for the last 18 months. Who cares if they win or lose? It will be on his CV. I think the repositioning of the member for Elder to the centre, away from the left, has been very curious and interesting in regard to how that may play out.

I think the next election will be determined, to a degree, by how well the Labor Party handles the transition. If it makes a smooth and seamless transition it will be interesting for us all, and if it is mucked up it will be even more interesting for us all. I am not going to indicate which particular line-up I would prefer but I am happy to take either.

It is by no means written that the Liberal Party will win the next election and I think we need to work hard to get there. I simply say this: I think South Australia's best years are yet to come but we need a government which can define where we must go and which leads the way. I am sure you will find in the renewed and refreshed opposition, led by Isobel Redmond, a determination to make sure that South Australia gets such a government. I commend the Governor's address to the house.

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:40):** I rise to speak in support of the Governor's speech. I will start by touching slightly on the election campaign, in particular within the seat of Unley. As members would recall, the seat of Unley was retained by the Liberal Party in 2006 when I came into the parliament. It was a seat that was only just held, despite the fact that many described it as a safe seat—we held onto that seat by 437 votes.

We were running against a very popular mayor, who had run as an Independent in Unley and as an Independent in the upper house. He had run for the Labor Party for the seat of Boothby a decade or so earlier, and I think he described his elevation back into the Labor Party as a dubious pleasure. We just held onto that seat; it was a hard fought campaign, and I was determined to improve the Liberal Party's margin in the seat of Unley for the 2010 election.

I was very pleased with the response that I was getting from my constituents throughout my term. I was very keen to be an active member of the community in Unley, participating in community events and developing a good relationship with both the City of Unley and the City of Burnside and with many of the multicultural and community-based groups within the seat of Adelaide.

We saw the campaign proper start, I would say, some time after the new year. I was very pleased to see that the former member for Adelaide, the Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith, was enlisted to campaign in the seat of Unley. I had been spending quite a bit of time speaking with our candidate, Rachel Sanderson, about the seat of Adelaide. Rachel did a tremendous job campaigning in the seat of Adelaide, knocking on many doors, listening to people and understanding what the real issues were. In the end the real issue was Jane Lomax-Smith. I think she was a major issue in the seat of Adelaide. So, I was very pleased to see that the Labor candidate had enlisted Jane Lomax-Smith to help her with her campaign in the seat of Unley.

But it gets better, the next week, at a listening post, she had her campaign manager, the member for Croydon, the attorney-general at the time, campaign with her in the seat of Unley. I was very pleased to see the attorney-general in the seat of Unley because all the polling that we had done indicated that he was one of the most unpopular members of the government, so he was welcome in the seat of Unley campaigning for the Labor Party as often as he liked. I was very pleased to see that he made the effort, and I believe that he was welcomed very warmly by a number of protesters at the Memorial Gardens in Unley (next to the Unley Shopping Centre), when he attended a listening post.

I am very pleased to continue as the member for Unley, and I was very pleased to increase my margin in that seat, taking it to a margin of 12.3 per cent. I still consider it to be a marginal seat, because we all know that South Australians will hold their members of parliament accountable, and so they should. I come from a background of 22 years in small business, where you know the customer is king, the customer is always right, and how important it is to service the customer. It is that very same philosophy that I brought into politics when I was first elected in 2006, and I will continue to have that policy and that philosophy as I continue as the member for Unley.

I turn now to issues raised in the Governor's speech, particularly the fact that we have the Treasurer's substantial budget commission, through which \$750 million in cuts must be found. I find it amusing that the Treasurer justifies the need to delay the budget and bring in an outside body to

get his books in order. He said that it was done by Dean Brown and John Howard. But, hang on, they had just come to government from opposition, taking over from long-term Labor governments and the books were a mess!

We see a justification from the Treasurer to bring in an outside body to get his books in order by referring to the mess that Dean Brown and John Howard had to clean up when they brought in a similar type of commission when they came to government from opposition after long-term Labor governments. That in itself indicates the lack of ability this Treasurer has to keep control of his expenditure.

The Premier, having shamelessly spruiked the benefits of the Olympic mine—he was a former uranium denier and the author of 'Uranium; Play it Safe'—plans with his Treasurer to throttle the goose that lays the golden egg. Here we have a Premier who has been telling us for eight years, 'Don't worry about the loss of our manufacturing or traditional industries in South Australia, because we'll be saved by the defence boom and the mining boom.' There were 23,000 jobs poised: in 2006 a press release went out by the Premier which stated:

Olympic Dam is poised to more than double in size, creating a total of 23,000 jobs.

If we look at the dictionary definition of 'poised', it means absolutely ready, instant, about to go. Here we are, four and a half years later, and not only is there still no sign—

**Mr Marshall:** We were holding our breath.

**Mr PISONI:** We were holding our breath, as the very good member for Norwood says, and we need oxygen. We need those 23,000 jobs promised by the Premier, but they are all at risk. We know that the Premier is a spruiker for the Rudd government. We know that everything Mr Rudd promotes and says, Mike Rann is right behind him. Mike Rann was right behind the insulation program and right behind the new mining tax. Before any of the other premiers came online after vigorous debate and squeezing more money out of the feds, Mike Rann, on the strength of a phone call, said, 'Yes, you want to take over control of our hospitals: do what you like, I don't care. Do what you like; I'm out there spruiking for you, Mr Rudd. Forget about what South Australians want or what is best for the state; you go and do what you like.'

Other state Labor premiers, along with Colin Barnett (Liberal Premier of Western Australia), were not such a pushover. They wanted value for their commitment to the national takeover of hospitals. They squeezed an extra \$1.3 billion out of Kevin Rudd that Mike Rann was happy to forgo, simply to keep Mr Rudd happy and to start his campaign for re-electing Mr Rudd at the next federal election.

We know that the government has been focused on the election for a very long time, and we are starting to see the price South Australia has been paying for this government's focusing not on its job of governing South Australia but on being re-elected. When the last round of funding was announced to the jobs fund—\$39 million of federal money to create jobs across the nation in some of our neediest communities and for some of our neediest recipients: the long-term unemployed, those who do not necessarily have skills for the workforce, those in our Aboriginal communities—and the successful projects were announced, South Australia received \$338,000 of that \$39 million for five jobs in a recycling plant here in South Australia, and there are conditions attached that are still being worked out before we can receive that money.

So, \$338,000 for training positions—not apprenticeships, not jobs that will add to the skills base that we need here in South Australia—while Victoria and New South Wales shared in more than \$21 million between them with over 1,100 jobs created through that jobs scheme. Ironically, in the very same month of that poor performance by the former training minister in attracting those funds to South Australia, we saw a big lift in South Australia's unemployment figures, with an extra 5,100 in the unemployment queue.

The job advertisements that we see today tell us where we are headed in terms of employment and unemployment figures two, three or four months down the track. The ANZ job index is the canary in the coalmine when it comes to unemployment in Australia, and the shocking thing about the ANZ job index released on Monday is that South Australia saw a dramatic drop of 19.1 per cent seasonally adjusted. The employment minister was on the radio saying that I was being alarmist and that I should look at the trend figures.

Well, let us look at those trend figures. They are the highest in Australia and have been in negative territory this whole year, while in Victoria the trend figures have been growing all year. The trend figures have also been growing in Western Australia all year, as they have been in the ACT

and the Northern Territory. So, yes, minister, let us look at the trend figures: they are also bad news for South Australia. Our seasonally adjusted figures are the worst in the country and our trend figures are the worst in the country.

Of course, our youth unemployment figures have traditionally lagged behind the rest of the country, and we regularly see that one in four of our young people cannot find a job. That is one in four of our school leavers who need that first job that is so important because it can set them up for a lifetime. The longer it takes you to get your first job, the less likely you are to work in a fulfilling employment situation, be independent, and move up the employment ladder as you learn skills and use them to improve your employability.

Mike Rann is the self-proclaimed education premier and has consistently talked big on early childhood. However, let's look at the government's record on early childhood, particularly its promises regarding buildings—and, remember, this government judges everything by bricks and mortar. It is interesting that during the election campaign the government promised 10 more early childhood centres, but three years earlier it promised 20 new early childhood centres. It has built only eight of those, but they were promised to be finished by the end of June this year.

Chronologically, the order goes like this: in 2006 we were promised 10 centres by 2010 at a cost of \$13 million, and in 2007 we were promised 20 centres by 2010 at a cost of \$16.3 million. So, either they got the costings wrong or we had downsized those 20 centres because they were able to double the number of centres for an extra \$3.3 million. In 2008, the promise had changed to \$26.5 million for 20 centres. Obviously they had picked up that maybe they had got that costing wrong in 2007, but it still does not account for the fact that the following year (2009), we were still being promised 20 centres by the end of June 2010, but this time at a cost of \$30 million.

However, during the election campaign, the government promised 10 centres for \$40 million, so we seem to be all over the place on the cost of these. Yesterday, we heard the minister tell us that these are better than what the federal government was going to provide, that these were super-duper centres which were much more sophisticated than what the federal government was going to provide, but its quote was \$3.3 million per centre. The state government's latest figures—if you can believe any of its figures, because they have been so rubbery over the last four years—has them at \$1.4 million each. It will be interesting to see just where we are at the end of June 2010.

**Mr Marshall:** Six weeks to go!

**Mr PISONI:** Six weeks to go, the member for Norwood interjects. I would also like to talk about the government's plan—and the Premier has ruled out ceasing the super school programs—for super schools in South Australia and what it is really about. We know that, over the last six years or so, we have seen Treasury slowly creeping into the education department where the focus has shifted from education to budget outcomes and we know from what we have read about studies elsewhere in the world—in the ACT through the Save Our Schools group in Canberra, a paper written by Trevor Cobbold who is a consultant in public issues and an economist—that super schools are all about money, reducing the cost of education and Treasury outcomes.

It is not about education outcomes, because if it were about education outcomes, you would not build super schools, particularly in lower socioeconomic areas. All the research tells you that they are a disaster in areas of high socioeconomic need. Yet, where are the six super schools that this government is planning to build in South Australia? Mark Oliphant College, birth to year 12; closing schools in Davoren Park and Smithfield Plains.

These schools are about 50 kilometres, I think, from the member for Napier's home at Springfield. He represents this area, but obviously he is not aware of the dangers that the students attending these schools will face as a result of the building of these super schools.

In fact, I visited a family at Davoren Park in the Peachey Belt during the election campaign with Cosi Costa, and on the son's first day at high school, they were introduced to drugs. She was horrified at the thought that birth to year 12 students would be going to the same school in an area that had a lot of families who were dysfunctional and who needed a lot of community support (which they were not getting) and that their children were going to be exposed to these types of situations at a much younger age.

Let us look at the justification from the government. This is the Education Works document presented by the government and it is interesting. The government is justifying the need to sell off dozens of school sites around the state. We estimate that about \$160 million worth of land is being

sold off. The government justifies it by referring to 'years of neglect of our school buildings'. We need to look at that—'years of neglect'. At the end of this term, the Labor Party will have been running South Australia for 33 out of the last 44 years. Years of neglect! I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*[Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00]*

## HEALTH AND HOSPITAL REFORMS

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:03):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** On Monday 19 April, the Prime Minister and the state and territory leaders met in Canberra for the final round of negotiations on transformational change for our nation's health and hospital system. It was the conclusion to many months of meetings and phone hook-ups between the commonwealth, state and territory health ministers, premiers, the Prime Minister and officials about what needed to happen to improve our nation's health system.

Principal among our concerns was, of course, patients and how the new system would benefit them not just now but in the decades to come. We also had to meet the expectations of the people of Australia, who actually fund the system and demand the very highest standards of care from it.

Within that context, we were being asked to make critical decisions affecting the various sectors of the health system: preventative health care, age care, primary care and our public hospitals. The COAG meeting was extended from one to two days, and became one of the toughest and most comprehensive rounds of negotiations in which I have been involved in the eight years I have been attending COAG meetings.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I don't think you've ever been to a COAG meeting. It resulted in what will be the most far-reaching reforms to our nation's health system since the Medicare reforms under the former Hawke government in the mid 1980s.

The new system, I believe, will better serve patients, and our hospitals will be better able, with improved resources and equipment, to respond quickly and efficiently to the needs of local communities.

Importantly, for the first time, the new system will involve the commonwealth committing to fund 60 per cent of all capital spending in health. As part of this new package, the state government will be negotiating with the federal government to ensure it pays its fair share of the capital cost of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.

As many South Australians know, the new \$1.7 billion Royal Adelaide Hospital is being delivered through a PPP arrangement, so the state government will not begin paying for the cost of the building until it takes control of it on completion in 2016. You would know that the new arrangements for health funding come into place in 2014-15.

The preferred consortium that will be chosen to build and maintain the new RAH will be named in November this year, and construction work will begin early next year. We will be negotiating over the coming months with the federal government for it to contribute to the stream of payments that will be made under the PPP arrangements over the life of the hospital, rather than seeking a single up-front payment.

Co-located with the new RAH site at the western end of North Terrace will be the \$200 million health and medical research centre. Building works will begin next month, and it is due to be completed in 2012. The centre will be entirely funded by the commonwealth and will eventually be physically linked to the new RAH. It will accommodate more than 670 highly skilled scientists and technicians from across Australia and around the world. Together, the medical research scientists and the RAH's clinicians and patients will work to find new and better ways to treat and care for a variety of conditions and illnesses such as cancer and heart disease.

While our hospital system in its current form provides a high quality level of care that is well run by dedicated health professionals, there will always be room for improvements. No government should ever believe that it should not keep striving for a better health system, for continuous improvement, but now is the time for significant change if it is to remain sustainable and responsive to local needs into the future.

Much of this can be explained through simple mathematics. At present, the state government pays about 62 per cent of all hospital funding, while the federal government picks up about 38 per cent. There used to be a 50-50 funding split between the states and the federal government but, under the former Howard government, the proportion of federal government input began to slide, because it refused to keep up its payments to meet the real cost increases. The rate of health expenditure was growing faster—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It's very hard to—continuing prattle.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes. Could we have some more order on my left side, please. I am sorry, premier.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** There used to be a 50-50 funding split between the states and federal government but, under the former Howard government, the proportion of federal government input began to slide, because it refused to keep up its payments to meet the real cost increases.

*Dr McFetridge interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Morphett.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** The rate of health expenditure was growing faster than the standard rate of inflation in the economy. So, while the national inflation rate held roughly at about 3 per cent, health expenditure was growing each year at more than 8 per cent. There are many reasons for escalating health expenditure: an ageing population more reliant on our health system; the expense of medical research—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Can we have some quiet on my left, please. It is very noisy today.

**Mrs Redmond:** It's rubbish!

**The SPEAKER:** Whether it is rubbish or not, the premier is entitled to be heard in silence—and it is not rubbish, if you listen carefully.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The premier.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** There are many reasons for escalating health expenditure: an ageing population more reliant on our health system, the expense of medical research, the expense of advancing and new medical equipment and technologies, the need to update ageing infrastructure, and growing salaries of medical professionals.

Under the previous Howard government—when Tony Abbott was health minister—the states were receiving from the federal government a growth rate of less than the hospital expenditure growth, so its proportion of hospital funding began to slide. The states and territories were left to pick up the difference. Over time, the state's proportion of hospital funding grew to where it is now, at about 62 per cent.

If that rate had continued on without major structural reform hospital spending would completely consume state and territory budgets within the next 30 years. There would be no money for schools, police, public transport or any other state-run services. The current slide in commonwealth contributions was simply unsustainable.

The Deputy Premier and I went to COAG in Canberra last month with one aim: to secure more money for an improved health system in a better partnership deal with the federal government. The Prime Minister, Kevin Rudd, is the first prime minister in decades to tackle this issue head on.

*Members interjecting:*



**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I have all afternoon.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Premier.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** He has demonstrated a personal commitment to reforming health and a willingness to work with the states and territories to restructure the way in which the system works and is funded. The new reforms begin in 2014-15. The commonwealth will take on full funding responsibility for aged care and for primary health care, which includes GPs, and it will fund 60 per cent of the costs of hospitals. The funding split will become 60 per cent commonwealth, 40 per cent state, and around 30 per cent of our GST money will be dedicated to health funding.

It is important to understand that more than 30 per cent of our state's GST money was already devoted to health, so there will be no negative impact on our state's finances. GST funds withheld will be returned to the state to provide for hospital services. The important feature of this new deal is that the commonwealth will be largely responsible for funding the future growth in the system; something that the states are just not able to carry.

Initially the premiers and chief ministers were not satisfied that there would be no new money for health in the next four years. We did not want to wait until 2014-15. So at COAG we pitched an argument and convinced the Prime Minister that more money was needed in the interim period for our hospitals over the next four years. We asked for a 9.3 per cent increase in health funding from the federal government each year for the next four years. I am delighted that the deal we brokered delivers an amount slightly above the 9.3 per cent increase.

Figures confirmed in last night's federal budget indicate South Australia's hospital system will get more than initially estimated at COAG, with an extra \$306 million over the next four years. This includes:

- \$120 million for sub-acute beds, which will allow for extra beds at the Repat Hospital and more long-stay mental health beds.
- \$47 million to improve access to elective surgery, to contribute to additional procedures announced in the recent election campaign.
- \$36 million to provide more senior medical staff working after business hours in our hospitals, which will improve access to emergency departments.
- \$29 million for financial assistance for long-stay older patients that will ensure fewer older people are placed in acute hospital beds while waiting for a nursing home placement.
- \$21 million for aged care to expand multipurpose services, which will allow us to provide more country hospital places and upgrade country facilities to commonwealth standards.
- \$20 million for emergency department capital works to expand the number of acute beds to help relieve pressure on their services.
- \$17 million in flexible funding for emergency departments, elective surgery and sub-acute services.
- \$13 million for elective surgery capital works, to be used for additional operating theatre equipment and refurbishment of theatres at Modbury Hospital.
- \$3 million to expand Early Psychosis Prevention and Intervention Centre services.

While some funds were made available for mental health care, I should point out to the house that the broader issue of mental health care is something that COAG will be examining separately at a later date. When the new system of funding for our hospitals begins in 2014-15 South Australia will receive the promised 60 per cent federal, 40 per cent state funding mix, which will mean our health system will get a guaranteed minimum of \$1.1 billion in extra money up to 2019-20.

Only the opposition, who failed to issue a squeak when Tony Abbott was cutting funds, would now complain that we have more than a billion dollars more for our hospitals, because they put their party before their state.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, deputy leader!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** This means that all up South Australia's health system is set to receive extra payments of more than \$1.5 billion over the next 10 years. This new deal delivers

what all Australians expect: a more efficient, responsive and better resourced high-quality health care system for now and the future. I commend the new system to the house. What a difference a change in federal government makes.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Bragg! I have had two complaints today from people who are not able to hear other speakers and I am not happy about that. I warn you that we won't tolerate this.

## PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Families and Communities (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

Local Government Grants Commission—Annual Report 2008-09

## QUESTION TIME

### MINING SUPER TAX

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15):** My question is to the Premier. How does the Premier reconcile his comments regarding the Rudd government's mining tax that—and this is a quote from the Premier—'What has been announced yet isn't a done deal. We are going to be given a chance to negotiate,' with federal treasurer Swan's statement that, 'The government's stance on the tax has not changed,' and that, 'There is no room to move on the tax itself.'?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:16):** The Deputy Premier has spoken to the Treasurer of Australia on a number of occasions. What we have been doing is talking to mining companies with a view to making suggested improvements to the tax regime. I mean, I do remember that the Leader of the Opposition announced, during the last election campaign, a major hike in royalties for mining.

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order: relevance.

**The SPEAKER:** No point of order. Premier.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** There is no point of order because it is about the issue of tax and royalties. The Liberals, in their election campaign, promised a major hike in—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order: 128.

**The SPEAKER:** I'm sorry, I didn't hear what you said, there was too much noise.

**Mr PISONI:** 128—point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Premier.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I remind members of standing order 303. But the point of the matter is that while the Liberals wanted to hike up mining in this state to make it—

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order: 128.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order. The member for Unley was first—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I'm not sure what the point of order is, Madam Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Then why are you standing up? We're not sure what the point of order is either. If you don't have a point of order sit down.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I suspect the Premier is trying to mislead the house. I would like to warn him not to go down that path.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Point of order, Madam Speaker: the deputy leader has just accused the Premier of misleading the house. He either moves a substantive motion or he withdraws. You cannot slate that; you either withdraw or substantiate it.

