

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Tuesday 29 June 2010**

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

The SPEAKER: Members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

ELECTORAL (PUBLICATION OF ELECTORAL MATERIAL) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 May 2010.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (11:02): I rise to speak on this bill, which was introduced by the Attorney-General—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: I can hear the former attorney-general bleating already. The bill was introduced by the new Attorney-General in the government, and it is now for consideration and debate. Essentially, this bill was introduced to amend the Electoral Act to deal with two specific issues. I summarise those as the circumstances in which a candidate can publish certain matter during the course of the election, and it purports to deal with what has been known as the 'dodgy how-to-vote card' issue to ensure that, in future elections, a penalty will be imposed in the event that anyone attempted to do so. This is to legislate with respect to a practice which, the government is well aware, is unacceptable and which it needs, it appears, to have legislation to make sure that it does the right thing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: Some further comment will be made about that, but the second aspect deals essentially with internet authorisations and the obligation for those to be imposed. It became a complete farce after statements were made by the former attorney-general in the early part of the election campaign during which he purported to interpret what would be required at the internet level, with particular reference to Facebook and other social sites, and his inconsistent expectation (the opposition says) with what had been disclosed by the Electoral Commissioner during briefings, as well as with commitments made by minister Holloway in another place and about which the government, again during the election campaign, was caught out, and it ultimately conceded by using the regulation power to withdraw from the insistence thereof, and I will refer to that shortly.

The opposition's position on this matter is that the bill should be referred to the newly established Select Committee on Matters Related to the General Election of 20 March 2010. The opposition takes the view that this should be referred, but that is not to say that we are not supportive of the intent of the government now to remedy its own misconduct by dealing with this issue, and we want to ensure that it is done properly and, also, comprehensively, in a circumstance where the government is clearly attempting to quarantine any further investigation as to the conduct of the Australian Labor Party during the recent past election.

Its way of doing this, of course, is to simply say to the people of South Australia, 'Look, we knew we did wrong, and we are going to amend that and produce the legislation to remedy that'; narrow it to those issues and then expect the public to believe that that is the extent of its misconduct, to quarantine itself against further criticism. It will then to try to argue to the people of South Australia that, if we do not immediately support the passage of this bill, the opposition are squawking about this bill and they are not supporting it right here when they have an opportunity to do so.'

The reason for that is simply that we are not satisfied this is the extent of the misconduct. Quite obviously, the Australian Labor Party is desperate to do this. Not only is that our assertion, but the very conduct of the government, in coming in with this bill after there had been a motion passed for the establishment of the select committee, only corroborates exactly what we are saying, that is, the government is attempting to narrow the issues of misconduct during the campaign to what it has been caught out on only, and suggest that any delay in this will now be our fault.

So I want to make it quite clear that the select committee motion had been in place well before the introduction of this bill, and I want to briefly remind members that, not only was there disclosure of this conduct during the course of the campaign and, indeed, on the day of the election (20 March 2010), but also there was public outcry subsequent to this occurring and, indeed, subsequent to hearing the Electoral Commissioner's finding on the complaint about this matter.

There was such public outcry in the general media that there was a call by minor parties, including the Family First Party, who were in support of the Liberals' position, that we must have an inquiry into the conduct of activities during the election, and it must happen quickly and it must have a term of reference that is sufficiently narrow to ensure it can occur quickly. The charter of that committee, as supported in the Legislative Council by the passing of the motion, was very clear: it had to be narrow enough to be able to be dealt with quickly but with sufficient investigative parameters to ensure that it was comprehensive enough to deal with the conduct of any of the parties during the election campaign. I want to place on the record the select committee's charter. It states:

A select committee of the Legislative Council of South Australia has been established to inquire and report upon—

- (a) the use of bogus how-to-vote cards and other election day material to mislead voters and measures that may be necessary to ensure that electors are not misled;
- (b) provision of voting services including voting by post, services to people with disabilities and residents of declared institutions;
- (c) the integrity of the roll, including the identification of voters presenting and measures for subsequent verification; and
- (d) management of the election by the Electoral Commission, including the powers and resources available to the commission.

As members would be aware, the committee has been established, invitations to make submissions have been called for, and later this week on 2 July submissions are to be presented to the committee secretary, Mr Guy Dickson. I do not doubt for one moment that they are flooding in because, although again the government's attempt is to try to narrow this issue to what it has been caught out on, clearly the parliament through the Legislative Council has identified a lot of other areas of concern that need to be dealt with and cleared up.