**The SPEAKER:** I would suggest that the deputy leader withdraw his remark.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** My remark was that the Premier was heading down the path that he might mislead the house. The reality is that the Liberal Party did not promise to raise royalties—

**The SPEAKER:** Are you going to withdraw your remark?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** If I have accused somebody of misleading the house, I withdraw.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. Sit down. Would the Premier like to finish his remarks and stick to the substance of the question?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Yes, I will finish my remarks, because the one thing that we do know is that the Liberal Party in this state decided to declare war on—

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order, member for Unley.

**Mr PISONI:** This time it's repetition.

**The SPEAKER:** No point of order. Premier, would you like to finish your remarks?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** First of all, we were told that they wanted to hike up royalties to 10 per cent. Then we were told—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** It's okay, I've got all afternoon.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr PISONI:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order, member for Unley.

**Mr Williams:** Put up or shut up.

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy leader, stop being so aggressive and sit down and be quiet for a while and listen to what is being said. There is a point of order from the member for Unley. What is your point of order?

**Mr PISONI:** 128: it is irrelevant and repetition.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier can choose to answer a question how he wishes. Premier, would you like to continue your remarks?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I will repeat that. Do you want to jump up first?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Three votes. That is Liberal Party democracy. With 14 per cent of the vote he got the position, and with 54 per cent of the vote he is sitting down the back. That is Liberal Party democracy. Let me summarise this, because—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** —the last thing I want to do is provoke members opposite. The Liberal Party decided to declare war on the Olympic Dam expansion. We saw that they were going to stop the arrival of machinery—

**Mr WILLIAMS:** I have a point of order, Madam Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy leader, are you going to talk about relevance? Is that your point of order?

**Mr WILLIAMS:** No; I am going to talk about debate. I believe standing order 98 provides that in answering a question a minister should not debate the answer. I believe the Premier is debating.

**The SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. Premier, have you finished your answer?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** I have finished my answer.

### SOLAR ENERGY

**Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:21):** Will the Premier update the house on the commonwealth's recent solar energy demonstration project announcements, including the Solar Flagships Program short list?

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (14:21):** It would have been nice to have greater notice of this question, but I will try to do my best, because I know the honourable member is keen. I am pleased to report that last night the commonwealth made two announcements that relate to potential solar energy projects in our state.

As part of the commonwealth's Renewable Energy Demonstration Program, \$60 million out of a total of \$92 million was awarded to the Whyalla Solar Oasis Consortium to build a 40 megawatt solar thermal demonstration plant near Whyalla. I am sure Her Excellency the Speaker would welcome that announcement. I congratulate the Whyalla Solar Oasis Consortium on its successful bid, which I understand is now subject to satisfying grant conditions.

The commonwealth also announced a short list for round 1 of the Solar Flagships Program, for which the federal government has committed \$1.5 billion. A number of solar flagship proposals involve projects in South Australia, so this announcement has particular relevance to our state. The solar flagships funding commitment will support the construction and demonstration of up to four large scale solar power plants in Australia using solar thermal and, of course, photovoltaic technologies. The Solar Flagships Program is part of the commonwealth government's Clean Energy Initiative which was originally announced in the May 2009 budget and which was expanded in the current budget with an additional \$652 million over four years to take it to a \$5.1 billion program.

I welcome the commonwealth's expansion of the program, which now includes investment in a new renewable energy future fund to support early stage projects in large and small scale renewable energy projects, including wind, solar and, of course, biomass. It will also be directed towards enhancing Australia's take-up of energy efficiency and helping business and households reduce their energy consumption.

The Clean Energy Initiative was designed to support the research, development and demonstration of low emission energy technologies in Australia and is also part of the commonwealth government's overall plan to achieve the national target of having 20 per cent of Australia's electricity from renewable energy by 2020.

The solar flagships component is specifically geared to accelerate the commercialisation of solar power in Australia. It is intended to provide the foundation for utility scale grid-connected solar power to play a significant role in Australia's electricity supply and to operate within a competitive electricity market. The program is aimed to deliver 1,000 megawatts of solar electricity generation capacity. Members should know that that is for the nation and that in South Australia by the end of this year there will be 1,000 megawatts of renewable energy, mainly from wind power—easily leading the country.

Round 1 of the Solar Flagships Program will result in two projects—one solar thermal and one photovoltaic—being announced in the first half of 2011. An additional process for round 2 will follow at a later stage. The selection process for these initial two projects has been divided into two stages. Stage 1 is the short list of eight projects (from a total of 52 proposals) which was announced last night. The short-listed projects will be invited to participate in the second stage of round 1 and will share up to \$15 million in feasibility funding. The short list that was announced last night did not guarantee a project for South Australia but did include our state in both the PV and solar thermal lists. Under the PV proponents (which included AGL Energy, TRUenergy, Infigen and BP Solar), South Australia was included as part of AGL's multi-site project list.

More importantly, the solar thermal list positions South Australia as one of two states in the running to receive a solar thermal project. Of the four solar thermal proponents listed—Acciona Energy Oceania, Parsons Brinckerhoff, Wind Prospect CWP and Transfield—all are positioned to be sited in Queensland, except for Acciona's project, which will be either in Queensland or South Australia. I welcome both AGL's and Acciona's inclusion of South Australia in their site lists, and note that our state not only has exceptional solar resources but also regulatory processes and a government fee structure that positions us very competitively against all other states, including Queensland.

#### ADELAIDE OVAL

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26):** My question is to the Treasurer. Given that the state government initially announced that it would be seeking up to \$100 million from the commonwealth towards the Adelaide Oval upgrade, has the government sought this funding and, if so, why is such funding not in the federal budget?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:26):** The shadow treasurer, Rob Lucas, was last night on radio and again had a press conference today on this issue. I guess that the member for Davenport has yet again been overtaken, supplanted in his role, as the former deputy leader was, by Rob Lucas. Rob Lucas just cannot get over the fact that he is not the shadow treasurer, or even the treasurer, any more.

Madam Speaker, what a silly suggestion. We have made it clear that we will not expect from the consortia—the stadium management authority—a signed agreement on the stadium until 1 July. Why would you ask the commonwealth to give you \$100 million in this budget if you did not have a signed guarantee? I have provisioned for expenditure on the stadium because it is a prudent thing for a state government to assess whether or not we have the budget capacity to withstand—

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Madam Speaker, honestly—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy leader, behave yourself!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** The Leader of the Opposition mumbles to herself and tries to interject across the chamber. I am happy to give an answer but, if members do not want to hear it, I will not waste their time or mine.

The commonwealth has indicated to us on a couple of fronts that we will receive a minimum of \$100 million. But we are also in separate negotiations, or negotiations parallel to this, about what would occur should the nation win the Soccer World Cup, which would require further financial assistance to ensure it was FIFA compliant. There is correspondence of a confidential nature regarding those matters. Both the \$100 million and the matter of whatever else may be required should we become the successful bidder with the need for it to be FIFA compliant, those negotiations—

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Sorry, the member for—

**Mr Venning:** Keep talking.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Are you happy with the committee you have got now, after you threatened to stand if we supported him?

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** After he stared them down.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Ivan was running around saying, 'Will you support me for the committee if they give it to the member for Unley?' I love you; you are such a loyal lot over there. I see the member for Waite was criticising the marginal campaign in parliament today. They are such a loyal lot over there.

**An honourable member:** I am ready to lead.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Well, there we go—another one!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Madam Speaker, in the eight years I have been Deputy Premier, you may not realise but I have faced six deputy leaders—six members opposite have occupied the position of deputy leader. We will receive funding from the commonwealth, it will be provided when we have a signed agreement and when we advise the commonwealth in which year we would like that money to be provided.

We have stated publicly that it will take two years from sign off to the first build beginning. The federal government would not be announcing in this budget \$100 million when we cannot even tell it as yet within which year we would want it provided. I know that many members opposite have not had state government budget experience, but I just say to them that this is a normal commonwealth/state financial arrangement.

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** You know, when I first came into this parliament, Madam Speaker, the chant from the then Liberals in government was, 'State Bank, \$2 million a day in interest,' and 16½ years later they are still parroting it. The only difference is that it might have been true back in 1993; it is not true today.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I would say to the Liberal opposition that, when it comes to Adelaide Oval, we are building a hospital on the site on which they would have preferred a stadium; and the reason we are doing that is because we campaigned on it, we received a mandate for it and we are going to build it.

**Mr Williams:** An illegitimate government!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** An illegitimate government?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** One thing I know is that we have had the member for Bragg commending David Cameron, but I think that David Cameron worked out that you have got to get the majority of votes in the majority of seats to win government. That is how it works. The member for Waite—I have just read the transcript—was critical because you did not put enough resources into your marginals, and the factional system in the Liberal Party meant that one side of the Liberal Party would not support another candidate because they did not like them. The member for Waite is a man of courage and a man who speaks his mind with authority, and I have to say—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a point of order.

**Mr PENGILLY:** My point of order is standing order No. 98: relevance and debating the issue.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes. I have thought carefully about this, but he is actually responding to a comment from your side of the house. But, Treasurer, perhaps you would like to refer back to the original question.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I will conclude and say this to members opposite: there is no other large, vacant space in the CBD to build a football stadium, and if you were to—

**Mr Pisoni:** The rail yards.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Where? Someone said the Parklands?

**Mr Pisoni:** The rail yards.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** We are building a hospital there.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** No; we are building a hospital. I reckon that if you looked at Adelaide and said, 'Where physically would be the best place to locate a stadium for the city?' you would probably pick Adelaide Oval if Adelaide Oval was not there.

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Why wouldn't you?

**Mr Williams:** Because there's no train or tram.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** They opposed the trams. I know that the member for MacKillop might not like walking, but it is only about a 300 metre walk from the train station to the front door of the Adelaide Oval. How much closer do you want us to put the trains? Come on, come on, come on! I know that the leader does not remember a lot about her time at the Adelaide Oval, or for that matter never been to Football Park, but I have been going to Football Park for 20 or 30 years and I have been going to Adelaide Oval for longer. I know a little more about Adelaide Oval—

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** There are no trams or trains down there.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** There is no tram or train down there. It has worked very well over these years. I simply say that the oval and the precinct that we will develop will be transformational in this city, and it will, as Andrew Demetriou said to me last night over dinner (and he paid, so you do not have to FOI)—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a point of order.

**Mrs REDMOND:** Point of order, Madam Speaker: the question was about the \$100 million from the commonwealth government. If the Treasurer is going to answer the question, he has probably already answered it, and otherwise I think he has completely finished.

**The SPEAKER:** I think you are probably right, but he has been responding to numerous interjections from your side. The member for Bright.

#### NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

**Ms FOX (Bright) (14:35):** My question is to the Minister for Volunteers. Can the minister share with the house the benefits of National Volunteers Week 2010?

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (14:36):** Can I start by congratulating the member for Bright on her appointment to the Deputy Speaker's role and you, Madam Speaker, on your elevation. I look forward to your firm but fair hand and your protection from time to time.

It is my great pleasure to be here today as the Minister for Volunteers, having launched National Volunteers Week on Monday. Volunteers Week will run from 10 to 16 May. What this means for South Australia is that we have a weeklong celebration and acknowledgement of the hard work that volunteers contribute to this fantastic state. It means, for instance, that we have 600,000 South Australians who provide about 1.4 million hours worth of work. We thank them here in the state government. What this means is an economic value of \$5 billion. In 2002 it was estimated that our volunteers contribute about \$5 billion in terms of economic value of volunteering.

The state government acknowledges that we can't do what we do alone. We need volunteers. We thank volunteers; we acknowledge what they do. Our theme this year for National Volunteers Week is 'Volunteering: Now, more than ever' and that recognises the difficult times that the community has gone through in our post-global financial crisis period. I encourage every member in this house to get out there amongst the community, thank our volunteers and have a good time.

#### ADELAIDE OVAL

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37):** My question is to the Treasurer. How much of the \$450 million in funding for the Adelaide Oval upgrade will be used to pay off the debt of the South Australian Cricket Association which has been reported to be in the vicinity of \$90 million?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:38):** I wouldn't send the integrity of the former leader of the Liberal right in South Australia and a former Howard government—

**Mrs REDMOND:** Madam Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes.

**Mrs REDMOND:** The Treasurer has launched immediately into debate and discussion and everything irrelevant rather than an answer to the question which was, quite simply: how much of the money that is being put by the government (the \$450 million that the government is putting up for this redevelopment) is to be paying off the debt of \$90 million of the SACA?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, Treasurer; I hope you are directing your remarks to answering that question.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I am, Madam Speaker, but I just felt a degree of responsibility to ensure that the good name and character of a fine South Australian—

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Point of order, Madam Speaker: there is no comment about the good name or bad name of anyone and no slur on anybody's character. It was a simple question: is any of the \$450 million going towards paying off that debt or not?

**The SPEAKER:** I don't think there is any point of order there yet, because we have not heard what the Treasurer has to say. I am sure he is going to respond correctly to the question.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Madam Speaker, I'm sorry. I apologise to the house. I just felt honour bound to defend a senior Tory—

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** You reflected on the indebtedness of the SACA.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Treasurer, can you answer the question please?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Sorry, I apologise. It has been so long since I have been in opposition that I can't remember what it's like to ask a question. I apologise. I am not in a position to finalise the payment structures that the government will make in respect of this project until such time as I actually receive advice from the Stadium Management Authority and my officials working with them as to what the final cost and the requirements are for that project.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I will be more than happy to answer that question when I am able to be in a position to answer it. I am not, at this stage.

#### HOMELESSNESS

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:40):** Can the Minister for Housing update the house on initiatives to help reduce homelessness in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:40):** Reducing homelessness has been a priority of the Rann government since we came to office in 2002. Just a little over a week ago South Australia received high praise indeed from the federal Minister for Housing, Tania Plibersek, who was quoted as saying, 'South Australia is nation-leading, with cutting-edge reforms.'

One cannot underestimate the importance of having a federal government that is also committed to addressing this important issue. I am very happy to be able to provide the house today with information on new homelessness initiatives in South Australia. Our partnership agreement on homelessness, with the federal government, is delivering nearly \$60 million towards initiatives that will significantly improve the lives of some of our most vulnerable people. This \$60 million is in addition to \$22 million already committed for A Place to Call Home.

We have been working hard to ensure that this funding delivers services on the ground to people as quickly as possible. Six hundred of the economic stimulus properties are being built specifically for people experiencing homelessness, including young people and women with children escaping domestic violence. I am particularly pleased to be talking about the economic stimulus money today, following the comments by the opposition leader in the house yesterday. The Leader of the Opposition made, to use her own words, 'an outrageous misstatement of true facts' in attacking the government for wasting commonwealth money in—



**Mr PENGILLY:** Point of order. I refer again to standing order No. 98, which provides that the minister or member replies to the substance of the question and may not debate the matter. The minister is clearly debating the matter.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not think there is a point of order. I think the minister is responding to the question.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** The truth is that South Australia is leading the way in our innovative delivery of 1,350 social houses, and we have specifically targeted these homes for homelessness, victims of domestic violence, mental health clients and young children—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** —exiting state care. We are absolutely on track in delivering those houses, absolutely on track—

**Ms Chapman:** What a joke.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** It just goes to show how little you know.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Bragg and the member for Finniss!

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** You ask Lynn Arnold. I am happy to advise the leader that construction is well underway, with interim service arrangements already operational for 150 of the 600 homes set aside for homelessness. Tenants are moving in and being supported as houses are being completed. In the area of homelessness, \$4.27 million in packages will be allocated each year to ensure that vulnerable people allocated the homes receive the assistance they need for long-term success.

A new homelessness response team is fully operational in partnership with the Crisis Response Unit. The sum of \$500,000 per annum is being provided for after-hours assessment, referral and response services. This will ensure that rough sleepers are assisted at any hour of the day or night. Four full-time social workers with expertise in homelessness will be working to ensure a thorough service is provided to homelessness clients. This project is also going to expand the emergency outreach available to support women and children escaping domestic violence.

We know that rough sleeping is not just confined to the inner city, and we have also turned our attention to regional South Australia. Based on the successful Street to Home model, a brand-new regional assertive outreach program is providing \$70,000 each year to fighting chronic homelessness in Ceduna and the Riverland. Rough sleepers in these areas are already receiving individual case management and are being provided with pathways out of homelessness as well as links into housing and ongoing support.

The Black Diamond Ladder Project is an innovative new model for young people at risk, focusing on connecting young people with training, education and employment, and it is supported by AFL mentors through the AFL's ladder program. The 23 units will be located at the iconic Black Diamond Hotel in Port Adelaide, and refurbishment is well underway and due for completion in November this year.

A range of other projects aimed at addressing homelessness are on track, and many will be operational within the coming months. Examples include a child focus support program providing \$500,000 a year for individual and group supports, for children accompanying adults in the homelessness sector; a schools assertive outreach program aimed at young people between the ages of 12 and 16; and an Aboriginal youth early intervention program will provide early intervention for Aboriginal young people.

Projects that will be operational later in the year include: a program that will fund safety and security measures in family homes to allow women to remain in their own homes; unique to South Australia, a new program aimed at perpetrators that will provide early intervention and prevention strategies to break the cycle of violence and repeat domestic violence; and the safe road home program will provide accommodation in the northern suburbs as safe, short-term accommodation for women and children, as well as outreach services when they return to their home.

In partnership with the federal government, we are making significant progress in reducing homelessness in our state and ensuring that our most vulnerable are provided with the best services available.

#### ADELAIDE OVAL

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:46):** Has the Treasurer received advice—either formal or informal—from the Stadium Management Authority, or any of the sporting codes involved with the Adelaide Oval upgrade project, that the cost of that project will exceed \$450 million and, if so, what is the advice about the new estimate of the project cost?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:46):** Informally, I have received advice, yes. It depends on your definition of 'formally'.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** How were they dressed when they gave it?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** How were they dressed? Informally. I have given a press conference, and I made the point there that what we are doing with this project is integrating it with the announcement we also made pre-election to expand the Convention Centre and to do work at the Riverbank and also with work that will be done, or will be planned to be done over time, with the Festival Theatre, as well as interface issues with the Adelaide Casino. It is no secret that the Adelaide Casino has been considering a further location. It may or may not wish to take up that option. There are issues relating to the car park in the Festival Theatre—that members opposite and members on this side are entitled to use—of concrete cancer, where there is a substantial cost to government for the rebuild of that car park.

We are in the process of putting together a framework to deal with all of the precinct and also the interface with the Research Centre and, indeed, perhaps even the new Royal Adelaide Hospital to ensure that, for once, we treat the entire Torrens Riverbank precinct as one precinct. We do not just simply—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Well, when my day comes to leave this parliament, one of the proudest things I will be able to look back on as a Labor cabinet minister is the building, construction and delivery of the most advanced, outstanding healing centre/hospital anywhere in the world.

**An honourable member:** You'll be gone, and you want us to pay for it.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** They want us to pay for it. Who else is going to pay for it? The taxpayer will pay for it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Yes. You were going to use a PPP for your hospital.

*Mr Williams interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Yes, as a PPP.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** And it was so well sold that the shadow treasurer is now the shadow something else.

**The Hon. P.F. Conlon:** It's all spin.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** It was all spin. If you want to talk about costings, it was all spin. The point I am getting to is that there is, and will be, available to government a number of options for this precinct.

As far as the oval upgrade itself is concerned, we have said we will put \$450 million into the project.

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** What is the estimate of the new cost?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Gee!

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** That was the question, remember. We ask questions.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! You have asked your question. We will wait for the Treasurer to answer it.

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** I am used to it. I have been doing it for eight years. You ask, we answer and—I get that. As I said at the very beginning of my question, when we have that information, when we have that advice, when we have made a decision as a cabinet and my colleagues have had an opportunity to see that advice, we will make a decision, we will announce it and we will make public what those figures are.

The truth of the matter is this: this is another stage in this Labor government rebuilding the fabric of the city and the infrastructure of this state. As I was about to say in a previous answer, Andrew Demetriou is incredibly excited with the Adelaide Oval upgrade, so much so that he said to me he wishes that they were building today Etihad Stadium. The reason he said that is that when we unveil the new oval, the level of technology and the level of advancement in consumer comfort, spectator comfort is quite extraordinary. I had a good discussion with Leigh Whicker about it as well.

Given the unique nature of the Adelaide Oval upgrade where we are keeping the mound, the scoreboard and the ambience of the precinct, there are going to be some quite unique features to what this oval will look like and the amenity that will be offered, not just to members but to the walk-up punter and to the people in the general admission area—quite extraordinary.

What has occurred is that technology has changed, but so has consumer behaviour and what consumers want at a game of football. The days of the corporate box as we have known it before may be different in the future. The point I am making is this is going to be a terrific investment and build for the state and the last people to get on the train to the Adelaide Oval upgrade will be the Liberal Party, because I can tell you the mood has shifted strongly in the football world and the cricket world and this government will deliver the greatest sporting venue anywhere in Australia, outside the MCG.

#### ADELAIDE OVAL

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:52):** Can the Treasurer confirm his public statement made today that the makeover at the Adelaide Oval is 'still expected to cost \$450 million'?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:53):** What I said today, shadow finance minister—

**The Hon. I.F. Evans:** Treasurer.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** Well, I had to respond to Rob Lucas today. I mean, if he's the shadow treasurer why wasn't he out there asking me those questions? He is in here in the parliament asking me the questions, but he will not go in front of the media.

**Mr PENGILLY:** On a point of order, Madam Speaker, number 98 again.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Treasurer, are you going to respond to that question?

**The Hon. K.O. FOLEY:** No; let's just wait and see, as I said, when we announce the figures.

#### TRAINING ORGANISATIONS

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:53):** My question is to the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education. What are the criteria used by your department to accredit registered training organisations catering predominantly for foreign students in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:54):** I do not carry the information around in my head. The information is, I understand, publicly available. I think the member for Unley could have a look on the internet; it would all be there. It is part of a national framework which the department use to set out the standards and what is expected of training providers in order for them to be accredited.

**TRAINING ORGANISATIONS**

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:54):** I ask a supplementary question. Was the department negligent in providing accreditation to the Adelaide Pacific International College when the major employer organisation in the automotive industry does not recognise the qualification they provide as a legitimate pathway into their industry here in South Australia or around the nation? If the rules are on the website then the minister would know whether they were negligent or not.

**The SPEAKER:** You have asked the question. Sit down. Point of order.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** I ask you to rule that that has no bearing on the answer that was given by the minister. It is not supplementary to it because it has no bearing on the answer he gave.

**The SPEAKER:** I agree with you. I think that was a separate question and I will count that as another question.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:55):** I presume that the member for Unley is referring to the press statement coming from Mr John Chapman of the Motor Trade Association, and that that is the organisation to which he is referring. I have met Mr Chapman several times since becoming minister and he is a great bloke. He is very well informed and has great knowledge about vocational education. I note that Mr Chapman is also a former staffer for the Liberal Party but, unlike members opposite, I am more than happy to meet any stakeholder in my portfolio, regardless of their political affiliations.

Mr Chapman and the MTA's concern with the training model provided at APIC is essentially one of methodology. The Motor Trade Association believes that training for automotive technicians and mechanics has to be on the job, which is the training that the MTA provides under its group training scheme. APIC and other training providers, including TAFE, provide their training methodology in an institutional setting which the MTA disagrees with. The MTA has a fundamental point of disagreement with that training methodology which you would expect, because it provides training on the competing methodology—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Unley!

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** The last five months have been difficult because I have missed the member for Unley's sunny countenance in this chamber. It has been so difficult—

**Mr PENGILLY:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**Mr PENGILLY:** Standing Order 98 again, Madam Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I uphold that point of order. Minister, can you direct your answer to the question?

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Point of order, Madam Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order.

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON:** Can I again point out that it sits ill in the mouth of the opposition to insist on standing orders, when they persistently fail to observe them with interjecting loudly and aggressively, I would point out, by the member for Unley.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I agree. The Treasurer did very well in his last response and stuck to the question. However he was constantly fielding interjections and could not help responding to one or two. Minister, I am sure you are not going to be like that; you are going to answer the question.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Thanks very much, Madam Speaker; I was sorely provoked. The Motor Trade Association provides a competing methodology in training to that which is provided in an institutional setting. That has been the basis of the MTA's concerns and those have been the concerns that have been looked at by the department and the regulator over the preceding months.

### INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58):** My question is for the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney-General raise the Rann government's proposal for a federal independent commission against corruption at the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General last Friday? The Attorney-General advised the house on 6 May that he would raise the issue of a national ICAC with the Standing Committee of Attorneys-General in Melbourne on 7 May; however, the issue was not mentioned in the communiqué issued from the meeting.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (14:58):** Yes, I did.

*Ms Bedford interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the member for Florey!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** He has answered. I'm sorry that question was answered too quickly for me; I'm not used to this.

### UNION HALL

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:59):** My question is for the Premier. Given that Union Hall satisfies the definition for its classification as a heritage place under the state act, will the Premier commit to support and preserve the historic Union Hall at the University of Adelaide?

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (14:59):** Certainly to date, since I have been Minister for Environment and Conservation, it is safe to say that quite a variety of views have been expressed to me regarding my role—if there is to be one—in the determination of Union Hall. To date I have not made a decision as to what I will do in relation to it. I am continuing to listen to the views of others. Ultimately, if I believe there is a case with respect to its being listed, I will make a decision based on the information I receive and my consideration of that information.

### UNION HALL

**Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:01):** I have a supplementary question.

**The SPEAKER:** I point out to members that I will listen to supplementary questions carefully because I do not want every question to have two or three supplementary questions. Members will get one supplementary question to each question, and after about three supplementary questions that will be it. I will allow this question, leader, otherwise we will have a question time with 30 questions—which is nonsense.

**Mrs REDMOND:** Will either the Premier or the minister advise whether the recent audit undertaken for Arts SA included Union Hall at the Adelaide University as an Adelaide theatre space?

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:01):** From memory, I cannot recollect whether it was included—I imagine it was—but I will get back to the house with a fuller explanation.

**The SPEAKER:** I will consider that to be a supplementary question, but, because a different minister answered it, I think we could have counted it as a separate question.

### INTERNATIONAL NURSES DAY

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (15:01):** Today is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! As this is the honourable member's first question in the house, we will treat him with the respect he should be accorded. It is rather like a maiden speech.

**The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON:** As today is International Nurses Day, marking the birth of Florence Nightingale, my question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister advise the house

how the government is working with nurses to continue to improve the quality of care that nurses provide to South Australian patients?

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, and well done. Minister for Health.

**The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurna—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Southern Suburbs, Minister Assisting the Premier in the Arts) (15:02):** I thank the member for Croydon for his first question. I congratulate him on his new role and take this opportunity to congratulate him on his outstanding service to this state over his eight years as attorney-general and minister for multicultural affairs. I must say that I am pleased he is maintaining his interest in the proceedings of this place by asking questions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** I say to the 14,668 nurses employed in the public health system as at June last year, including 3,692 who have been employed since we have been in office, 'Happy International Nurses Day.' Today is the anniversary of the birth of Florence Nightingale. She was born on 12 May 1820 and today marks International Nurses Day which commemorates that fact. It is also the centenary of the death of Florence Nightingale, who died on 13 August 1910; so she lived to the ripe old age of 90 years. Of course, modern health care owes much to Florence Nightingale.

I was pleased that the member for Morphett joined me at the stall in the mall held by the nurses and midwives union today. We were there to have our blood pressure taken and help to promote International Nurses Day. I thank the member for Morphett for being there.

Of course, Florence Nightingale was a pioneer in areas such as nursing theory, education and preventive medicine, and a formidable advocate for her patients in more ways than one. When Queen Victoria wanted to send Eau de Cologne to the troops during the Crimean War—perhaps to cover the stench of the battlefields—Florence wrote that 'a little gin would do better'.

**An honourable member:** My kind of nurse!

**The Hon. J.D. HILL:** She is my kind of nurse, yes. The compassion for the sick and commitment to providing excellent health care that drove Florence Nightingale lives on today in our nursing and midwifery workforce. The education, training, recruitment and retention of health workers, of course, will be critical to providing quality health care in our state, particularly into the future. So, it is important that we continue to provide greater training opportunities, improve conditions and foster new roles and professional pathways in nursing and midwifery.

From 1 July this year, nurses and midwives throughout Australia will meet the same requirements to be registered and their registration will be recognised in all states and territories, subject to the passing of the legislation in this house and other places. The introduction of the Nursing and Midwifery Practice Bill in 2008 recognises nursing and midwifery as separate professions and also provides recognition and protection for the increasing number of nurse practitioners.

I want to talk a little bit about nurse practitioners. These are highly skilled nurses and midwives who have masters level qualifications and who are authorised to practise in an expanded nursing role. Nurse practitioners may perform examinations, prescribe some medications and undertake diagnostic procedures. The role of nurse practitioner provides an important career progression path for nurses and also has a significant role to play in expanding the capacity of our medical workforce. Not only are nurse practitioners capable of undertaking a broader range of roles than other nurses, but they also enable doctors who would otherwise be performing those tasks to undertake alternative tasks.

Currently, there are 28 nurse practitioners working across a range of clinical speciality areas in our public health system and, during the most recent campaign, I was pleased that this government was able to commit to employing 100 additional nurse practitioners over the next four years, including 18 in palliative care, 20 in aged care, 18 in emergency departments and 29 in cancer services. To help the nurses undertake the additional study required, we were pleased to announce that we would provide 80 scholarships worth \$20,000 each for nurses to study to become nurse practitioners. So, that is a very practical way of celebrating International Nurses Day.

When Florence Nightingale was starting out, the nursing profession was desperately in need of some PR. Hospitals then were seen as dirty and dangerous, and nurses had a reputation for drunkenness. My, how things have changed! Through Florence's work and the nursing profession's ongoing dedication and commitment to good quality patient care, nursing has, of course, been transformed into a well-respected and vital occupation. Today the professionalism and commitment of our nurses ensure that the image of nursing continues to flourish. Here is some evidence: in the annual ranking of our most trusted professions, nursing claimed top position, ahead of doctors and pharmacists. I will not embarrass members by mentioning where politicians finished. It shows how highly we regard our health professionals. We members of parliament, of course, did languish near the bottom, along with radio announcers and car salesmen.

Finally, I take this opportunity to congratulate all the winners of the recent South Australian Nursing and Midwifery Excellence Awards for their service to South Australian patients. I attended the Nursing and Midwifery Excellence Awards dinner on Friday night, where we were able to pay tribute to the outstanding work of those who have achieved those awards. I also congratulate the recipients of the Premier's Nursing and Midwifery Scholarships of 2010-11. I am sure I can pass on to all of the hard-working nurses and midwives of our state the best wishes of all members of this place.

### VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** Before I ask for the next question, I acknowledge in the house the presence of the Hon. Lynn Arnold, former Premier of South Australia. Welcome. It must be a week for former premiers this week. The deputy leader.

### QUESTION TIME

#### MURRAY RIVER WATER ALLOCATIONS

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:08):** My question is to the minister for water. Given that our River Murray irrigators have capped their water entitlements for almost 40 years and are the most efficient irrigators in the nation, can the minister assure those irrigators that their water entitlements will be protected against reductions made across the Murray-Darling basin to counter over-allocation?

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:09):** I thank the deputy leader for his question. Also, I congratulate you on your role, ma'am, which I have not had a chance to do yet.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Ma'am. I also congratulate the deputy leader on his ascent to the lofty position that, at least at this time, he holds.

It was a good question, and I think the point to be made here—and it was a point that was made by the deputy leader—is that we capped our allocations in 1969. In addition to that, on any fair assessment—on anyone's assessment—there is no doubt that we lead the way with respect to the way in which we irrigate in this state. It is a standard, of course, that has not been adopted by those upstream states that, of course, over-allocated beyond what was the capacity of the system as a whole.

In regard to the specific question about what will happen with the sustainable diversion limits, that will be determined by and through the draft plan (which, I understand, will be released around the end of July but which is still to be confirmed), which will take into account what will occur with allocations across the basin.

Certainly, it is my position as minister; and I am certainly hoping that, throughout this term, we might adopt a greater bipartisan approach to the way in which we manage water in this state. That would be good for the state and it would be good for the opposition to adopt such an approach. The point I would make is that I think that, on any fair assessment with respect to the consideration that is going to be made by those within the authority, they will, should and must take into account that which South Australia has done over the years in regard to the capping and the way in which we use our water.

The way in which the system has been managed—or, if you like, mismanaged—over the years would say to me that, if the authority gets it right, that is, to treat the system as a system,

South Australia will be a beneficiary of that not only from an environmental perspective but also from an economic perspective and, indeed, a social and cultural perspective.

I thank the deputy leader for his question, and I look forward to a more bipartisan approach on the matter of water than what has occurred during the previous parliaments.

### FLOODPLAIN HARVESTING

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:11):** My question again is to the Minister for Water Security. Has the government made a submission to the New South Wales government on its draft floodplain harvesting policy; and, if so, will the minister table that submission?

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:11):** As I understand it—and I know that the honourable member raised that issue, I think, when I was on the radio one morning—the question specifically is about how you measure the flood waters on floodplains, which I understand is a very difficult thing to do, but it should not be insurmountable.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I will ignore the interjection, again, of the former deputy leader. It is an interesting thing, isn't it, because you have got a one in four or a one in three chance of becoming a deputy leader on the other side, save and except—

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Madam Speaker, point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is a point of order. The deputy leader.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The minister was almost about to answer the question, but he got sidetracked. Perhaps you could call him back.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I will call the minister back to the question.

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Thank you very much, ma'am. I apologise for being so poor in my performance as to respond to interjections, which, of course, are disorderly. Getting back to the substance of the question. As I understand it, New South Wales, around 2008, was directed to look at ways by which it could measure the interception of water on floodplains. At that stage New South Wales had nothing in place. It is safe to say that it has not got much more in place today except the fact that it is, as I understand it at this point, being undertaken in the form of an honour system, which, of course, is better than having nothing, but is it still—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** You should let me finish. Is it still as good as it should be? I would say that the answer is no. It is something that needs to be taken up by the authority to make sure that, even though it is difficult, practices should be put in place that, as far as possible, can measure that interception on floodplains. In regard to the specifics of the question: have I contacted my colleague on this specific matter? Not at this time, but I do understand, and I will correct the record if it is not the case, that dialogue is occurring at official levels on this matter.

Of course, that dialogue will better inform the response of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority which is required to deal with this matter. Again, I thank the deputy leader for his question.

### NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:14):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Conservation. How critical is the role of community engagement in delivering beneficial outcomes to South Australians through sustainable use of our natural resources?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Environment and Conservation, Minister for the River Murray, Minister for Water) (15:14):** This will excite you, I know. Thank you very much, again, Madam Speaker. I thank the honourable member for his question and, again, congratulate him on his election to this parliament. The sustainable management of our state's natural resources presents all of us with significant challenges, especially in light of predicted population growth and



climate change. It is vital that we engage with local communities and industries right across our state to build a solid foundation upon which a sustainably prosperous future can be delivered.

I think all members are aware that our water resources have been under stress, that many of our soils are fragile and that much of our native vegetation has been cleared. What we need to find is a workable balance that manages our natural systems sustainably into the future, that conserves our native animals, plants and vegetation, while at the same time ensuring that the natural resources are appropriately utilised to deliver economic benefits.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Madam Speaker, I find it interesting, again—and I am not seeking your protection—from the interjections from the other side: are they really interested in our natural environment? Perhaps the answer, given the comment over there, is no.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Then maybe you might actually learn something if you listen. You might actually pick up something. Our natural environment goes beyond the boundaries of Burnside, member for Bragg. It goes well beyond.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I am happy for it to keep coming, but—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Bragg!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Getting back to the question, again, I apologise for responding to interjections. This government will, as I hope the opposition will, undoubtedly continue to provide strong leadership in this area knowing that, to achieve the best balance in pursuing both environmental and economic goals, it is critical that we foster greater collaboration across our local communities by ensuring that they are involved at the grassroots level in the delivery of natural resource management projects.

Our local communities, which include NRM boards, local government, various industry sectors and individual enterprises as well as the range of non-government organisations and other committed individuals, each make important contributions in delivering improvements in the sustainable use of our natural resources, and they need to be supported and encouraged. Recently, I announced the availability of grants totalling approximately \$1 million provided through the second round of community grants for land, coast and water care projects, and this follows the distribution of more than \$1.5 million in the first round of this grants program. The government welcomes the development—

**The Hon. M.J. Wright:** There's more?

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** There's lots more, Michael.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Yes, there's more, Ivan. I know you're such a committed person to our natural environment. I know that you've benefited from working with your natural environment, Ivan. The government welcomes the development of community driven initiatives including efforts to reinvigorate the Landcare movement in our state and recognises the critical role played by the regional NRM boards in determining priorities and delivering projects locally.

I also look forward to working closely with peak bodies such as the NRM Council, the Conservation Council, the South Australian Farmers Federation—indeed, my friends in the Farmers Federation—and the Local Government Association in setting broader policy and strategic directions to natural resource management.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Madam Speaker, you'll be pleased to know that I'm ignoring the member for Bragg. Recently, I visited a number of sites in conjunction with the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM Board.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Some of the sites have benefited from funding under previous rounds of the Community Grants program and these visits provided me with a valuable demonstration of the effectiveness of good natural resource management practices in assisting businesses to become more profitable and farms to operate more productively while at the same time improving the quality of the local environment.

What I also saw were some fantastic examples of what can be achieved through engagement with local communities and landowners. For example, about five years ago Mr Barry Windle, a landowner at Balhannah, started fencing off the creek for his property and has since undertaken native vegetation replanting resulting in a much cleaner flow of stream water due to the reduction of livestock disturbance. He has actually rehabilitated that creek bed back to something that has been restored to its natural state. The work was undertaken by local volunteers, whom I commend for their passion and commitment to improving the environment. These local volunteers, as should be the case from government and non-government, were supported by the NRM board's expertise. No doubt—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** That's right. No doubt, replication of projects like this, built on partnerships between landholders and local community members, can make a genuine difference to the state of our natural resources. It is great to see that the success achieved in this initiative has motivated 13 adjoining properties to be part of that extended project. Madam Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I can't hear the minister—

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** Shall I go back to the beginning, Madam Speaker?

**The SPEAKER:** —and I am very interested in hearing the minister.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. P. CAICA:** I am somewhat disturbed by the flippant nature of the opposition on what is a very important issue, and I would have expected better. We do not always need to choose between environmental and economic values. It is clear that, through continued strong government leadership and support for effective local NRM collaborations, we can achieve sustainable development of our natural resources for the benefit of generations of South Australians to come.

#### **GIFFORD, MR DUN**

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (15:21):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.D. RANN:** Members on both sides of this house who have followed Tasting Australia's progress in Adelaide over the years will share my distress at the news of the tragic and untimely death on Sunday of United States good food campaigner Dun Gifford. Dun and his partner, Sara Baer-Sinnot, have been frequent visitors to Adelaide both for Tasting Australia and as convenors of the Food Summit.

For years this wonderful couple have been on the front line of the battle for healthier, tastier, more authentic food as the developed world confronts epidemics of obesity, including the scourge of childhood obesity, diabetes and other diet related diseases.

Dun Gifford, President of Oldways, the food issues think tank based in Boston, was a great and prominent advocate of the Mediterranean diet, consistently judged as the world's healthiest diet over many decades. As Dun said:

The main reason is that its principal fat is olive oil, which is not only delicious, but it is a monounsaturated fat. In this country, as we all know, butter was the principal fat for some generations, and butter is a saturated fat. The differences have to do with heart health.

The Italians, Greeks, Spanish, North Africans, in other words all Mediterraneans, had a much better heart health profile than Americans did during the 50s, 60s, 70s, 80s and 90s.

He went on to say:

Another reason is fish. Much more fish is eaten per capita in the Mediterranean countries than in the [United States]. This helps prevent obesity and hypertension.

Then Dun would talk about the importance of vegetables, where people in Mediterranean countries eat more vegetables per capita than Americans, which lowers their risk of colon cancer.

Dun Gifford engaged with people in the most positive, charming but convincing way to change food production and food consumption. He played a significant role in changing public opinion about food and in warning Americans of the dangers of junk food and fast food. He was once described in America as the 'guru of a new way of eating'. In fact, he was the champion of older, more authentic, more pleasurable ways of cooking and eating.

Dun was a great teacher. He brought science and good cuisine together. He loved coming to South Australia. He loved our big red wines and he loved our quality regional produce. He celebrated food and wine with character made by great characters. He also loved Adelaide's restaurants. Only last week Sasha and I took Dun and Sara to Auge, here in our city. I remember how much they enjoyed Enzo's and the Star of Greece a few years back.