One of the reasons it is very important is that members will be aware that the Electoral Commissioner is also responsible here in South Australia for the supervision of elections at local government level. We obviously are about to embark on a period of campaigns for, ultimately, an election in November this year, which is only a few months away, and campaigns will start to be very active at local government level, which the Electoral Commissioner has the jurisdiction to monitor and supervise. Therefore, it is important that we sort out any of these issues.

This select committee inquiry covers the use of bogus how-to-vote cards, which is a principal aspect—in fact, one of only two aspects—of this bill, so it is fair to say that the presentation by the government in this bill covers one of the aspects of the inquiry. But the government got this wrong back when it made amendments to the Electoral Act. The government mucked it up then. Of course, they try to blame us by stating that our amendments were the problem and that amendments made in the upper house, which they ultimately acceded to, were our fault. But they are the government, and when that bill came back down to the lower house they nodded. That was their issue. They presented the amendments and they have thrown them back here without any proper inquiry.

There has been no indication in the very brief contribution made by the Attorney-General as to who he has consulted on this, whether in fact he has any legal or Crown Law advice on whether this rare insertion of a provision in the bill will remedy the problem or not—nothing! There was just a two paragraph submission presented to us with this bill. We certainly are not satisfied. We say the government mucked it up in the first place. It attempted to push this through with a whole lot of other reforms under the Electoral Act, which it has mucked up. We want it remedied, but we want it remedied properly.

It is wrong for the government to come in here and make an assertion that, if there is a delay of a few months by having an inquiry on this matter, that is somehow our fault, and not support our bona fides in supporting an inquiry, when, in reality, the government knows that this conduct was wrong during the election campaign. It wants to try to get the people of South Australia to believe that they are capable of doing it again and need to be in some way directed by

a change of law to know what is the right and decent thing to do, to know that this was unacceptable behaviour. We say that it should be culpable and it should have been acted upon by the Electoral Commissioner during the campaign.

In relation to the bogus how-to-vote card issue, and for the purposes of the record for those who might follow this debate, this relates to the Australian Labor Party's use of how-to-vote cards, we say, to try to mislead electors on 20 March. Essentially, they dressed up Labor Party officials, supporters, members, sympathisers or people who were sucked in—I am not sure—people who volunteered or maybe were paid—in any event, people committed to the Labor cause—with T-shirts that were emblazoned with the Family First slogan. They distributed how-to-vote cards which also bore the Family First slogan but which directed preferences contrary to what the Family First party had on its how-to-vote cards.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Just like Brokey did in 2006.

The SPEAKER: Order! One speaker at a time.

Ms CHAPMAN: On the day these fake how-to-vote cards were distributed, they had in small print the authorisation by M. Brown. Members of political parties may be well aware that he is Secretary of the Australian Labor Party, but poor old average people in the general community do not know that. These how-to-vote cards were distributed in some state electorates, in particular, Morialta, Mawson, Light—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr PENGILLY: I have a point of order, Madam Speaker. I refer to standing order 131 in relation to the member for Croydon.

The SPEAKER: The member for Croydon is very vocal this morning, but I do not uphold the point of order. The member for Bragg.

Ms CHAPMAN: After it was clear that these cards had been distributed in the circumstances I have described and a complaint was made to the Electoral Commissioner, I am advised that on election day she gave an oral assessment of the circumstances, claiming that she did not consider there was a breach of the Electoral Act by virtue of this distribution on the day. Subsequently, she dealt with the matter in writing.

In a letter of 15 April 2010 the Electoral Commissioner (Kay Mousley) responds to the formal complaint by the Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division). The letter states:

I refer to your clients' complaint of 9 April 2010 regarding material published and distributed by the Australian Labor Party in the electorates of Morialta, Mawson, Light and Hartley on polling day in the 2010 State election.

I have considered the complaint and whether it discloses an offence under the Electoral Act 1985 ('the act'), in particular whether an offence under sections 111, 112B and 113 of the Act has been committed.

After closely considering the material you have provided to me, I am not satisfied that any offence has been committed under these provisions of the Act.

Section 112B

An offence is committed under section 112B(1) of the Act if a person publishes or distributes an electoral advertisement or a how-to-vote card that identifies a candidate by reference (relevantly) to the registered name of the registered political party, unless either the candidate is endorsed by the relevant registered political party (section 112B(1)(c)) or the relevant registered political party has consented to the use of the relevant name (section 112B(1)(d)).

I am satisfied that the material that is the subject of the complaint constitutes electoral advertisements or how-to-vote cards and that the material identifies candidates by reference to the registered name of a registered political party. I am also satisfied that each candidate that is so referred to is the endorsed candidate of the relevant registered political party. As a result, section 112B(1)(c) is met.