He was not just a food activist; he was part of American political history. As a teenager he survived the sinking of the *Andrea Doria* in the Atlantic. After graduating from Harvard, Dun served in the US Navy, and then, after working in Washington DC, became a key adviser in the presidential campaign of United States Senator Robert Kennedy. Dun accompanied Bobby Kennedy during the June 1968 primary in California. When the results came in that Kennedy had beaten Eugene McCarthy and was therefore in a good position to win the nomination for president at the Democratic Convention in Chicago, Dun was with him in the ballroom of the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles. He was also walking behind Senator Kennedy in the kitchen of that same hotel when he was shot and fatally wounded. Dun helped to subdue Kennedy's assassin, Sirhan Sirhan, and accompanied Kennedy and his wife, Ethel, in an ambulance to the hospital.

Dun had a long involvement and friendship with the Kennedy family and served as a legal assistant to Senator Edward Kennedy, but tragedy again struck and Dun, who was a resident of Nantucket Island in Massachusetts, had to identify the drowned body of Mary Jo Kopechne.

After leaving full-time politics, he was involved in a number of businesses, including setting up a cookie and muffin shop in Boston's Quincy Market, with a returned Vietnam hero, John Kerry, himself later to become a US Senator for Massachusetts and the Democratic Party's nominee for President of the United States. He owned and opened restaurants (including the famous Harvest Restaurant), was a great sailor and fisherman and served as chief executive of the Nantucket Electric Company.

I first met Dun Gifford in Adelaide in the year 2000 and later met him in Boston and many times during his visits to our state. I, like many others of his South Australian friends, found this gentle giant from Nantucket to be a lighthouse of decency and quiet wisdom. He had many stories to tell but was also a great listener—a rare combination. He inspired people to do good things and to make a difference. When we banned junk food in schools and outlawed genetically modified crops in South Australia, I was thinking of Dun Gifford. He was an activist in life who was deeply committed to public service and was a good and loyal friend.

On behalf of the government and this parliament, I would like to extend our deepest sympathy to Dun's beloved Sarah and his family and to his colleagues at Oldways and Tasting Australia.

## GRIEVANCE DEBATE

### INTERNATIONAL NURSES DAY

**Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:27):** As the health minister said during question time, he and I had the pleasure of going across to Rundle Mall this afternoon to help the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation (SA Branch) celebrate International Nurses Day, which is today, 12 May. International Midwives Day was officially on 5 May; however, both are being celebrated today.

The role of nurses and midwives in society has been a long and very honourable one for many years, not just the last 100 years that we are celebrating with the centenary of the death of Florence Nightingale, who was born in 1820 and died in 1910.

Nurses in Rundle Mall were providing information for people passing by, and while the health minister and I were there—and I should also say that the member for MacKillop went over there as well—we had our blood pressure taken. My blood pressure was a bit higher than I would have liked it to be, but I am relaxed about that because, having had a number of tests in the last couple of months, I know that my cardiovascular system is working exceptionally well. Can I say that the member for MacKillop's blood pressure was 130 over 70, which is exceptionally good. He must be on some very good red wine or some very good pills; I am not sure which. He must have had Leonie, his wife, with him at the time to keep him nice and calm.

The sad part about today is that I was given a sheet outlining some of the information that you can get to ask and answer questions about your health. There is a website here, [www.betterhealth.vic.gov.au](http://www.betterhealth.vic.gov.au)—not South Australia. There is no website on here for the South Australian health department, which I think is pretty disappointing. I asked the minister to take note of that so that, perhaps, we can do something about it. It is always nice to buy home-grown rather than having to go across the border to see the Mexicans.

Nurses and midwives do an excellent job in South Australia. I speak with the federation on many matters and we get on exceptionally well. We do not always agree on everything but we do talk. In fact, when I spoke to its state council last year, I described the federation as an association, and I was reminded that it was a union. I said that calling the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation a union is like calling the *USS Midway* a boat. I do not think it is; I think it is much more than that.

It is a powerful organisation and does represent its members exceptionally well. In fact, one of the issues that has been raised with me by nurses is another very serious issue here in South Australia. I do not know which genius decided to do this, but that was the transfer of the renal unit from The Queen Elizabeth Hospital to the Royal Adelaide Hospital. That would have been okay if it were a permanent move, but we all know the government plan to build a new hospital down at the railyards, so by 2016 we will have to move that renal unit again.

We had a world-class renal unit at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, backed up by world-class nursing staff, medical imaging staff, renal dialysis staff and researchers. But what happened? There was a decision made to bring that away from TQEH to the RAH. Fine. However, you are going to bulldoze it in a few years' time.

It started out at about \$15 million, I understand it has gone to \$20 million—I have even had as high as \$40 million put to me by a senior doctor at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for the cost of that move. That is good value for money, bulldozing it in six years' time! I just do not understand why you would do this when you had a world-class facility already operating down there.

I have been told that, because of the move, there have been significant problems with patients having to go back down to TQEH for testing, for dialysis, backwards and forwards. It is just not working smoothly, not working seamlessly. I did hear of one tragic case where, because of the unavailability of an ultrasonographer after hours—and you need to have regular ultrasounds to check that the renal vein and renal arteries are working well and the new kidney is working well—a kidney transplant actually failed because it was not checked and that kidney ended up in the bin. That is a tragedy that should never have happened. It would be very unlikely to have happened if it had stayed down at TQEH. Why this move came about I do not know. It is a waste of money, it should never have happened.

#### NICOLL, MR MURRAY

**The Hon. M.D. RANN (Ramsay—Premier, Minister for Economic Development, Minister for Social Inclusion, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Sustainability and Climate Change) (15:32):** Last week I attended the funeral of Murray Nicoll. I first met Murray in 1978. He was press secretary to Geoff Virgo; I was the young new press secretary for Don Dunstan. Murray took me under his wing and so did his wonderful wife, Frankie. They would invite me up to Greenhill Road for a feed and to try and educate me about practical things.

Murray was in his 30s but was an experienced newspaper and TV journalist, and we had something in common: we both came from New Zealand. I had worked for Radio New Zealand, Murray had worked for the *Waikato Times* and *Evening Post*. Murray never forgot where he came

from. It shaped his values. It was his anchor. We would often have dinner on Friday nights, with restaurateur Libero De Luca being his favourite mein host. Murray was the great storyteller, whether it be through his journalism or through telling a yarn. There was a Mark Twain quality to the way he told a story, particularly if it was about the bush or fishing.

Murray was lucky to be alive. In 1975 Channel 7 asked Murray to go to East Timor to report on the imminent invasion by Indonesia. He was on his way, but he and other crews were stranded in Darwin. Murray killed time by going pig hunting with another Kiwi, a Darwin copper. Their jeep struck a buffalo; Murray was hit on the head and ended up in Darwin Hospital. His journo mates left him behind and then perished at Balibo.

Murray reported on some of South Australia's big stories. He was the great police reporter and could tell the real story of the drowning of Dr Duncan, and then there was the Nullarbor nymph. People liked him. He had the best contacts. The quirkiest the story the better. He liked a story with a twist, but never twisted the story. There was no political bias, no personal malice. He did not distort. He was an old-fashioned journo. He was honest.

His ability to tell a story prevailed over his peers and over fashion, no matter what the technology or which decade. I remember the time he was at 5DN, along with Colin Tyrus, Tim Sauer, Anne Fullwood and others. It was the best reporting team I have seen. As press secretary to John Bannon, the first call I made with a story was to 5DN. It was the engine room of Adelaide journalism. I was not alone in thinking this. When I went on to phone other newsrooms I could hear 5DN in the background. It was a reference point. 5DN liked to break stories, and they did.

Murray, of course, became famous for his coverage of the Ash Wednesday bushfire—a disaster that claimed many lives and many homes, including his own. His live broadcasts, while trapped with others behind a stone wall as the holocaust of fire and smoke engulfed them, is celebrated in broadcasting history. Even today, the simple, stark clarity of the report by a journalist facing death is both chilling and compelling.

So many of his friends offered to help, but it is a measure of Murray's dry, ironic humour that he phoned me several weeks after the fire to apologise for not returning a biography of Mohammed Ali I had lent him, because it had burnt in the fire. Twenty years later, on the anniversary of the Ash Wednesday fires, I went to Murray and Frankie's house, which they had built on the same spot and read him and his family the speech I had just given at the official ceremony, where I quoted from Murray's broadcast.

Murray won a Walkley Award for his Ash Wednesday report, then another when he reported from base camp on an Everest campaign led by Sir Edmund Hillary's son, Peter, in which two climbers had perished. He also reported the Azaria Chamberlain story.

Murray Nicoll is sometimes described as a journalist's journalist. That is true, but he was much more than that. He was a mentor to scores of young journalists and a beacon of honest reporting. Too often these days, TV news broadcasts can be as much about the journalists as about the story. Reporters can see themselves as the star, and sometimes journalists on rival stations will collude in order to communicate the same line across the networks. There is safety in numbers, and no-one is therefore putting their neck out. None of this interested Murray. It was not about him: it was about the stories. Murray preferred to break stories rather than be part of a pack. He was no hack.

After 5DN, Murray went on to 3AW. When he returned to Adelaide he had his own *Drive Time* show on ABC but was treated shabbily and fired by minnows who were not fit to lick his fire boots. However, for years now his stories on Seven—whether they be about the plight of the River Murray, tales of the outback or reporting on daily events—are so often run nationally, because they are good yarns told with eloquent humanity by a great storyteller.

Haere ra, Murray Nicoll. A kauri has fallen. Deepest sympathy to Frankie, and his lovely daughters Tia and Peta and their families.

#### MORALANA STATION

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:37):** At 2pm tomorrow, at the Hawker Community Centre, Landmark will auction a premier property in South Australia known as Moralana Station. This is a property which is situated in the Flinders Ranges near Hawker, in the state seat of Stuart. It is one of three properties to be sold by the University of Adelaide or, in particular, a trust, which I will refer to shortly. The other properties are Munduney Station at Jamestown (also in the state seat of Stuart) and Martindale Farm, near Mintaro which, as many members would know, is in the Clare

district, in the state seat of Frome. These are rural properties of stock and crop farming operations which, prior to their bequest by generous family benefactors, had been operated as rural holdings. I will give a brief history.

J.T. Mortlock died in 1950 and granted his wife a life interest, which expired upon her death in 1978. The property was conveyed to the Mortlock Trust. Other properties, via Mr J.S. Davies, who had generously donated the properties of Moralana and Munduney stations, are also under the operation of the Mortlock Trust.

Martindale Holdings Pty Ltd operates this trust for and on behalf of the University of Adelaide which, except for a very small interest in favour of Prince Alfred College, is in favour of the University of Adelaide. Not only are these properties significant in the development and agricultural gains for this state, but also, as properties that have been there for the benefit of the University of Adelaide, they have been very substantial in the history of the agricultural and animal science education and research fields of the university.

It is no secret—as I have published in the *Stock Journal*—that I object to the decision by the Adelaide University to offer these properties for sale. It is clear, I think, that there is no legal impediment against the terms of the trust in allowing the university to sell these properties but, certainly, I think that is in breach of their moral obligation to maintain these properties for the benefit for which they were given.

Furthermore, even though the trust terms under the bequest to operate the property as a farming property for a period of 20 years expired in 1989, this property, particularly at Martindale Farm, has provided very significant income to the university. In fact, in 2008 it was budgeted to receive \$404,000—which was actually received in 2009—net benefit to the university, yet the university has made the decision to sell these properties, the first of which is to be auctioned tomorrow, as I said.

The University of Adelaide has prided itself—and as a former old scholar I received a notice recently from the university doing just that—in agriculture and animal science education and, very importantly, the number of research projects that it has maintained. It claims that the proceeds from the sale of these properties will be reinvested 'in world-class research facilities'.

I say to this parliament that it is of great concern to me that when we debated the University of Adelaide bill—and the Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith was the former minister—she provided to me, and I read into the *Hansard*, a list of properties that would be the subject of sale under that new legislation which essentially allowed, amongst other things, the right of the university to buy and sell property without cabinet approval.

The properties on that list included the 5UV transmitter site at Wingfield, the Coobowie property near Edithburgh, Jervois land at Clare, Middleback field station out of Whyalla, Buckland Park field station and the Buckland Lake out of Port Gawler, two properties known as the Charlick experiment station at Strathalbyn, Glenthorne Farm at O'Halloran Hill (which I am sure is well known to members) and the Thebarton precinct, which is the fourth main precinct of the University of Adelaide. Not one mention of these rural properties was made in the debates by the minister for higher education at the time, yet I have no doubt she was provided with that information by the University of Adelaide. I read this list into *Hansard* at the time and I raised my concern about the university's intention to sell off properties, yet we stand here today, on the eve of an auction of one of the premier properties of this state—which was never disclosed in those debates—and I want some answers.

### NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

**Mr PICCOLO (Light) (15:42):** Today I wish to speak about volunteers in our community, it being National Volunteer Week. One of my passions is to support volunteers in our community. As the Minister for Volunteers said earlier in question time, the theme for volunteer week this year is 'Now more than ever'. The minister elaborated on this theme, but we also need volunteers now more than ever because the age profile of volunteers in our community is rising rapidly. We need to recruit, retain and resource volunteers more now than in the past.

In South Australia we are very lucky in the sense that we have one of the highest participation rates in Australia, with nearly 600,000 volunteers providing an estimated 1.4 million hours per week of assistance. Nationally, more than 5 million Australians give up more than 700 million hours of their time to help others. The economic contribution to our state and the nation is enormous, and in 2002 it was estimated to be around \$5 billion nationally.

The importance of volunteers is recognised by this Labor government, and that is why it has a clear target in the State Strategic Plan for volunteering. The state government considers volunteering to be a critical part of the state's cultural, economic and social wellbeing. The plan sets a target of maintaining a high level of volunteering in South Australia, with a 50 per cent or higher participation rate. We have reached that target and our challenge now is to maintain it.

In addition, the government has a number of initiatives to support volunteers. The Community Voices Program enables Flinders university students to work—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Great program.

**Mr PICCOLO:** Thank you, minister—with volunteer groups to produce television commercials or short films to encourage volunteering in the community. A sustainable online community engagement program allows UniSA students to help community groups to build free websites, produce promotional materials and market their services.

I am proud to say that when I was mayor of Gawler I was involved with the establishment at Gawler of the first Volunteer Resource Centre in this state. Also, Corporates4Communities are matching business volunteers with community organisations, providing them with more hands on deck as well as access to new skills. There is a whole range of other resources the government is producing to support our volunteers in our community.

At the local level within my electorate, my community is well served by volunteers, which is a common feature of most country and regional centres. In fact, there is not one walk of life in my community that is not touched upon by the involvement of volunteers. I refer to schools: there are parents in classrooms, canteens, sports and school governing councils. There are volunteers in churches. Most weekend sport, if not all weekend sport in the community, is run by volunteers. Support for the elderly and the aged includes Meals on Wheels, the Gawler Care and Share, the pensioner's association and the senior citizens' groups. They all help a section of our community.

In relation to community safety, we look at the CFS and the SES: they do a wonderful job in keeping our community safe and helping out when things go wrong. In relation to community support, we have the community enabled houses and charities such as Vinnies, the Salvos and U Care. We also have the Men's Shed, which provides a range of support services to men in our community.

In the area of recreation and leisure, there is a number of groups that provide a range of programs for people in our community. We have the Gawler Environment and Heritage Association, which is very active in protecting and promoting environmental programs throughout the electorate. Also, a number of councils have council volunteer programs—for example, the recreation centre, the volunteer centre and the visitor centre all have volunteers who make them operate well.

There is one particular program in my community that I would like to highlight, and that is the anti-graffiti team. It is one of those programs that you cannot highlight too much because it would have a negative effect. This group of volunteers does a great job cleaning up graffiti in our town. They are one of those unsung groups because, if you promote it, it only encourages some people in our community to do the wrong thing. However, I pay tribute to those groups of people who keep our town tidy and clean.

There are the service clubs for the community projects—the youth advisory committees, the residents' associations, the institute and town hall committees, the cultural groups and arts societies, and education.

Our society benefits enormously in a social, cultural and educational sense from the work of volunteers and without them our society would be very different—it would be very much the poorer. So, in this week marking National Volunteer Week, I would like to pay tribute to our volunteers in our community, and I also take this opportunity to thank the former minister for volunteers (Hon. Mr Koutsantonis) and the current minister for giving me the pleasure of chairing the Volunteer Ministerial Advisory Group.

Time expired.

#### REGIONAL ROAD NETWORK

**Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:47):** While I wish to talk predominantly about another matter, I commend the member for Light for his contribution in regard to volunteers. All of us who are lucky enough to represent the people of our communities in this place respect and witness every day the

effort that volunteers make in our community, and have done for generations. I pay credit to the wonderful people out there who willingly devote an enormous amount of their time, often at great personal sacrifice, to make a difference to the communities they live in. Without their efforts, we would be a much poorer place.

I wish to talk today about roads, which is a shadow portfolio-related issue for me but also predominantly an issue in my own electorate. In my Address in Reply contribution this morning I talked briefly about transport infrastructure, but I wish to highlight some particular instances that I think should be brought to the attention of the house.

Prior to coming into this place, I worked for some years in local government, and local government has a strong responsibility to provide a reliable road network. Therefore, I recognise the difficulty in ensuring that the resources required to build a road network to the expectations of every community are challenging, so I am not completely naive in this. However, I think it is important for us all to recognise that there is an enormous unmet demand for an improvement in our road network.

Within my own electorate, and not very far south of where I live, is a section of road that I travel on very regularly between Maitland and Millicent. There is a particularly bad section and there is no way of describing it other than it is a disgrace. The number of gouges in the road, because drivers of vehicles can be unsuspecting about the pronounced dip in this section of road and suddenly find that the bottom of their vehicle scrapes along the road, is frightening. When following people down that section of the road, I can tell whether they are locals because they move to the centre of the road. If they are first time visitors to the place they go straight over the bump and you see everything around their vehicle jump around. So, to the member for Mawson (who, I understand, has taken on the parliamentary secretary role associated with this), I encourage him to visit regional South Australia, as he has indicated this morning he intends to do.

Investments have been made, and I commend the government on that. Within my own electorate I have had an investment of funds also, but there is an enormous unmet need out there that needs to be fixed and very soon.

In about 2004 there was a reduction in speed limits from the previous 110 km/h to 100 km/h. As the CEO of a regional council at that time I was hopeful that that would result in a significant investment in road infrastructure to bring it back up to the standards required to return to the 110 km/h speed limit. However, sadly, shoulder situations are terrible on many roads. Again, I do acknowledge the fact that some investment has taken place, but there are some sections of road that people in the community continually come to me about. I know that they are writing to the Minister for Transport. I encourage them to write letters to the local newspaper and I encourage these people to ring talkback radio, too, because it appears that you have to be a loud voice all the time to make a difference.

Within the electorate last year I circulated a petition specifically calling on the Minister for Transport to invest in the road network. Some 2,396 signatures, I think, were collected from many of the communities across the electorate who were very upset about the road network, and they wanted something done. They were pleased that, as part of the election commitments made by both parties, the Liberal Party put funds on the table to address this backlog of road maintenance. Sadly, the Labor Party did not come out with that level of commitment. It does have some funds available, but there needs to be a lot more. I therefore encourage the member for Mawson in his deliberations with the minister to fight for a greater share of the amount of money in the state budget to go towards transport and, indeed, towards the maintenance of our road network, because it is seriously in need of it.

The Barunga West Council is no longer within my electorate—only a small portion of it is; most of it has been transferred to the electorate of Frome. That council has been writing to me and to the member for Frome, Mr Brock, asking for support in getting some funds allocated to it. I know that the member for Frome has spoken to me about the fact that he intends to enter into regular discussions with all the representatives of the parliament who surround his electorate to try to get some things done on the linkage roads that are in poor condition, and I think that is a good move.

Clearly, there is a desperate need in much of regional South Australia—indeed, the member for Morphett referred me to a section of Anzac Highway today, too, which needs an investment in road funding—for an enormous amount of investment to occur, because the people of South Australia have paid their taxes for generations. They have done so on the basis that it was going to be returned to them in some way by the provision of services and infrastructure. In many



cases they have had improvements occur, and I am sure that they would gratefully acknowledge that, but there is an enormous area of road network that does need more to come into it.

### FEDERAL HEALTH FUNDING

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:52):** Yesterday's federal budget and its commitment to health shows how important this issue is to everyone—consumers and providers alike. The Premier's statement today on the COAG health reforms helps us to better understand the complexities of providing health care in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and beyond, not just here in South Australia but all around this nation, for we are a mobile population and, in the true meaning of access for all, Australian governments have always striven to have health facilities throughout the length and breadth of this vast continent.