Accordingly, I am satisfied that no offence was committed under section 112B of the Act.

Sections 111 and 113

An offence is committed under section 111 of the Act where a person hinders or interferes with the free exercise or performance, by any other person, or of a right or duty under the Act.

An offence is committed under section 113(2) of the Act if an electoral advertisement contains a statement purporting to be a statement of fact that is inaccurate and misleading to a material extent.

I understand your clients to be asserting that the material published and distributed by the Australian Labor Party in the electorates of Morialta, Mawson, Light and Hartley would have given voters the impression that the

material was published by or on behalf of the Family First Party and was the Family First Party's recommendation to voters as to whom they should give their second preference in those electorates. I understand this assertion to be the crux of your clients' submission that section 111 and 113 of the Act was breached.

I am not satisfied that the material is capable of bearing the interpretation that is asserted in your clients' complaint. In my opinion, a reasonable reader of the material would understand that the material was not distributed by or on behalf of the Family First Party but that it was distributed by or on behalf of the Australian Labor Party as that Party's recommendation to voters as to whom they should give their second preference. In forming this opinion, I have taken into account the content, language and tone of the material and, in particular:

- that the recommendation to '[p]reference someone who shares your values, preference Labor' is likely, because of its tone, to appear to the reasonable reader to have been more probably made by the Australian Labor Party than the Family First party;
- the marked differences in appearance between this material and the Family First how-to-vote cards; and
- that the material states explicitly that it is 'authorised...for the Australian Labor Party'.

Accordingly, I am not satisfied that sections 111 and 113 of the Act have been breached by the material.

Yours sincerely,

K Mousley

Electoral Commissioner

That is the full extent of the letter, and I want it all to be on the record.

I would like to make the following comments. First, Family First itself—on the face of it, the first victims of this dodgy practice by the Australian Labor Party on 20 March—says that not only are they without authorisation but, yes, they have also used their slogan, they have breached that, and they are very strongly taking objection to that.

I do not quite understand—and this is why it is important that we have an inquiry—how the Electoral Commissioner herself is able to make an assessment on the tone of a piece of paper and the statement in it, nor do I have anything from this correspondence which identifies the basis upon which she makes the finding that the appearance of the dodgy material was likely to give a reasonable reader the impression that it had come from the Labor Party and not Family First. There is absolutely no basis whatsoever disclosed in this correspondence.

My second comments relate to the marked difference in appearance of the dodgy material and the Family First material. When a voter comes along to the polling booth and picks up these dodgy how-to-vote cards from the dodgy Labor Party official who is handing them out, and they give the impression, and the prospective voter forms the view, that they have collected the Family First material, why on earth would the voter go along and try to find another Family First official to get the correct, authentic, original material approved by Family First if they believed they already had it from Family First?

How would the voter possibly be in a position to receive both on the day and make the assessment—in the clear light of day and subsequent to the event—that the Electoral Commissioner does? She pulls together these two pieces of material—the real ones and the dodgy ones—and says that there is a difference, and she notes that there is a marked difference. How would the reasonable, prospective voter be in a position to make that assessment at the time? In any event, the opposition does not accept the finding of the Electoral Commissioner that in fact there were marked differences—even when they were put side by side—that would readily give a reasonable reader the impression that it was an Australian Labor Party piece of material.

The final point the Electoral Commissioner relies upon is the claim that the material is explicitly authorised for the Australian Labor Party. Well, we have a whole lot of laws about authorisations and a whole lot of laws about disclosing all sorts of things in fine print. Let me give an example: we have laws that say that an airline carrier must disclose to its passengers, on every ticket issued, information about what their obligations are in terms of not carrying illegal product or weapons and the like on aircraft, what amount of baggage they can carry, their conduct, their acceptance of the ticket price, all sorts of things.

All of that has to be disclosed to the passenger every time the passenger has an exchange of contract with the airline carrier. If members look on the back of any of their airline tickets—that is, if they still have them, because we often now just go to the counter, show our driver's licence and get on the plane—they will see all those explicit obligations that the passenger accepts on entering the aircraft and subsequently undertakes to do or not do. But how many of you read it? How many

people can honestly say that they have said, 'I have read all the small print and consciously made a decision to purchase a ticket to travel on that particular aircraft?'

Obviously, in the case of the prospective voter, who enters the polling booth area and picks up the dodgy how-to-vote card, believing that it is a Family First vote card, why would they then, having formed that belief, read the fine print at the bottom, which says, 'Authorised by M. Brown, Australian Labor Party?' Of course, they do not do that. They pick up the how-to-vote card, having worked out themselves which party is their preferred preference. Believing they have picked up a Family First how-to-vote card, they walk into the polling booth to vote and they have the option then to follow that how-to-vote card if they so wish. I ask members: how many of you have ever read the authorisation on the bottom of the how-to-vote cards that you have picked up as you have walked into a polling booth?

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Well, we have one exception, of course, and that would be the member for Croydon, who is an exception in every way, no doubt about that. We can never regulate for stupidity or for the eccentrics of the world. It is absurd, the opposition suggests, that the tiny fine print on the bottom of a how-to-vote card has alerted the prospective voter that it is actually an Australian Labor Party how-to-vote card and that it had been authorised by the Labor Party.

Some voters going into the polling booth who knew about this tactic of the Labor Party may well have been alert to what was going to happen there and thought, 'Well, I'm going to go along and pick up one of these cards'—but they were already in on the secret. What we are talking about is the prospective voter who goes into the polling booth, having made the decision that it is likely they want to support the Family First Party, and they are told on a piece of paper issued by the Labor Party in disguise the best way to do that.

That is a dodgy practice, even though, after the election, Michael Brown, the Secretary of the Labor Party, gave a clear indication that he would do it again. I note that the Premier has distanced himself from the practice. He has claimed that he did not know anything about it at all, which I find completely unbelievable.

Mr Griffiths: He didn't know about the Adelaide Oval.

Ms CHAPMAN: He didn't know about all sorts of things. However, that is the position. Some Labor Party candidates have publicly said that they had that practice in their electorate but that they would not do it again. This practice was carried out in the electorate of the member for Mawson, who was the candidate and sitting member for that electorate. At the time of the declaration of the poll, he publicly indicated that he considered this was a practice he would not participate in again in the future. Good on him for recognising, at the very least, post the event, that he would not participate in that practice again. There is a question about why he would sign up to that practice in the first place if he knew in his heart that it was wrong.

I give credit now to the member for Bright, who was also an Australian Labor Party candidate during the election that is the subject of this bill. She publicly stated that she had been offered the opportunity to have this dodgy practice within her electorate and she declined it, and I give her credit for that. She knew full well that this was an unacceptable practice, and she was prepared to reject it and to fight the election without the use and support of that crutch and devious way to win the election. I give credit to her for that, because she said, 'No, I'm not going to accept it,' even though she would have known, during the lead-up to the election, that she would be under some pressure in respect of that vote and that she may well have lost her seat, given the public indication that there was a swing to the opposition and that she was one of those who would be at risk.

Clearly, at the end of the election campaign and final completion of scrutineering of the votes in the seat of Bright, it was a pretty longwinded and, no doubt, nerve-racking exercise for the member, as I know it was for our candidate, Maria Kourtesis, and I am sure that, for some of the others who had genuinely participated in that electorate in the election, that ultimate decision was heartbreaking. To her credit, the member for Bright had taken that risk in the full knowledge that she was one of the vulnerable candidates, in the end winning by a only few hundred votes out of the 23,000-odd within her electorate. Good on her for acknowledging that.

What is incredible to me is that not only was the Australian Labor Party, in the knowledge that this practice was clearly unacceptable, so desperate to try to retain office and used this

practice but it was also on full alert that some of its own people refused to participate in its use, even people like the member for Bright, who were at risk and yet were prepared to say no.

With Michael Brown and the Australian Labor Party, I include the Premier in this as the parliamentary head of the Australian Labor Party and who, of course, is well experienced, not only as a parliamentarian but also as the federal president of the Australian Labor Party. If the Premier does not know what the rules are in the Australian Labor Party and in elections, then who would? He is a man who has been around for 30 years in Australian politics, who maintains the position as head of the Labor Party in South Australia and who has been federal president of the Australian Labor Party.

The Premier knew what the rules were and the party knew what the rules were. Michael Brown ultimately consented to his name being put on the dodgy how-to-vote cards in the full knowledge that at least one member who was in a vulnerable position had said, 'No. I reject the use of that practice in my electorate. If I am not the member for Bright, so be it, but I reject that being used. It is an unsatisfactory practice that I will not participate in.'

We need to properly investigate this matter and make sure that we get it right as a parliament. We need to make sure that, in the government's rolling over on what was inadequate law, as the Electoral Commissioner says, we actually get it right so that she gets a very clear legislative message about what her obligation is in the interpretation of breaches of the act for such reprehensible conduct.