These announcements will see the biggest investments in the acute services that Australians need and need to know will be available. In all, South Australia's health system will receive \$1.5 billion over the next 10 years. It is worth repeating what is about to happen. South Australia's hospital system will receive an extra \$306 million over the next four years; \$120 million for subacute beds; extra beds at the Repat and more long stay mental health beds; \$3 million to expand the Early Psychosis Prevention and Intervention Centre services; \$29 million to assist long stay older patients waiting for nursing home placement; \$21 million for country aged care upgrades; \$47 million for improved access to elective surgery procedures; \$36 million for senior medical staff to be in our hospitals after hours (and this has been identified as a key way to improve emergency department outcomes); \$20 million in emergency department capital works; \$17 million in flexible funding for emergency departments, elective surgery and subacute services; and \$13 million for refurbishment of theatres and additional equipment at Modbury Hospital.

Complementary to these measures, we can also look at preventive measures. We can all do a lot more for ourselves in this area, and I have referred to the importance of whole grains in our diet. I have mentioned before, and it has been mentioned in reports from the grains and legumes health people authored by Associate Professor Peter Williams of the University of Wollongong, that, on average, Australians eat about half the whole grains they need daily. We need to boost our consumption of cereals, oats, brown rice and even muesli bars and popcorns of the less sugared variety. This could lead us to a reduction in the risk of developing diseases like diabetes and heart disease by up to 30 per cent and cut the annual health bill by \$1.2 billion. We all know that sort of saving could easily go back into extra preventative measures and acute care.

A no lesser authority than the CSIRO, via the Food Futures Flagship Chief Research Scientist, Dr David Topping, noted the suggestion that whole grains played a greater role in our diets than we all believed. I have begun to campaign to get this message through to my local community groups and those who work at fundraising via sausage sizzles. Multigrain and wholegrain breads are almost the same price as white bread (more often it is) and should be offered to people.

I have been canvassing this novel idea for almost a year now without influencing much action. All I ask is that this report be acted on, even on a trial basis, so that we can see the results, especially when you consider that sausage sizzles are often aimed at children at sporting events and other activities not to mention football matches where we see men eating large amounts of hamburger and sausage—not that there is a problem with that. Real people can handle whole grains. Let's all get behind this measure out in our electorates and even here in the parliament by asking for those sorts of changes to be made in our own eating areas.

Another way we can help ourselves is by reducing portion sizes, and in a roundabout way some of our most popular brands are helping us by reducing the size of their products while keeping the price structure at the same level—unfortunately, though, keeping us in the dark. In fact, these manufacturers even tell us they have modified the size to keep us healthy. Even so, this is a way to cut snack food portions. What might be useful, though, is an admission of intent. They would no doubt still want to increase unit sales overall and that is another way we can be tempted to have another rather than just stop at having one.

While on this topic of the underhand way that some changes are made without telling consumers, I noted a report late last year on research by the *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health* arguing that, because Coles and Woolworths run 80 per cent of the retail sector, the lack of competition can have a serious effect on public health. The ability to provide access to food, particularly fresh food, is a way to control what we eat. Programs to increase consumption of nutritious foods are doomed without greater competition. In fact, the report suggests that

'accessibility of health food choices as a result of a non-competitive grocery sector should be considered as a matter of public health as much as it is an economic one.' In an article in *The Advertiser* by Tory Shepherd mention is made of the same sort of thing as follows:

...a report issued last year by the Bureau of Infrastructure, Transport and Regional Economics demonstrated that the entry of a major chain into a rural or remote area served to lower the price of groceries and increases access to fresh food.

It is not rocket science, is it? A dietician is also quoted as agreeing variety, price and quality of food could suffer if the two big supermarket giants dominate the retail sector any further. People are encouraged to buy local and keep our growers in business.

Time expired.

#### **ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:58):** I move:

That the Hon. I.F. Evans, Mr Goldsworthy, Mr Griffiths, Mr Kenyon, Mr Piccolo, Ms Thompson and Mrs Vlahos be appointed to the committee.

Motion carried.

#### **ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:59):** I move:

That the Hon. M.J. Atkinson, Ms Thompson and Mr Venning be appointed to the committee and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

#### **LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:59):** I move:

That Mr Gardner, Mr Sibbons and Ms Thompson be appointed to the committee and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:59):** I move:

That the Hon. M.J. Atkinson, Mr Hamilton-Smith, Mr Odenwalder, Mr Pengilly and Mr Piccolo be appointed to the committee.

Motion carried.

#### **SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:59):** I move:

That Ms Bedford, Mr Pisoni and Mr Sibbons be appointed to the committee and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

#### **PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION**

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (15:59):** I move:

That the Hon. S.W. Key, Mr Venning and Mrs Vlahos be appointed to committee and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

**STATUTORY OFFICERS COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (16:00):** I move:

That the Hon. S.W. Key, Mr Odenwalder and Mr Whetstone be appointed to the committee and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

**NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (16:00):** I move:

That Mrs Geraghty, the Hon. S.W. Key, Mr Odenwalder and Mr van Holst Pellekaan be appointed to the committee and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

**ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers) (16:01):** I move:

That Ms Bedford and Mrs Vlahos, nominated by the minister, and Mr Marshall, nominated by the Leader of the Opposition, be appointed to act with the minister on the committee and that a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution.

Motion carried.

**The SPEAKER:** Congratulations to all members.

**ADDRESS IN REPLY**

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption (resumed on motion).

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:02):** Prior to the lunch break I was discussing the Premier, who in this house just last week reaffirmed his commitment to the super school program in South Australia, which, of course, is very disappointing for those of us on this side of the house who are opposed to the super school program and closing our small community schools, selling off the land and building education factories, if you like, for the satisfaction of the Department of Treasury.

I want to go back to some studies that I mentioned earlier, first of all the report that was prepared by Mr Trevor Cobbald from Save our Schools Canberra, who is a consultant in policy issues and an economist. He points out a number of reasons that he had his group are opposed to the super school program proposed in the ACTU. He states:

The majority of research studies support the idea that students perform better in smaller elementary and middle schools...researchers have reached broad consensus on several key issues:

- Under the right conditions, as schools get smaller they produce stronger student performance as measured by attendance rates, test scores, extra curricular activity, participation and graduation rates.
- Smaller schools appear to promote greater levels of parent participation and satisfaction, and increase communication skills between parents and teachers.
- Teachers in small schools generally feel they are in a better position to make a genuine difference in the student learning than do teachers in larger schools.
- There appears to be a particularly strong correlation between small school size and improved performance among poor students in the urban school districts.

This is an important point. As I was saying earlier, the government super school program is in some of our poorest suburbs in Adelaide.

It is no wonder that, in the case of a super school program in the Spencer Gulf, which was being pushed so heavily by the Premier prior to the last election, when parents started to study it and realised the change in school culture and the change in opportunities for their children they rejected it outright. But that is not the end of the issue for the government. This government will tell you on the one hand that it consults, while behind your back it is working at ways to change your mind to make you feel as though you are agreeing with the government.

**Mr Marshall:** They call it consultation.

**Mr PISONI:** They call it consultation; we call it indoctrination. There is a big difference between the two. The report goes on to say:

- Small schools provide a safer learning environment to students.

This is very important. It is a very important element, because we know that larger schools are where we have seen a number of elements of violence occurring in schools, not just here in Adelaide but also interstate and overseas. But do not just take the example from Canberra. Let's move to the state of Utah in the United States, where a study was produced in 2002 by David Cox. David Cox is a Utah public school teacher and a member of the Utah state House of Representatives, and obviously and advocate for small schools. The introduction to his report states:

Big school districts—

When they say big school districts they are talking about school clusters. In our instance, the relevance there would be the Department of Education and Children's Services, which in South Australia is enormous, with enormous central control compared with some other states, particularly Western Australia where they have just moved to individual funding for government schools—they call them independent public schools—where schools run their own budgets and agendas, and principals have the power to select their own students. The introduction states:

Big school districts promised to hold down costs by centralising functions under one roof and delivering a greater selection of academic offerings and activities—

that is what they promise—

thus improving education. But they have not delivered.

Now, what was the catchcry in the Education Works document put out by the department when they launched Education Works? This is in bold, so this must be an important statement. It goes on to say:

This is about every child having a better start and access to quality schools that offer better curriculum choices.

So, it is the same spruiking, the same spin that we heard from those who were spruiking for the failed super schools in the United States and UK, in some instances up to a century ago. We saw a big influx of these schools in the 1950s and the 1960s in the UK. The report goes on to say:

Up to a certain size, consolidation can save costs, but above that size, districts experience 'diseconomies of scale', including misallocation of funds towards bureaucracy rather than instruction.

There we go, DECS all over again. We have seen a huge growth in the bureaucracy of the education department under this government and it its addiction to centralisation that has stifled innovation and growth. Don't just take my word for it; go to the government's own strategic plan.

A key element of the government's economic platform is science and technology—the new industries. It is letting our traditional manufacturing industries die. We are having trouble keeping up with our demand for tradespeople. I am reading from the government's own strategic plan, the latest report. Before this government came to office, 44 per cent of students in South Australia received a tertiary entrance rank (TER) or equivalent in at least one of the following subjects: mathematics, physics or chemistry. It was 44 per cent before this government came to office.

**Mr Marshall:** What is it now?

**Mr PISONI:** Now, it is 37 per cent. After the government let it slip down to 39 per cent in 2003, it said, 'We're going to improve the figure by 15 per cent. We're going to take it back up to 45 per cent by 2010.' By 2010, it was going to take it up to 45 per cent. Where is it now, member for Norwood? Where is it now?

**Mr Marshall:** It's gone downhill.

**Mr PISONI:** In 2007, it got down to 35 per cent, and there was a slight improvement for 2008 at 37 per cent, but that was still a long way behind the 44 per cent that was achieved under the previous Liberal government.

You do not need to research very far to learn that the story is the same; it does not matter who you talk to, which academic or which education expert you talk to, big schools mean poor outcomes for students, particularly in lower socioeconomic areas and particularly in areas that have difficulty with their students and dysfunctional families. They are areas where we need to put in

resources to get better results—areas where people need a bit of a cuddle to make them understand that they are appreciated. There is a whole world out there for them to explore; they just need the skills themselves to understand that those opportunities are there for them as well.

The Minister for Education and the Premier do not understand the problems that big schools will cause here in South Australia as they continue to roll out their super schools program. Mike Smithson understood it. He got in contact with Professor Kenneth Leathwood from the University of Toronto. This was back in December last year. Professor Leathwood had extensively researched a number of studies that had been produced about large schools in North America. Mr Smithson asked Professor Leathwood the following:

So, you are saying, professor, that 1,000 students is about the maximum size school to keep everything on track and finely balanced?

Professor Leathwood went on to say:

Yes, but it could be far too large if the school was primarily serving kids who were coming from backgrounds in which they had some social or economic deprivation and weren't getting as much support at home as we'd like them to have.

I think that is the important issue. We have seen the massive swings in the seats that are part of the government's super schools program. We see that, in the education minister's own seat, 64 per cent of families send their kids to non-government schools because of the lack of choice in government schools.

Time and time again the minister said, 'Don't worry; we're building you a school at Gepps Cross.' They were telling people living in Fitzroy, Nailsworth and Walkerville, 'Send your kids to Gepps Cross.' They do not want to go to Gepps Cross. They want a second city high school; that is what they want. The premier understood that, because he cobbled together in response to the member for Adelaide's proposal for a second high school that I know she will fight hard for as the member for Adelaide—a second campus at Adelaide high school.

Time expired.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling) (16:12):** Madam Speaker, first I would like to congratulate you on your election to the highest office in this parliament. I have known the member for Giles since before she was elected. She is a close friend, someone whom I admire greatly. It is difficult being a regional member of parliament, and it is probably even tougher doing that as a Labor member. I am exceptionally proud of what she has achieved. I am sure that she will serve in that position with the high esteem that it requires.

I also want to take the time to congratulate the new members, and I will mention them by their political party. First, our new members: member for Taylor, congratulations on entering the house.

**Mr Pisoni:** He's not here.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** 'She' is not here, member for Unley. Congratulations, member for Little Para and, of course, my favourite new member, the member for Mitchell, about whom I will talk later. Also, of course, the member for Mount Gambier—a stunning result, despite everything but the kitchen sink being thrown at him. He did a wonderful job, as did the member for Frome in being re-elected after a short stint in the last parliament. Then there are the new members from the Liberal Party. Congratulations to the member for Norwood on his campaign. The member for Adelaide ran an amazing campaign; congratulations.

The member for Stuart, after a tight fought campaign, has very big shoes to fill. The Hon. Graham Gunn, who held the seat for nearly 40 years, was a credit to this house. The member for Chaffey did an exceptional job, as did the member for Morialta and the member for Flinders. I send my deepest condolences to the defeated candidates in those three Labor-held seats; I know how difficult it is to lose an election. It must have been very hard on them, their families and all their supporters. I send out my sympathies to them.

I also want to congratulate our marginal members, who did an exceptional job in this house—the members for Hartley, Light, Mawson and Newland—and who I think showed what is truly best about the Labor Party and about campaigning against all odds and adversity. They made a wonderful achievement in maintaining their seats.

In terms of the election campaign, there are some very stark contrasts in the way campaigns are run. I think this campaign is one that people will be looking at for a while. I am a bit of a student of election campaigns, and I am interested in strategy. I was fascinated to see the Liberal Party's campaign. I was fascinated to see the level of resources being put into seats that the Liberal Party has never traditionally held.

**Ms Chapman:** Cheltenham.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Like Cheltenham, like Enfield. These are remarkable campaigns and they achieved remarkable results. I had an 11.18 per cent swing against me, the member for Colton had an 11.3 per cent swing against him, and I think there was a 12 per cent swing in Croydon. These are wonderful achievements. I think the member for Enfield received a 14 per cent swing against him on the back of a campaign by Luke Westley. That is a remarkable result. Of course that was all for nothing, and that is the genius of the Liberal Party campaign. The Liberal Party campaign was based on a PR system that exists only in its mind.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I will get to your sacking in a minute. I find it fascinating that the Liberal Party feels robbed by its 52 per cent 2PP result, given that there were more than two parties contesting this election, and that it claims some sort of moral majority and that it should therefore be in government, but that is not our system. Our system is a majority of votes in a majority of seats, and the magic number is 24. Just as Bill Clinton in his campaign headquarters had written up on a chalkboard, 'It's the economy, stupid!' perhaps somewhere on Greenhill Road it should be, 'It's 24 seats, stupid!'

I am sure the Liberal Party takes great pleasure in the fact that it received 52 per cent of the vote, that it got great results in the safe seats which were not contested by the Labor Party, but I would ask members opposite to ponder this question: what if the Labor Party only contested 26 seats and won those 26? What would our two-party preferred vote be then? Would it be anywhere near 50 per cent? Could you then claim to have won the election? No, of course you could not. So the argument that the Liberal Party is putting up is complete rubbish.

In fact, I understand that the campaign manager, Mr Sheezel, has now been promoted to the national campaign and will be assistant director, or whatever the position is called, to campaign in the federal election, so we have warned all our members in safe Labor seats that the Liberal Party has never held to watch out for an onslaught of campaign material to go out in those electorates.

I am sure the member for Port Adelaide here in South Australia will be inundated with a campaign he has never seen before. The Liberal Party may well get a massive swing in Port Adelaide and of course not win it, and it will ignore the marginals, which is what it did in this election campaign.

It seems to me that the election campaign also showed that for a brief period of that four-week campaign the Liberal Party does have some discipline, but of course it cannot get that discipline right. The first job of every political party is to hold the seats in their traditional heartland: Frome and Mount Gambier. Those two seats, which were held by Independents, should have been won by the Liberal Party, but it chose its candidates poorly.

**Ms Chapman:** What about Vini Ciccarello from your side?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I will get to Vini in a second. If the Liberal Party had won Mount Gambier and Frome it may have been a springboard for it to form government, but it spent a lot of resources in those seats that came to nothing because of the hard work of two very popular local candidates who, against the massive might of a party political machine that was cashed up on massive donations, went door to door and won the hearts and minds of the local community through sheer hard work. The Liberal Party could not combat that and lost.

Coming back to the point about discipline, the campaign was going quite well for the Liberal Party until the last week when there were three incidents that I want to talk about. The first and most celebrated incident was a press conference in Hindley Street where the member for Bragg was asked a very simple question: if she lost, would she challenge for the leadership of the Liberal Party after the election? To all our shock, including the journalists who were there, she could not bring herself to say no—one word, 'no'. 'No, I won't challenge. I support Isobel Redmond.'

**Ms Chapman:** That's what I did say.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The next day you said it when you saw the signs go up. The member for Bragg is made of tougher stuff than just giving up. She comes from very good stock and I am very impressed with her political tenacity, because she has high ambitions for herself, and so she should; she is a very talented woman who I think will probably be leader of the Liberal Party again one day. But that break in discipline showed the first crack.

The second crack was when the deputy leader admitted to *The Financial Review* that their costings on the Royal Adelaide Hospital upgrade were based on spin. That was a devastating blow to the Liberal Party's chances of forming government. That bit of honesty that the member for Goyder showed during that campaign is to be commended. He is a man who I think cannot tell a lie. He is a bit like George Washington: he cannot tell a lie. When he spoke to and got quizzed by an interstate journalist who came down for the campaign for two days and admitted that their costings on the RAH were spin it completely derailed the Liberal Party's campaign.

The Liberal Party's campaign was based around a couple of things. The first was its argument about the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the second was about a new stadium. To give credit to the member for Adelaide, she did an exceptional job of using those two issues to gain a large swing to defeat Jane Lomax-Smith, and good luck to her.

**Mr Pisoni:** You're sad about that, Tom, aren't you?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am. I have a great deal of affection for Jane Lomax-Smith. I congratulate her on that. However, that is not enough to form a coalition of a majority of seats in the house. The Liberal Party was obsessed with its own talk about this one issue and, of course, the deputy leader derailed it.

Then we got a result and the leader refused to concede, having only won, I think, 18 seats. She thought somehow, miraculously, through postal votes or whatever it might be, they would come through and win the day. In terms of strategy in the seat of Mitchell, I am still stunned at the stupidity of the Liberal Party. I mean, in the words of Graham Richardson, they were not only stupid but also stupid often. Why the Liberal Party would campaign so hard in the seat of Mitchell is beyond me. It is a seat they could never win, it is a seat they had no chance of winning, yet a high Liberal Party vote hands that seat to the Labor Party. It is just absolutely amazing. If I was the Liberal Party campaign director I would have rung up the Liberal Party candidate Peta McCance and said, 'If I see one Liberal Party volunteer handing out how-to-vote cards on election day, there will be trouble.'

But they staffed every single polling booth. They were very excited and revved up, got about 20 per cent of the vote pushing Chris Hanna into third place, and got Labor elected. I say, 'Thank you very much, Peta. You are a Labor hero. You are one of those Labor heroes we will remember always.'

Of course, it was very interesting after the election. I remember listening to the Leader of the Opposition's press conference on 5AA (when it was replayed) after she demoted the member for Bragg (who, unfortunately, has left the chamber). I remember the Leader of the Opposition clearly saying that, while the member for Bragg was longer the shadow attorney-general but, rather, the shadow minister for families and communities, she would play a large role in the lower house in dealing with all the business that the shadow attorney-general (who is in the upper house) would normally deal with.

I have here a *Notice Paper* that includes notices of motion in relation to a bill to amend the Civil Liability Act (Attorney-General), a bill to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act (Attorney-General), a bill to amend the Correctional Services Act (Attorney-General) and a bill for an act to amend the Coroner's Act (Attorney-General); and two notices of motion about the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and one about the Parliamentary Committees Act. These are all motions and bills that the shadow attorney-general would normally deal with. The Leader of the Opposition said in her press conference that even though the member for Bragg was no longer the shadow attorney-general she would be handling those matters in the lower house.

Madam Speaker, do you know who moved all those notices of motion? It was the shadow treasurer. Well, so much for Ms Chapman being so busy after having lost the shadow attorney-general's portfolio in the house. It seems to me that there is division in the Liberal Party. That is just one example that people may not yet have picked up about how Mrs Redmond says one thing and does another.

For example, there is also the issue of the deputy leadership of the Liberal Party. There are 18 members of the Liberal Party in this chamber and six of them have held the position of deputy leader. That is a one in three chance of being deputy leader. The current holder of the position was able to get three votes and be elected deputy leader—which is an amazing result, to turn three into a majority is impressive.

Of course, there is the member for Davenport. The member for Davenport has been deputy leader and leader. He recontested the deputy leader's position and failed. He was defeated by the member for Waite in a fair ballot. The member for Waite has had a lot to say about this issue. He tells us that for the entire time he was deputy leader the Leader of the Opposition did not speak to him, not even to congratulate him. She was furious that he had won. She was furious that he had dared to stand in a democratic process and be elected. The member for MacKillop was not even in the race. I think he probably got one or two votes in the first ballot—and that was it.

The Leader of the Opposition used her influence after an amazing election result of winning 18 seats, and got the member for Waite to stand down in a humiliating backdown. Quite frankly—I do not usually say this—I agree with the member for Waite. I would not dignify that sort of behaviour by turning up, either. The member for MacKillop was elected unopposed on a ballot at which a lot of people did not bother to turn up. They did not bother to show. Why? The whole thing was a farce. The honourable member knows it and everyone knows it. The whole thing was a farce.

From 2010 to 2014 what can we expect from the new, improved Liberal Party? I think we will see the new members, who are not accustomed to the stupidity shown by older members, probably rise to the frontbench. I see a lot of talent on the backbench. I think they will do very well. They are presentable and articulate and I think they will do a good job. They are the future of the Liberal Party. The old war horses up the front every six or eight months knock off a leader or a deputy leader and treat them appallingly.

Without doubt, the member for Finnis is my favourite Liberal Party member. The guy cannot cut a break. The way in which he is treated is so unfair. All right, so he announces internal Liberal Party decisions on Facebook before they are announced publicly. Okay, that is a mistake anyone can make. Okay, so he launched a corrections policy that was withdrawn 12 hours later. That could happen to anyone! So, without speaking to their treasury spokesperson, he puts out two different dates in relation to a prison they will build. That could happen to anyone, but he does not deserve to be humiliated by his leader.

He does not deserve humiliation by his leader at a press conference by her telling journalists that she has not spoken to him about his dismissal from the frontbench because she does not want to read about it on Facebook. He does not deserve that. He deserves a phone call to say, 'Mr Pengilly, your services are no longer required.' She should front up: he did. Why can't she? A member deserves the right to be spoken to by their leader and to be told that they are no longer required. I bet when the member for Unley fired people at work he did it face to face.

**Mr Kenyon:** Not by a press conference.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Not by a press conference. You can imagine it at the caucus meeting. 'All right; everyone who is on the front bench take a step forward. Not you, Pengilly; get back in line.' Is that how it was? It is outrageous behaviour.

And what has the member for Waite done that was so bad? Okay, he had a bit of a mishap. 'We will still go to court about it but we will sort it out amongst ourselves.' What did he do that was so bad? He got 10 votes. He won. He won, fair and square. Why can he not be deputy leader? Why can he not do the job? He is much more effective than others. I read his speech this morning, and I thought it was a fantastic contribution. He talked about the bastardry of the Liberal Party. He talked about how, when they made mistakes, they leaked; and when we made mistakes, we stuck. That was the difference, and that is the difference. I can understand his frustration at the whole process.

I think what concerns me most is that the Liberal Party is—

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am glad you brought up Rick Phillips and Michelle Chantelois. I was not going to bring up Rick Phillips and Michelle Chantelois but, since you have, no; Rick Phillips is not my new mate. I have never actually met Rick Phillips. Have you?



**Ms Chapman:** On my electoral rounds.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Is he is in your electorate?

**Ms Chapman:** He is in my electorate.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Did he hand out how to vote cards for you?

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It is a bit of a sore spot for the member for Bragg. We would not want to expose any conversation she may or may not have had with Mr Phillips.

It seems to me that the Liberal Party has a choice to make. It has a choice to make, because the Leader of the Opposition says she is going to ban factions, that she will not allow people—

*Mr Kenyon interjecting:* Or not.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Or not. She is not really sure what she wants yet. She will either ban factions or she will not. Factions do not work for the member for MacKillop, because he never gets elected, but he is happy to use the factional support that the Leader of the Opposition gives him to make him deputy leader. She is opposed to factions, except when it suits her, so I am interested to see how this ban on factions is going to work, and I am interested to see how her federal counterparts are going to take this new ban on factions. I assume there will be no more how to vote cards at Liberal Party internal ballots and procedures. There will be no more organising behind the scenes. I am sure the member for Bragg will vote for people based on the merits of their arguments rather than—

**Ms Chapman:** Always have.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** She always has!

*Mr Kenyon interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pengilly):** If the member for Newland wishes to take part, I suggest he returns to his seat to interject.

**An honourable member:** Who said, 'Burn the village to save the village'? Was that you?

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Can the minister get on with his remarks, if he would not mind?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No, that was from the Vietnam War, before I was born. I think it was—

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! I ask that the minister return to the substance of his speech without the assistance of members from the other side, and perhaps he can get back to the substance of the debate, which is the Governor's speech.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, sir, and I will. I think it was Commander General Westmoreland who said that about Vietnam.

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** You only have 10 minutes to do it.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I can talk more about your Facebook page, if you like, because it is a great Facebook page. At least other leaders had the courage to speak to him personally when they were sacking him, rather than hide behind the office and then go out to a press conference and announce to the world that you would not speak to him because he would leak it to Facebook. That is how much confidence you have in your backbenchers.

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Is that right? I will make this wager with the Leader of the Opposition: she will not lead the Liberal Party at the next election, because the knives are out for her already. When she is deposed as Liberal leader, which will happen eventually (and, unfortunately for her, she does not deserve that; she deserves another shot at it, but they will not give it to her, because of the ambitions of others, and those ambitions are justified), I wonder what she will say a couple of weeks afterwards. I wonder what she will say about her beloved Liberal Party then. I wonder what her words will be. Maybe it will be, 'Gee, I should have stayed in the Labor Party when I joined it all those years ago.' Maybe it will be that. Maybe it will be, 'I should

have stayed in the New South Wales right when I joined them. I should have stayed in the New South Wales Labor Party.'

**Mrs Redmond:** What about Michael Brown and the dirty tricks that he was prepared to pull?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** You were at Michael Brown's wedding.

**Mrs REDMOND:** No; I was at his wedding reception.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Okay; there is no love lost there?

**Mrs Redmond:** He was prepared to go to any lengths.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I would defend the honour of our campaign secretary and, if the Leader of the Opposition wishes to go outside this place and make the same accusations that she has just made now, which are grossly defamatory to Michael Brown and his character, I would encourage her to do so. Go outside and say he has behaved in a way that is illegal and corrupt.

**Mrs Redmond:** It was indefensible.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It was not indefensible.

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, I suggest you get on with your comments.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** If Liberal members want to talk about dirty tricks, they have got plenty up their sleeves that they ran during the campaign but, of course, we don't squeal about them. We just take it. We don't squeal about them like spoilt little kids who did not get what they want. We just take it.

**Mr Goldsworthy:** Who called the front bench 'a bunch of duds over there' a couple of years ago? It was you, mate. Your ambition got the better of you.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The member for Kavel, the future of the Liberal Party! I have got to say I am always impressed when he speaks up, because it is such a great contribution. He is taken so seriously in the Liberal Party. I understand he is up there in tactics meetings. I understand he is deeply involved in the campaign. He is someone whom they listen to when he speaks; he is someone who is taken really seriously. He is a big thinker when it comes to strategy. Maybe he is the guy who decided it was okay to spend a fortune in safe Labor seats and not worry about the marginal Labor seats. Maybe he is the genius who came up with that idea but, who knows? We will find out eventually.

I find it amazing, Mr Acting Speaker, that you are languishing on the backbench while the geniuses such as the member for Kavel are still in the shadow ministry. I quite frankly do not see it. You are a great representative of your local community, and you are a former mayor. I think you were a bank manager, weren't you?

I also want to talk about the member for Schubert and how terribly he was treated. The member for Schubert is a great member of the Liberal Party, and I will tell members why. Whenever the Liberal Party is in trouble and it needs financing quickly, it goes to the member for Schubert and he fronts up. He is a good soldier of the Liberal Party. They took the whip's position away from him and they then took away his position on ERD. Now, I have to say that, for someone of the calibre of the member for Schubert, to be taken off that committee in probably his last term was really unfair. I think that he took it pretty badly.

I feel really sorry for him, because Ivan and his lovely wife have been great supporters of the Liberal Party. They are a traditional Liberal family. His father served with distinction and Ivan has served with distinction, and he did not deserve the treatment dished out by some members of this house in his last four years, maybe, in the parliament. I think that Ivan deserves better than that. Maybe the Leader of the Opposition could have stuck up for him but, of course, there are no factions in the Liberal Party anymore so he simply did not get it on merit, I assume, in that great meeting members opposite had where they discussed all these committee positions. The member for Schubert has been hard done by. I feel sorry for him and he deserves better.

*Mr Kenyon interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Could have been just a mistake.

*Mr Kenyon interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER:** Order! If he wants to interject, the member for Newland should go back to his seat.

*Mrs Redmond interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It seems to me that the Leader of the Opposition is really disappointed that the member for Newland got re-elected.

**Mrs Redmond:** Absolutely.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It is just too bad that the candidate she chose was not good enough to defeat him, or that her own personal campaigning in the seat was rejected by the local community, overwhelmingly, I understand. In fact, I understand that the member for Newland received quite substantial swings in some traditional Liberal areas in his seat.

**Mr Goldsworthy:** His margin went back.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The genius from Kavel! Anyway, I am sure that the former shadow minister for corrections will make a comeback under the new regime, which is coming to a parliament near you soon. I think that when that new regime comes into place, with the new talent on the backbench, I am sure that the first phone calls the Leader of the Opposition will make will be to tell us how appallingly she has been treated.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Hang on, here we go. I did not win Lockleys and West Beach. Oh, no! That is like Labor not winning Bragg. Oh, no, what a disaster! That is why they cannot win an election. Like I said, it is about winning a majority of votes in the majority of seats. Members opposite ran a PR campaign; we ran a Westminster campaign. We won, they lost, and they still do not get it, they are still in denial.

Madam Deputy Speaker, congratulations on your election to this high office and your wonderful campaign in your seat in very difficult circumstances. I always knew that you would come through. Others on the other side did not. They were quite confident that they had beaten you, but I always knew you would come through because of your dedication to your local community, and they have repaid you immensely.

Congratulations to all the new members. I look forward to their first maiden Address in Reply speech; I am sure they will make excellent listening.

**Mr Pengilly:** Most of them have been done. Where have you been?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I have been listening. There is one to come now that I am looking forward to: the future leader of the Liberal Party I heard on the radio. She holds ambitions for the job and so she should. She is a very talented young lady who I am sure has a lot of promise. Mr Gardner is also a candidate for the job. He has a great mentor in Chris Pyne, someone who has more front than David Jones. However, I am sure that he will do very well. I am sure that he has learnt a lot from Chris Pyne, and I am sure that he will bring that to bear in this parliament, especially on the backbenches. He will do a great job; they will all do a great job.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I even said nice things about you, believe it or not. That is okay. Vanity is my favourite sin, and the one person who will die of vanity the most is the member for Norwood.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, minister Koutsantonis. I call on the member for Adelaide, and I would point out, especially to my friends and colleagues on my right, that this is the honourable member's first speech, and, accordingly, I would ask members to extend the traditional courtesies to the member for Adelaide. The member for Adelaide.

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (16:43):** I would like to thank His Excellency for opening the 52<sup>nd</sup> parliament and for his speech regarding the future of our state. I would also like to thank both the Governor and Mrs Scarce for their service to the people of South Australia. I support the motion to adopt the Address in Reply, although, unfortunately, I disagree with many of the initiatives.

Madam Deputy Speaker, I congratulate you on your new role, as well as congratulating Madam Speaker on being elected the first female Speaker of the house. I trust that you will both

always act fairly in your very important roles of controlling the house. I congratulate our leader, Isobel Redmond, for attaining 51.6 per cent of the South Australian vote. It is unfortunate that we now sit in opposition against the wishes of the people of South Australia. Being chosen by the people of South Australia to represent them in parliament as their member for Adelaide and to represent this great city is a true honour.

I thank them for their support, and I pledge to the people of Adelaide that I will always act with integrity, honesty and openness. I will always work hard to find solutions that bring the greatest good to the greatest number whilst considering the best interests of the state as a whole as well as minority groups and interests, including those where social structures are not equally accessible to all. I will not be swayed by the vocal minority, as I am willing to listen to the views of all people with an open mind and to gain a balanced perspective.

The Adelaide electorate includes the suburbs of Adelaide, North Adelaide, Fitzroy, Thorngate, Prospect, Gilberton, Ovingham, Medindie, Medindie Gardens, Walkerville and part of Collinswood. The electorate of Adelaide includes the beautiful Parklands, which are part of our first Surveyor General's (Colonel William Light) original vision for South Australia. This legacy surrounds the city with a green belt that encompasses the Aquatic Centre, the Memorial Drive tennis courts and a vast array of sporting fields throughout the Parklands, which encourage sport and recreation for all South Australians to enjoy.

The north-east corner of the city has a wonderful botanical gardens, its design influenced by many famous gardens in England and France, which I frequented often as a university student. On the edge of Botanic Park is the National Wine Museum and Adelaide Zoo, the only major metropolitan zoo in Australia to be owned and operated on a not-for-profit basis and now known internationally as the home of our famous pandas. The State Library, Art Gallery and third oldest university in Australia, the University of Adelaide, are on the city's cultural boulevard, North Terrace, which is enjoying a revival of inner city living with apartments, the occupants including students, able to take in the spectacular views over Government House and beyond.

The electorate of Adelaide has many shopping, dining and entertainment precincts blessed with myriad shops, cafes and award-winning restaurants in O'Connell Street, Melbourne Street and Prospect Road. Rundle Mall is the premier retail centre in the heart of Adelaide: home to over 700 retail specialty stores, 200 service providers and 15 unique arcades and shopping centres. With 175 fashion stores and flagship stores such as Myer, David Jones, Harris Scarfe, Target and Woolworths, as well as a large number of smaller independent chain stores including Borders, Toys 'R' Us and Harvey Norman, this vibrant precinct employs around 5,000 people and is visited daily by thousands of 110,000 city workers and 50,000 students who earn or learn in the city as well as thousands of tourists each year.

I support Rundle Mall becoming a designated tourist precinct under the Shop Trading Hours Act such as Glenelg. As one of our key tourist destinations, the state would benefit from having Rundle Mall open on a number of the 11 public holidays that occur throughout the year. I also believe we should be investing in the reinvigoration of Rundle Mall as there has been no major reinvestment back into the mall since it was first established in the 1970s other than one minor facelift in the 1990s which was just the repaving, erection of the Gawler Place canopy and various subsurface infrastructure improvements.

I believe this should be a high priority, given it is visited by 85 per cent of tourists to South Australia, has the highest point of pedestrian traffic with over 23 million visitors each year, has annual sales of approximately \$800 million and employs around 5,000 people. The Adelaide electorate comprises a diverse and dynamic group of people including 27 per cent migrants from over 35 different countries. It also has the highest percentage of people living alone. The top three industries of employment include professional, scientific and technical services, manufacturing, health care and social assistance. The electorate also has 6,391 volunteers—and I note it is National Volunteers Week—who are a vital part of our community and 5,081 tertiary students.

What some see as impossible, others see as a challenge. Winning the seat of Adelaide was always going to be a challenge but a challenge that I was up for. I believe firmly that the people of Adelaide deserve better from their political representative. Their wishes and concerns were not being heard or properly represented in parliament. The Labor policies affecting Adelaide did not correspond to the wishes of the people of Adelaide, so when eight candidates took time out of their life to stand against the one sitting member, it had to have sent a message to the government that either there is a problem with the member or a problem with the policies of the Labor Party.

**An honourable member:** Or both.

**Ms SANDERSON:** Or both. The residents of Adelaide have spoken with their vote and they have clearly chosen the Liberal policies of rebuilding the Royal Adelaide Hospital on its existing site, building a new covered city stadium and building a second campus of Adelaide High School. This strong vote against Labor has sent an obvious message back to Labor as it is now saying it is reconnecting with the people of Adelaide and that they are now ready to listen. In my campaign I did listen and the result was a 14.5 per cent two-party preferred swing on a margin of 54.2 per cent.

Many generations ago my family came from Scotland, England and Germany. In 1983 my mother, sister, Colleen, and I followed my aunty Beth and cousin Jesse from Melbourne to live in Prospect. Since then more family members have moved to join us in this wonderful city. I come from a family of very strong and independent women. My mother encouraged me always to do my best. She was a strong disciplinarian and never gave in. My home was a place of healthy eating, and a good education was seen as paramount. It was assumed I would attend university even though no other family members had.

I attended St Peters Collegiate Girls School, a place where several women in politics were also educated, including Julie Bishop. I thank the teachers who encouraged my quest for knowledge and who nurtured me on my journey. By studying physics, chemistry, biology, maths and Australian history in year 12, I planned first to study science but changed my preferences and completed a Bachelor of Arts in accountancy at the University of South Australia. Uni life was vibrant and informative and I formed many close friendships that continue today. I paid my own way through university and my mother, on my commencement of university, told me that I could do anything I wanted as long as I paid for it and got myself there. While sounding good, without a car and earning about \$40 a week, my choices were limited.

My younger years were filled with study and sport. I participated in many of our school sports and was heavily involved in sport outside of school including swimming for North Adelaide, playing basketball for the University of South Australia and competing in judo for Prospect and the state team coming fifth at the nationals. I believe in encouraging sport in schools. It not only keeps children fit but it gives them a positive focus and it will also help our obesity problems.

I started working at the age of 14 babysitting for families in Prospect and North Adelaide. I later went on to cleaning, waitressing and worked as a casual at Myer for six years. Until I started regular work at Myer, other than my school uniform of which I was very proud, most of my clothes were second hand or hand-me-downs. Casual days and school dances were terrifying days at school and I would either wear my uniform or borrow clothing from friends. My mother did not place any importance on clothing or material possessions or being like others. Whilst this was a hard lesson for a teenager who wanted to be like everyone else and fit in, it has now given me the confidence to be my own person and not need the acceptance of others to feel good about myself.

A quote that was on my wall that inspired me through my years of study and through my campaign is by Paul Meyer as follows:

What you vividly imagine, ardently desire, sincerely believe and enthusiastically act upon, must, inevitably come to pass.

I am a living example of the truth of this statement after working tirelessly for 18 months and daring to dream of representing the people of Adelaide in parliament.

I have not been involved in student politics or a trade union. Instead, I have real world experience with over 15 years in small business and several years of financial experience covering tax, business services, audit and financial management. I have no interest in the politics of politics. Having said that, I am here because I am absolutely committed to the people of Adelaide, and I am determined to get things done. I want to improve my community and be an advocate for my constituents both in parliament and in the party room.

I was motivated to become involved in politics after the Liberals lost the federal election in 2007. I could not bear the thought of back-to-back Labor governments. I felt it was time for me to do something for my community to ensure our economic future, as Labor governments have a history of leaving our economy and finances in decline, and this has been proven as, currently, in South Australia we are on track to be paying dearly, to the tune of \$2 million per day in interest on debt by 2013.

After considering both federal and state government options, I decided my skills and interests were best suited to state issues such as education, business, water, health, the environment and local concerns, as well as invigorating our city. I enjoy meeting new people, communicating, listening and helping individuals, so the lower house was the best option for me. With Adelaide being my home since the age of 13 and my place of business for over 15 years, it was clear to me that the state seat of Adelaide was a position from which I could do the most good for my country, my state and my neighbours. I know and love this electorate and look forward to listening to the ideas and concerns of my constituents and fighting for the results.

The Liberal philosophy and core values include freedom of speech, religion and association and freedom of citizens to choose their own way of living and of life, subject to the rights of others. It is about protecting people from exploitation and looking primarily to the encouragement of individual initiative and enterprise as a dynamic force of reconstruction and progress. These values fit with my own beliefs, and as such I have always been a Liberal voter and I have admired many Liberal leaders.

I see our prime ministers, premiers and members of parliament as leaders in our community, and expect that they should always act with integrity, honesty and openness. To act within the law yet without any moral fibre or ethics that even a child could determine is a disgrace. I am extremely embarrassed that we now have sitting members in government who won their seats through using false how-to-vote cards that were both misleading and dishonest, along with several who sent out letters defaming their opponents and spreading lies and unjustified doubts in the minds of voters. A life without integrity is no life at all.

As a business owner for 15 years it has taught me about hard work, deadlines, pressure, budgets and getting results. Small business is a major employer of South Australians and needs to be supported, so I will use my experience to help others in business by supporting legislation to improve their conditions. I believe we should be working to reduce business taxes, including payroll taxes. South Australian businesses are paying 4.8 per cent more state taxes than the national average and 11 per cent above that of Western Australia. The average business in South Australia pays \$247,000 in state taxes per annum.

I have a particular interest in youth, including their education, health and self-esteem. I personally believe that many problems such as binge drinking, drug use and eating disorders are a result of poor self-esteem. Through my businesses, Rachel's Model Management and Training and Rachel's Junior Models, of which I declare I am still the sole owner, I have met with, interviewed, taught and worked with thousands of young people, and I believe good role models, encouragement and self-belief are important basics to the wellbeing and future of our young.

Our city needs reinvigoration to provide employment opportunities and to give our youth a reason to stay in our state. We lose too many of our finest young and capable minds to the Eastern States. More people leave our city each year than are born here. Immigration is the only reason our state population has increased. I want to engage with our young and work with them to find out how we can make our city more liveable for them.

Over 20 years ago, while studying accountancy, I was the treasurer for the Prospect Neighbourhood Watch. I would like to revive the Neighbourhood Watch groups and start groups where presently there are none. From a safety point of view these groups are an excellent way of informing residents on keeping safe, identifying potential trouble spots and problems as well as engaging with the community. I am also an advocate of being able to protect yourself in your own home.

Education is a high priority of mine. While doorknocking during my campaign I identified a strong demand for a second campus of Adelaide High School for the people of Prospect and Walkerville, as a zone school is currently two bus trips away and is soon to be demolished for the Gepps Cross super school, which will be even further away.

The electorate contains a total of 17 primary schools, six of which are public and 11 private. Of the secondary schools in the electorate there are 12 secondary schools of which only one is a public school and not zoned for any suburbs further north than North Adelaide. The Adelaide electorate has the highest percentage of families choosing non-government education for their children, with 64 per cent of children attending private schools. I believe this high figure shows that there are not adequate public high school options available in this area.

Adelaide High School has a proud history and has a great academic record, with students from over 85 schools seeking enrolment each year. Increased demands on enrolments at the

school are in line with increased population in the inner city and the popularity of the curriculum and special entry students through their double language, rowing, cricket and hearing-impaired programs.

In June 2001 advice provided to DECS, using state asset management plan benchmarks, indicated that the Adelaide High School site is able to use between 9,579 square metres and 11,207 square metres to house students. The building area was identified and equated to a shortfall of space for approximately 226 students. Based on enrolments in 2010 this shortfall is now 329. In a panicked reaction to the Liberal announcement of a second campus of the Adelaide High School to be situated on the Bowden Clipsal site, the Labor government, on 16 March, only days before the election, announced an expansion of Adelaide High School of 250 students by 2013. It stated:

By expanding the schools, we can relax the zones—so students from Prospect or Walkerville, for instance, will be able to attend Adelaide High School.

I note that Adelaide High School is already over capacity by 329 students, and the number is increasing yearly. By adding Prospect and Walkerville, that demand could increase by a further 650 students thus, by 2013, Adelaide High School will require about another 800 places. The people of Adelaide require another public high school option that is convenient and of a high standard. The proposed super school in Gepps Cross is not what the people of Adelaide want. I note the quote by Jay Weatherill on the front cover of the School Post as follows:

By listening to what communities have to say, I believe we can together build a responsive school system.

I plead with you, Mr Weatherill, to honour your pledge and that of your government to start listening. From the eight governing council members surveyed in the magazine from around South Australia, five wanted the super school plan to be put on hold while real community consultation took place, one wanted it scrapped and the money returned to the school, one wanted it replaced by a better development, and only one wanted it to continue as planned.

I now come to the Adelaide Oval. Although I do not believe the Adelaide Oval redevelopment will ever go ahead, I see the proposal as a knee-jerk reaction to the extremely popular Liberal policy put forward for a covered city stadium. The Adelaide Oval, known for its quaintness and surrounding lawn, would be forever destroyed by turning it into a concrete jungle to seat 50,000 people at a cost to the taxpayer of at least \$450 million. Adequate parking has not been included in the plan, and I worry about the Parklands becoming an all year car park, which will have a devastating effect, especially during the winter months when I fear it will become a quagmire.

I am also concerned that businesses in the area will have their regular parking taken up by people visiting the stadium, as was the case with the recent AC/DC concert, which saw people parking up to 2 kilometres away and walking in to save paying for parking. The government's plan would see residents of North Adelaide living their weekends in a car park with restricted access and road congestion. Another stadium that has a multitude of purposes and is covered will be required in the near future to enable large concerts and events throughout the year, rather than all the events happening in what has become known as 'Mad March'.

Regarding the Parklands, I believe we need a balanced approach to the protection of the Parklands as an important state asset. I believe that the restoration of the railyard site for the building of a city stadium and entertainment precinct would be a great state asset and a benefit to all South Australians for many decades to come.

Having had to negotiate my way through several commercial leasing agreements, I see many improvements that need to be made within the current system. I believe that introducing a series of related standardised commercial leases would protect lessees. I would also like the onus of the three months' written notice for renewal to fall on the lessor, who is in the business of leasing and not, as it is currently, the lessee, who is unlikely to remember a date three months prior to the end of their term, which could be three, five or even 10 years forward.

There are many complicated clauses that easily trip up those who are new to commercial leasing or those without a law degree to negotiate their way through the sometimes hundreds of pages. Many people who have previously had private rentals assume incorrectly that some moral or ethical obligations exist, and they are shocked when none of the safeguards available for private rentals—nor the help and advice—are available for commercial leasing.

With regard to the Royal Adelaide Hospital issue, the hospital is currently situated in a prime position near the Adelaide University Medical School, the Institute of Medical and Veterinary School (where I did work experience in year 10) and the Hanson Research Centre. It is devastating to think that another state icon worth over \$1 billion, with an award-winning burns unit, an intensive care unit that was rebuilt only eight years ago and the biggest radiology department in the southern hemisphere, should be ignored by a government happy to decommission this public asset forever and rebuild on a contaminated railyard site.

This option will take several generations to pay off and is another sign of the Labor government's inability to manage our finances. The proposed site will block future development of an entertainment precinct along the Riverbank and is a poor use of such prime land.

In bringing my remarks to a close, I would like to take this opportunity to thank those who have encouraged and supported me in my journey thus far. I am humbled and overwhelmed by the number of people who have offered their help and support. Many of the supporters and helpers only met me during my campaign or were people from my past whom I had not seen in many years. I would like to thank all of the branch members and helpers and supporters, of whom there are too many to name. I would especially like to thank my campaign team—Margaret, Angie and Peter—without whose support this journey would not have been possible. I would like to also thank Sheree, who worked tirelessly and put in extra hours at my office to enable me the time to campaign and fundraise.

I acknowledge the women in politics who have encouraged and inspired me. These include: the Hon. Michelle Lensink, MLC; Vickie Chapman, MP; the honourable Diana Laidlaw, MLC; Julie Bishop, MP; the Hon. Jing Lee, MLC (our new member in the upper house); and, of course, most importantly, our leader Isobel Redmond, MP, who has shown a clear contrast in leadership style to that of our Labor government. Isobel is a straight talker who says what she means and means what she says. I thank her sincerely for her leadership.

I would also like to congratulate all the new members in the house today, particularly those with whom I have shared the journey over the last 18 months. I look forward to working with you all, and I am excited by the strong leadership qualities you all possess. My election motto was 'substance, not spin,' and that is what you can expect from me now and in the future.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

**The SPEAKER:** I congratulate the new member for Adelaide once again and well done on her first speech. We now have another new member—the member for Chaffey. As this is also the member's first speech, I ask accordingly that members extend the traditional courtesies to our new member.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:08):** I would like to thank His Excellency the Governor for his opening speech. His service to South Australia has been exemplary.

It is an honour to be standing here as the new member for Chaffey. I am humbled by my constituents' faith in my ability to represent their interests in this house. I would also like to congratulate you, Madam Speaker, on your historic appointment and express my hope that, despite not being able to participate in debates on the floor, you will ensure that regional South Australia has a strong voice.

I extend my congratulations to those members who were re-elected in March, especially to those who, like me, are here for the first time. I am confident that the new members will make a telling contribution to parliament and represent their electorates with distinction.

For several years, Chaffey was in a unique position, having a member of a conservative party serving a Labor cabinet. My predecessor represented the electorate with formidable energy and ability, helping to bring the issues of water and the River Murray to greater prominence. This is because, for Chaffey, there are no issues of greater importance than water and the River Murray. They are central to Chaffey's economy: its social fabric, its history, its survival and its very existence. Water and the River Murray are also the main reasons I am here.

I am from a farming family from Keith in the South East of South Australia. My father Graham was a well-respected stock agent and livestock producer, and my mother Judy was a nurse. When I was quite young, we moved to Adelaide where I attended school before undertaking a fitter and turner apprenticeship with GMH at Woodville. I then became a qualified toolmaker in 1982. However, like many of the GMH workers, I was retrenched a year later when the company let half of its workforce go.



Having a passion for fast cars and boats, I began a small business restoring muscle cars and fitting out speedboats. I was a keen water ski racer who proudly represented South Australia and went on to be selected in the national team in the late 1990s. One of my fondest memories was winning the world's toughest water ski race. The Sydney Bridge to Bridge involves towing two skiers from Dangar Island at Brooklyn into the mouth of the Hawkesbury River and up to Windsor—a distance of 112 kilometres. We clocked speeds of greater than 200 kilometres per hour and completed the course in just 40 minutes. It was a life changing moment for me, but it wasn't the first and it wasn't the last.

Watching the birth of my three children—Nic, Charlotte and Eliza—were also special moments that changed my life forever. In 1989 I returned, in part, to my farming roots. I moved to the Riverland and purchased a citrus property, which I still own today. In the early 1990s I bought farm country on the bank of the River Murray, where I developed a vineyard. I was one of those fortunate growers who entered the industry before the 1990s wine boom took off.

As an irrigator I became aware of just how much my livelihood, those of my fellow irrigators and the Riverland community itself relied on water and the River Murray. It is the very lifeblood of the region. Irrigation is responsible for the birth of towns along the upper reaches of the Murray in South Australia. Chaffey itself is named after two Canadian brothers who, at the invitation of the colony of South Australia in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, developed what is now the oldest large irrigation district in Australia, at my home town of Renmark.

Back then the irrigation infrastructure was extraordinarily primitive. Steam powered pumps delivered water into open channels which flowed into the small orchards and vineyards of those first pioneers of the settlement. Paddle steamers plied the river, bringing the produce of the district to markets in Adelaide and beyond.

I mention this today because irrigation infrastructure and on-farm irrigation practice in the Riverland is state-of-the-art. It is a tribute to the foresight and innovation of local irrigators that during the 1990s, with their own money—in addition to considerable support from previous state and federal Liberal governments—they upgraded irrigation infrastructure, primarily to conserve water, to reduce what was taken from the Murray while maintaining the production levels that drove the region's economy.

Irrigators in the Chaffey region and along the length of the Murray in South Australia are now the most efficient in the Murray Darling Basin. They are recognised internationally for this efficiency but, it would seem, not so much in their own country. I also mention this state-of-the-art irrigation because, today, irrigators upstream from South Australia continue to receive River Murray water from infrastructure that was not even state-of-the-art in the days of the Chaffey brothers. There are still thousands of kilometres of unsealed dirt channels in New South Wales and Victoria, open to the sky, wasting vast quantities of our most precious natural resource. The losses from evaporation and leakage can reach up to 50 per cent. If only irrigators in those states had the courage to meter at the point of extraction, they would wonder in amazement where half of their water has gone.

Our current federal government has promised billions of dollars to upgrade infrastructure in the Murray Darling Basin but, astoundingly, not to replace these wasteful channels with pipelines. To call this shortsighted and irresponsible is to dramatically understate the case. It is past time for South Australia to make this case to Canberra and to make it forcibly, before these billions of dollars are spent on projects less worthy of attention—if they are spent, that is.

Three years ago, \$400 million was promised to reduce evaporation from the Menindee Lakes—a vital water storage for South Australia—but nothing has been done. Floodwaters entering the lakes, which should be a boom to this state, are evaporating at tremendous rates, as I speak.

The federal government's plan for the basin is of great concern to my constituents and all South Australians. South Australia's record for water efficiency is second to none in this country, and it must be recognised before consideration is given to sacrificing any more of the water on which my electorate and this state depends. Very little more water can be saved in South Australia but vast amounts can be saved upstream, if only we had a government with a vision and a determination to achieve it.

Irrigators acknowledge the need to provide water for the basin's environmental assets and to ensure that critical human needs are met. What they do not appreciate, because it is manifestly unfair and unrealistic, is being ranked below these interests in importance by a federal government that has shown nothing but ignorance in the application of policy aimed at improving environmental

outcomes. We will have a window of opportunity when the draft basin plan is released for public comment to have our say, but it is simply not good enough. We must have assurances, certainty, recognition and, above all, transparency—and we must have it now.

Lack of transparency regarding water decisions that affect the lives of so many people in Chaffey is why I became a director of the Renmark Irrigation Trust in 1998 and why I became a director of the South Australian Murray Irrigators (SAMI) two years later. Everything I did to succeed and prosper as an irrigator and to contribute to my community depended on timely and accurate information about water.

I felt strongly that it was time to help other irrigators who had, historically, lacked sufficient representation at government levels. While South Australia remained true to agreements that capped further extractions from the Murray-Darling system, irrigators in Chaffey watched in growing horror as the other basin states took more water from the system without consideration for the consequences. The warnings of South Australian irrigators were not heard.

This was before record low inflows into the basin made the issue of water security become more prominent in the minds of South Australians. This was before the Lower Lakes started to become a toxic wasteland. This was before my predecessor joined forces with the Rann government to preside over the economic crisis steadily enveloping the seat of Chaffey.

Irrigators saw it coming years before. We proposed solutions, like the one basin, one plan initiative which, if it had been supported by the Rann government, would have saved irrigators much of the pain they are going through today. SAMI rose to prominence as water became more important to South Australians. As I spent more of my time representing the interests of the state's irrigators in their own plight, I realised our community needed better representation on a whole range of issues. As water flow lessened so did the job opportunities. As water flow lessened so did the number of tourists decline. Primary industries in the region no longer receive the support they once had. Local health services no longer receive the support they once had. Support for attempts to diversify industries in the region was half-hearted at best.

This is what convinced me to stand for election. This is what convinced my constituents that Chaffey was ready for change. Chaffey is a great electorate. Its people come from many walks of life and many parts of the world. It is one of the most culturally diverse communities in Australia. It is a community with a strong sense of family. The community identifies closely with the landscape and its majestic river, and with its history and heritage the people of Chaffey, without doubt, were amongst the most informed voters in this state on 20 March.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr WHETSTONE:** They expect much from their local member, which is a legacy of my long-serving predecessors, William Macgillivray and Peter Arnold.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr WHETSTONE:** The people of Chaffey expect much from their state government, too, and, while it may not be politic to say so, their expectations were not met in recent years—and neither were mine. I vividly recall meeting with the Premier in my capacity as a representative of the irrigators, and the Premier asking, 'Why would I support the people of Chaffey? I will never win that seat.'

More than anything else this is what convinced me to stand. The Premier's apparent lack of regard for the region is what partly convinced my constituents that Chaffey needed change. Again, I say that I am humbled by their confidence in me and I am determined to repay their trust.

Winning election as the member for Chaffey is my most recent life-changing moment. This is a new phase in my life and with it comes new goals. For the moment, most importantly I am seeking to make change for the greater good of the seat of Chaffey. In the future my goal is to effect change for the greater good of South Australia as a minister in a Liberal government.

I would not be here were it not for the support of many people—my children, my family and friends, my dedicated campaign team, a determined local party membership and my parliamentary colleagues in the Liberal Party, ably led by Isobel Redmond. Her frequent visits to the electorate—five times since becoming opposition leader—have not only presented a stark contrast to the Premier's conspicuous absence but also underlined our party's commitment to the interests of regional South Australia.

I make special mention of my campaign manager, Anne Ruston, who played an important role in my success on 20 March. Together, all these people and the voters of Chaffey achieved the largest swing of the election in any seat. My constituents would simply not have forced this change unless it was needed. Because it is needed Chaffey's needs are great. Farmers in the Northern Mallee struggle with poor rainfall, fluctuating markets and increasing input costs, not to mention a recent plague of locusts to which this government's response has been inadequate, to say the least.

Many tourism operators struggle with declining visitor numbers. Irrigators struggle with inadequate water allocations and poor commodity prices. People have lost their jobs as major employers have pulled out of the region and local businesses have been forced to close their doors.

Perhaps the most visual example of our need is the iconic Lake Bonney. This integral part of the river system is a major regional centre for tourism, recreation, sport and leisure. The town of Barmera, with a population of around 4,000 people, and other towns in the area rely substantially on the income generated by visitors to Lake Bonney. Many here in this house will have fond memories of family visits to the lake where, for decades, generations have swum, sailed, fished and skied under the Riverland sun. The lake is also an important habitat for a large range of aquatic species.

Today, Lake Bonney symbolises much that has gone wrong in the management of the River Murray. In 2007 it was disconnected from the system to save water being lost through evaporation and this was, perhaps, a prudent measure in such a year of poor rainfall in the basin. It was also supposed to be a temporary measure, and this government nominated trigger points at which, when reached, the lake would be reconnected to the system. These trigger points have been reached, yet Lake Bonney remains disconnected.

The impact on the lake is shocking. Fish have died and continue to die in their millions, littering the exposed shore with their bodies and polluting the air with their stink. Salinity levels have risen, putting further pressure on the lake's aquatic life. Recreational and sports activities have been restricted due to health concerns from the deteriorating quality of the water; and many families who usually visit Lake Bonney have stopped coming. Barmera's businesses have declined as the local people watch their beautiful lake dwindle. That is unacceptable, as is the continued disregard for regional communities in the management of the River Murray in South Australia. Lake Bonney must be reconnected immediately. A new management plan for Lake Bonney must be put into place—a plan that allows for its continued connection to the river system. A significant part of my electorate relies on the outcome. Lake Bonney must be recognised as an important economic, social and environmental asset to South Australia, and treated as such.

Indeed, all of the River Murray's environmental assets within South Australia need reassessment along social and economic lines. Chaffey alone boasts two Ramsar sites of international significance—the Riverland wetland encompassing Chowilla and Calperum stations and the Banrock Station wetland—in addition to hundreds of creeks, lagoons, backwaters and natural flood plains. We owe it to our future generations of South Australians to ensure these are managed with regard to their long-term sustainability and health, their capacity to generate tourism income, and their social value to local communities. A healthy river environment is essential to ensure sustainable irrigation industries and river communities, viable ecosystems, improved biodiversity and sustainable tourism.

Tourism, in particular, should have a bright future in Chaffey. The experiences offered by the region are many and unique, and the climate is stunning. Here I acknowledge the tireless efforts of tourism industry operators and businesses in Chaffey and those who manage the many events that attract thousands of visitors to the region every year. They continue to innovate, particularly in terms of ecotourism and food and wine tourism, and are moving to make Chaffey a regional conference and convention destination. They make an important contribution to the regional economy in these difficult times of compromised water security.

Water security will, of course, be my number one priority as the member for Chaffey, as it should be for this government. Water will become an increasingly scarce and valuable resource. There will be fierce ongoing competition for water amongst various interests such as the environment, industry, agriculture and human needs. This country needs a visionary nation-building approach to water security in this century to ensure our future water needs are met; and perhaps no state will need to influence this vision or drive this nation-building approach more than South Australia. Our future capacity for population growth, wealth and job creation, quality food

production, energy generation and ensuring a strong, healthy community are all greatly dependent upon it.

It must begin with developing and maintaining a much stronger position on the River Murray. Reducing Adelaide's reliance on the Murray for water, while necessary, will not reduce the river's importance to the city or to regional South Australia. Water from the Murray is used across the breadth of this state from the West Coast to the eastern border. The vast majority of this state's population relies on continued availability of this water. When members here drink a Clare Valley riesling or a Barossa Valley shiraz, chances are that it has been irrigated with River Murray water. The seat of Chaffey relies on it greatly.

Chaffey presents itself to almost every South Australian when they sit down to a meal or order a drink at the bar. It is an important food bowl for this state and this nation. South Australia is the wine state of Australia and the Riverland is the engine room. It takes advantage of abundant sunshine, innovative farmers and the absence of pests such as fruit fly, but it relies on water from the Murray. Without secure water entitlements, without a state government willing to go in to bat for them, this region's irrigators could face oblivion. Indeed, many of them are already facing it.

We certainly must not sit back and watch our irrigators' entitlements be stripped away under the proposed federal plan for the Murray-Darling Basin. This would debilitate regional communities and place the food security of this state at risk. The federal government will not even commit to compensating irrigators if their entitlements are required but, in view of the efficiency investments made by irrigators in this state and the senseless waste of water upstream, South Australia's position must be that irrigators should not have to give up any more of their water. It must be if we are to retain our river communities, if we are to continue to enjoy the benefits and security of fresh local produce grown in our state, and if we are serious about South Australia's status as an exporter of quality food and wine.

Some years ago, this government released its food strategy for South Australia. It talked about increasing the food sector's contribution to the state's economy. It talked about its vision for an internationally competitive and innovative food industry. It talked about creating more jobs in the food and wine sectors, and it talked about ensuring long-term availability and quality of the state's local food supply. These goals will not be met unless this government supports irrigators and ensures their water entitlements are not reduced any further. South Australia's food security will be compromised if irrigators' entitlements are reduced, and South Australia will be further exposed to the well-documented health and biosecurity risk of food imports.

In its more recent obsession with mining and defence industries, this government would do well to remember that we cannot eat iron ore, copper or uranium. We cannot eat air warfare destroyers. Minerals are not the only thing that come from the soil. Mining is not the only primary industry. This government would do well to shift some of its attention to food production and investing more funds and more effort into the food sector. A good place to start would be the Loxton Research Centre.

The Riverland is a world-class horticultural area due in no small part to the research and development which once took place at Loxton. Established in the 1960s, the centre focused on breeding, developing and trialling new horticultural crop varieties in consultation with growers and industry. The centre conducted research to address issues, such as salinity, pests and diseases, and from Israel it brought over cutting edge irrigation technology and adapted it to local conditions. It developed groundbreaking soil survey technology and it provided sought-after agronomic consultancy services across the region and developed irrigation benchmarking to improve the performance of growers in terms of water efficiency and yields.

Because irrigators cannot gain much in the way of further water efficiencies through investment in infrastructure and on-farm systems, the best way to ensure their viability is to ensure that they continue to supply South Australians and the world with quality produce to help make them better, more efficient food producers with the aid of targeted, local, on-the-ground research, development and extension. This is why I believe that the government investment in the Loxton Research Centre must be reinvigorated. It must have more modern facilities, it must be staffed with skilled researchers and it must have sufficient funding over the long term to pursue research projects that will take many years to reach fruition.

This will help not only to secure a future for horticultural production in the Riverland but also research outcomes from Loxton could in themselves become a valuable export product for this

state. I see it as a long-term investment to ensure the state's food security and sustainability of the communities in Chaffey which depend on the viability of this region's horticultural industries.

This year we have witnessed the violent end to many young lives on our roads. There is no escaping the fact that their inexperience is a major factor in the disproportionate road toll on young people. It is a sad fact with which the people of Chaffey are all too familiar. Our young drivers have to contend with a national highway running through much of the region—a highway with an increasing number of large B double trucks travelling upon it. Speed cameras, breath testing stations and harsher penalties for driving offences do not make younger people more experienced or better equipped to drive, but education does.

This is why I strongly advocate the establishment of a driver training facility at the permanent site of the Riverland's field days near Barmera. Not only would it be a safe place in which to educate our young people how to handle the conditions they will experience on our roads (particularly the Sturt Highway), but also it could effectively create a new industry in Chaffey. It could become a regional hub for defensive driver training and create jobs in the area. The Australian National Drag Racing Association is also prepared to invest in establishing a Riverland motor sport and driver training complex at this site. This is something which would also contribute to the local economy. So, it is important that we do not let an opportunity pass to integrate a state-supported driver education facility with it.

While we are on the subject, Madam Speaker, it is equally important that we have safe roads for young drivers and for those who are not so young. Whilst the maintenance of our state's roads should be acknowledged, there remain several road black spots to be addressed in Chaffey. Money is available from the federal government to do so but it will not act without state government support.

Young people also require the best facilities and other incentives to remain in the region. Quality public education is paramount amongst these. It is with great concern that I consider moves to centralise education in South Australia, because local schools are immensely important to the identity and the integrity of the regional communities, such as those in Chaffey. They provide a focus for communities and they provide facilities for sport, entertainment, meetings and other events. They are a source of community pride, and this state has an obligation to maintain them.

The same goes for the health services. The Riverland continues to wait for its general hospital in Berri. This government has been quick to sacrifice a third of its GST income to federal health reform without much scrutiny of the plan, but ever so slow to spend the \$41 million it promised for the Berri hospital. This project must proceed without delay. Chaffey is in the same situation as many regional areas in Australia with regard to health services. To call them 'inadequate' is an understatement. Renmark, for example, currently has the lowest doctor to patient ratio of any town in South Australia. We must have more trained Australian doctors and nurses. The lack of Australian trained doctors is having a major negative impact on regional health care. We must make more places in our medical schools available to Australian students instead of giving those positions to fee-paying overseas students.

We must also put in place the best possible incentives to attract more doctors to regional areas. The proposed Flinders University regional medical school at Renmark must be given priority support by this government. It will better enable the Chaffey region to attract and retrain medical practitioners. Consideration must also be given to other ways of improving health services in the region, such as re-establishing a commercial air service to Renmark, and this would enable flying visits by health specialists which, at the moment, people in Chaffey can access only by travelling to Adelaide.

I wish to conclude my reply by urging the Premier to visit the Chaffey electorate and meet with its community. It is a part of South Australia which he has neglected for far too long and which this city-centric government has neglected as well. It is past time for the Premier to meet with local irrigators and tell them how he is going to protect their water entitlements and ensure that South Australia's efficiency record stands for something in the formulation of the National Water Plan. It is past time for the Premier to meet with the people of Barmera and see for himself the disaster brought upon Lake Bonney. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

**The SPEAKER:** Congratulations to the member for Chaffey on a very good first speech. I now call on the member for Bright.

**Ms FOX (Bright) (17:38):** Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am not quite sure whether or not I have congratulated you. There is a lot of congratulating going on today, so congratulations to the members for Chaffey and Adelaide and you, Madam Speaker, on reaching this phenomenal achievement in your career. I would also like to thank the Governor for his opening of parliament this week. He is one of the best governors I recollect as having, and I am very fond of him. I think he is doing a great job.

I rise today to reflect on some of the points that emerged from our most recent election. First and foremost, I would like to thank those people in the electorate of Bright who once again placed their trust in me to represent them with fairness and goodwill for the next four years. I acknowledge in this place that I only won the election by 167 votes and that approximately half of the electorate did not vote for me. To those people, I promise to represent all electors regardless of their political affiliations to the best of my ability. It is my job and my personal privilege to do so. A result where you win an election by only 167 votes—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** Fewer people to thank.

**Ms FOX:** —certainly gives one pause for thought, member for Croydon. I have engaged in a great deal of reflection over the last month, noticeably in relation to my own conduct as a member of parliament and an examination of that very close result. I acknowledge that there were greater issues at stake that were perhaps beyond my control—an extraordinary redistribution of the boundaries in 2007 and a swing, albeit patchy, against our party in some seats.

Due to the very difficult and precarious circumstances of my pregnancy last year I could not campaign in the way that I would have liked. I was obliged to remain in bed, which is extremely boring, from October until January which didn't help. The next two months were spent in the neonatal unit of Flinders Medical Centre willing and hoping that my little boy, born two months early and weighing 1.1 kilos, would actually pull through, which he did, and above all I am grateful for his life, his health and the support and understanding of my parliamentary colleagues from both sides of this house.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms FOX:** Indeed, member for Schubert. Member for Hammond, very nice of you, thank you, and the wider Bright community. Still, at the end of the day, it was my face on the posters. It was my face and name on the how-to-vote cards, and I do feel a certain weight of responsibility for the narrow margin that then occurred. I have been thinking of ways in which I can improve my performance in this job, and let's face it: an election is the end of a four-year job interview. I only just got this job. Perhaps I value it all the more because of its marginal nature and its precarity. Time and hard work alone will tell whether the next job interview will be as successful.

This election was also an interesting one because of the result. Those who say that the Labor Party did not win it are very wrong: we won a majority of seats in this parliament and we were thus able to form government. It is as simple as that. I do not have any recollection of the Liberal Party complaining about the system we have up until this time and certainly not in 1998 when then federal Labor leader, Kim Beazley, won a majority of the two-party preferred vote yet did not win enough seats to claim government. I didn't notice any of you protesting on the steps of Parliament House then. John Howard took office, much as we have taken office, because he clearly won a majority of seats in the parliament.

The past can teach us many lessons, can it not? If we look far enough into the past, perhaps back into the 1990s, you may remember, colleagues and friends, a scandal that erupted in 1997 when a Liberal candidate was investigated for—wait for it—alleged electoral misconduct involving how-to-vote cards. A number of stories about the matter, written by the excellent journalists Miranda Murphy and Phillip Coorey in *The Advertiser* and Matthew Abraham in *The Australian*, showed headlines such as 'Misleading ads assisted Lib poll win' and 'Libs face charges over poll campaign'. I should point out that the Liberal candidate in question was cleared of any legal wrongdoing in much the same way that members on this side did not do anything legally wrong.

It is simply not worth throwing mud over an election that one has not won, especially when one's own party has been tarred with the same brush over a decade ago. Had the legislation put forward by the Labor Party in this house last year been agreed to in another place, none of these unsavoury events which occurred in 2010 would have been repeated. We live, the member for Schubert, and we learn.

*Mr Venning interjecting:*

**Ms FOX:** Indeed. Losing graciously is very difficult and admirable, and this morning many of us will have seen former prime minister Gordon Brown being extremely gracious as he said goodbye to the waiting media pack outside No. 10 Downing Street with his two sons and his wife. In a much smaller way on the other side of the world, the Liberal candidate I ran against in Bright was equally gracious. Losing by 167 votes is devastating for anyone, and I know that because for the better part of a week I was certain I had lost that election by about four votes, and it made me feel sick to the stomach. I acknowledge the hard work of Liberal candidate Maria Kourtesis who, with her team of young Liberals, ran a clean and committed campaign. I earnestly hope that the Liberal Party sees its way to working with Maria in another capacity in the future.

I would like to mention the literally hundreds of people who regardless of their voting intentions were so kind to me when my son was born. The beautiful cards and gifts from individuals and community organisations were very moving, and I have actually kept all of the cards that I was sent so that when Theo is 15 years old and says, 'I didn't ask to be born' I can give him these cards. I can ask him to read all the cards and we will have a very interesting exchange at that point, I am sure.

In closing, I must thank the people I work with who had a really hard time. My electorate office staff, Matthew Sarunic and Simone McDonnell, have worked above and beyond the call of any duty, and I am proud to be able to work with them. I also thank the staff and the secretary of the SDA. The unconditional support and friendship shown to me by these people was invaluable. I have to say that the compassion, understanding and support that SDA secretary, Peter Malinauskas, gave to me was unbelievable. It was a really tough time for many different reasons, but Peter was always at the end of the phone offering encouragement and solutions.

I would like to thank my friends, particularly my parliamentary colleagues. I would like to thank my family. I would like to thank, in particular, Paul Marcuccitti. *Born to be alive* was his theme song for the campaign, a disturbing song for many of us, but I thank him for what he did. I would also like to thank my colleagues. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you to the member for Bright. I am sure we will work very well together as a team. The member for Newland. All I could think of was the member for Kenyon; I'm sorry.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** It is late in the day. Order! The member for Newland.

**Mr KENYON (Newland) (17:46):** Madam Speaker, congratulations on your election. Congratulations also to the Deputy Speaker. One day it would be nice to be honoured in such a way as to have a seat named after me, but it will not be me. I will always be the member for Newland while I am here, I think.

First, I would like to congratulate the Governor on his speech. He is, on reflection, a very good Governor. Along with the member for Morphett, I have had the pleasure of dealing with him on the matter of the City of Adelaide, the Clipper Ship, and I have found him to be a very personable, focused and dedicated Governor, and I think we are very well served by him. So, I would like to thank him and congratulate him on his speech.

I would like to congratulate the Premier on his win. The Premier has been through an exceedingly difficult six months, particularly leading up to the election. It was very intense for him personally and professionally, and the way he carried himself through that time is a credit to him. I would particularly like to congratulate his wife, Sasha, who carried herself with such grace through that time. She is a very impressive person, who I did not really know much before the election campaign, but I certainly know her better now.

I would like to congratulate my fellow members, those who are newly elected from the Liberal and Labor side. We have certainly got three good members of parliament, and we are very happy with our intake, and they will make a big contribution over a long period of time. I would also like to offer my commiserations to Jane Lomax-Smith, the former member for Adelaide; Lindsay Simmons, the former member for Morialta; and Vini Ciccarello, the former member for Norwood, all of whom are a loss to the parliament. They have my sympathy in this difficult time. Losing an election is never fun. I have lost elections, and I never enjoyed one of them. I am enjoying this one, though; it's good.

**Mr Pederick:** How much did you enjoy it on the night?

**Mr KENYON:** A lot. I can tell you that I enjoyed it a lot on the night. I have said it before and I will say again—

*The Hon. J.D. Hill interjecting:*

**Mr KENYON:** No, not that. No, it is something else. I've moved on now. There was a slight pause and we moved on. I have said it before and I will say again, and I am quoting other people, of course, that no-one gets here alone. Of course, it is true for me; it is probably more true for me than anybody else. I need to thank a long list of people, firstly, my wife Tina and my children, all of whom have been much more cognisant of the events going around them this time than they were last time. They suffered it with good grace. In the case of my eldest son there was a disturbing amount of interest. I will have to dissuade him. He is a bit of a vacuum for knowledge in politics; he takes it all in.

I would like to thank my wider family for their support, particularly my father and my mother-in-law, Micheline. There are a lot of demands on a member of parliament's time, especially at night, and finding babysitters is often difficult. My dad and Micheline filled in often at very short notice and allowed me spend some time with my wife, albeit at a work function.

I would like to thank my staff of over the past four years: Rose, Michael, Chad, Matthew and Sean, all of whom have been a great help over the last four years, especially Michael and Rose in the last year when things got a bit more intense.

I would particularly like to thank the Minister for Employment and Training, Jack Snelling. He was my campaign manager, and he was excellent. It certainly inspires a lot of confidence in a candidate when you know that things are getting done that need to be done, and I can just go out and do the work I need to do when I am campaigning.

I have a lot of volunteers who need to be thanked, but there is a small group of people who really deserve a lot of thanks. They are: Bernie Finnigan, Paul Marcuccitti and Corey Harris. I would especially like to thank some people from interstate: Gus 'G Man' Riggs, Comie 'Conrad' French and Ted 'Two Loops' Sussex, as well as Father Guy Wilcock, Sam 'Slavemaster Two' Runnel. They are all great people, all were a great help, and they just worked tirelessly. I would like to thank Don Farrell and John Quirke for their invaluable assistance.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr KENYON:** You guys should wish you had people like these, because you can rely on them to help when you need them. Things go a lot better when they are around; that is for sure. They have my deep gratitude, and they will always have my deep gratitude. Peter Malinauskas at the SDA was another great help. It is almost impossible to achieve things without the help of friends, and he has certainly been a friend.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr KENYON:** I'm quite happy with that situation; it's helped me. It's the reason I'm here. There has been a bit of talk in the reply speeches about how the election was unfair and that the government does not have a mandate. I just remind members that we work in a Westminster parliament, and you have to win a majority of votes in a majority of seats. The government did and it has a mandate. You do not have a proportional representation system in the lower house; that is the upper house. Upper house—PR; lower house—Westminster.

**Mr Pederick:** Thanks for the lesson.

**Mr KENYON:** You need it.

*Mr Pengilly interjecting:*

**Mr KENYON:** Do you just want to wallow in the lesson or are you happy to move on?

**Mr Pengilly:** Are you still a very strong supporter of uranium mining?

**Mr KENYON:** I am a very strong supporter of uranium mining, and I am very proud to have played a small and minor part in the change of the Labor Party, but I played a part nonetheless.



*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr KENYON:** I wish I had said that. I think the system of redistribution needs to be looked at. I say this staring down the barrel of a redistribution that is probably going to make me a notional Liberal seat. The flaw in the system is that it is always looking back, seeking to determine a result based on a past election. It is an impossible task. It cannot possibly achieve that goal. While I suspect that the Liberal Party is a lot less keen for change this time, they might be a little bit more keen for change next time, but we will wait and see the result in four years' time.

The redistribution system needs to move away from trying to determine a result based on last time's result and move more towards the federal system, which identifies communities of interest, and have that as the basis for seats.

*Ms Chapman interjecting:*

**Mr KENYON:** It is eight years more than I should have got. I think if we identified communities of interest, it would be a much better way of redistributing and a much better way of forming seats, but that is for other people, certainly not me.

As everybody knows, I speak briefly. I like speaking about mining, so I will have a crack at that. It is quite clear to me that the resource super profits tax that the federal government wants to introduce needs some amendment. The Treasurer has ably identified what those amendments need to be. Certainly, it is not sufficient to say that just the long-term bond rate, at roughly 6 per cent, is an appropriate return for the risk of building a mine. I suspect the Treasurer will make a wise decision in that matter.

**Mr Pederick:** You need to move over here, Tom. Over you come.

**Mr KENYON:** He has already asked.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr KENYON:** You're a much braver man than I am. To say that 6 per cent is an adequate return before we start really taxing heavily is a bit rich. If any investor or banker is faced with the prospect of having money in the bank at 6 per cent or risking all of that money in the construction of a mine for a 6 per cent return before hitting super profits, it is an easy decision for them: they are not going to do it. That is why it probably needs to be two or three times the bond rate before a super profits tax on that kicks in.

In some ways, there needs to be a certain amount of flexibility in just the type of mine that you build. I think all the easy mines have gone. Not a lot of people are going to fly over a bunch of red hills, wonder why their magnet is going crazy and find a whole heap of iron ore. That is not going to happen, so any mines that we find in the future are going to be deeper, harder to find and harder and more expensive to extract. When you are out there trying to tax the runaway profits of iron ore mines and coal mines that are long established and well paid off, that needs to be taken into account. Future mines need to be taken into account.

The second point is that the capital needs to be expensed in the same way the petroleum resource rent tax is expensed, which means that you pay off all your capital before you start taking into account profits, super taxes and everything like that. If it is treated in the same way as the petroleum resource rent tax, that should solve that problem. I think it is a fairly straightforward amendment.

Finally, I am not opposed to resource rent taxes; I think they are an efficient way of taxing mining companies. In the bad times, remembering that it is a cyclical industry, as the prices drop away, your profitability declines and declines quite quickly, almost exponentially in most cases. When it does, you basically stop paying tax at a certain point, and that is a fair thing, because the important thing at that point is keeping the mine going, keeping people employed and keeping exports and everything else going. So, I am not opposed to a resource rent tax, but if you are going to bring one in, I think you need to be a bit more committed to the exploration side of it to generate the projects so that you have mines to pay the tax. So, I think the federal government needs to implement the flow-through share scheme that it promised at the last election in 2007. It promised to introduce a flow-through share scheme, and it should.

Normally, a mining company has income to offset its exploration against; an exploration company does not. All it does is spend money drilling holes, and it racks up a whole lot of deductions that in all likelihood it will not use, because most exploration companies are not successful. It is an incredibly risky venture—most of them are not successful; most exploration

holes do not succeed—but it is essential. Unless we have the flow of exploration going on underneath the whole mining venture, we are not going to get the next mines coming. That is why it is absolutely critical. In fact, I think a study was done in a well explored gold area—the Kalgoorlie-Boulder area—which found that, even where there were deposits, that land had been explored seven times before someone actually found something. So, it is critical that this exploration continues and continues strongly.

Getting back to the point, what a flow-through share scheme does is allow the company to pass on the deductions it cannot use on to its shareholders, who can then deduct it against their income. That is essentially what a flow-through share scheme is. It should have been implemented by the federal government. I urge it to do so. I congratulate everyone again on their election and wish them well. I look forward to the next four years.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.D. Hill.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Thursday 13 May 2010 at 10:30.