The second matter is internet authorisations. Much has been said when we debated this matter under the Electoral Act reforms in 2009. I will place on the record the opposition's position. Again, for members' benefit and those reading these debates, this was the inclusion in the Electoral Act—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: —that, in addition to authorisations on printed material, there be a requisite authorisation on the publication of material on an electronic medium. The argument of the government was that in this day and age we have use of electronic media, including websites, which publish material that, clearly, would have some influence relating to the support or otherwise of a political party or candidate—Independent included—and that, because those media are so readily available, it is rather a nonsense to require authorisation on a printed piece of material but not on that which is published and distributed electronically.

When the matter came to the opposition for briefing, the Electoral Commissioner attended, in addition to the bevy of people who were sent along from the Attorney-General's office, who generally ably assisted with advice on the amendments proposed. I attended the last of these briefings on behalf of the opposition. This issue was raised because there had been a change of representatives on attorney-general matters for the opposition, and it became my responsibility to attend to get a full briefing on the bill and to make sure that, where possible, as we had indicated, we would support the passage of the bill, because we already supported much of it.

In fact, a number of its aspects had been the subject of inquiry and investigation over a number of years, and a number of aspects needed to be looked at, and we were supporting the government on them. There were a number of very significant aspects that we opposed, about which we had had significant debate. My predecessor as spokesperson (now leader, the member for Heysen) had undertaken those debates. So, at this briefing, which I attended, along with representatives of the former attorney-general's office and the Electoral Commissioner, this particular amendment was the subject of discussion. We indicated, as the opposition, that in principle we supported electronically published material, for example, on websites coming under this umbrella.

We discussed this specifically, because websites, for example, of members of parliament, which we particularly looked at, on which material could be published before and during an election campaign, we accepted could reasonably be included—there is not much point in us having to have authorisation for what we put out on the street. In fact, on the day we discussed with the Electoral Commissioner the practical implementation of how we would address material that had been published or placed on our websites well prior to an election campaign, and which stayed on it. Was it going to be necessary, with this amendment, to trawl back through everything that is

published on our websites and make sure that we added authorisations? The Electoral Commissioner's answer—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: —notwithstanding the absurd interruptions by the member for Croydon—was not no. Her answer to that question was that she agreed that that would be impractical, and that, when she considered the drafting of the regulations to go with this, she would appreciate the concern we had raised and look at it in the drafting of her regulations.

Some would argue that, if she excluded everything prior to the issuing of the writs that had been published on the internet, if its continued publication meant that you avoided an authorisation, of course, every effort would be made, say, 40 days before an election—because we now have a fixed date—for everyone to download onto their websites everything that they wanted to publish and therefore be excluded from being caught. Again, this was a very practical example given by the opposition where we conceded to the principle, but where the practical implication would need a lot of work on it to make sure that we did not produce the absurd; and that was important.

During the course of the briefing we also touched upon other electronic media in a general sense. We did not specifically ask whether this requires an approval on Twitter, or whether this requires an approval on Facebook, that any poor person, who is not even interested in politics, who has Facebook, who hears something on the news, makes some comment about how hopeless the Premier is, or whatever, needs to put an authorisation on it, yet they would not even know what the Electoral Act says nor care. Would they be caught under that?

None of that was discussed but what was indicated to us was that under 'other electronic publication' the electronic publications of newspapers and media outlets was an aspect which was discussed in that briefing. There was no mention of Twitter, Facebook or the social page interaction that became clear during the course of the election, which became an absolute farce.

The Electoral Commissioner had clearly indicated to us that her drafting of what would be the interpretation of the applicability of this clause would be read down. We were given this very clear indication.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Yes, that's right. Read down. Exactly right.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CHAPMAN: Subsequently, in the debates in the other place when this issue became alive again, minister Holloway gave a very clear commitment that this would not apply to social websites. What happened then? On the eve of the election proper—if I can say that, by mid-February we were into the lead up to the election proper—the former attorney-general issues the edict about what is to actually apply—and it covers everything.

Not surprisingly, the public were outraged. The media outlets were outraged, and the consequence was that the former attorney-general was called in to answer, via media outlets, questions as to what on earth was going on. We had the undertaking by minister Holloway and the briefing from the Electoral Commissioner and now we had the former attorney-general, on the eve of the election campaign, saying that it was going to apply across the board and expecting authorisations on everything. He publicly confirmed that, of course, and it was clear to us then, in opposition, that it was always the intention of the former attorney-general to bring to account anyone who dared to issue a statement or publication in any form whatsoever, in this state, that was critical of his party or the government.

The reason that was crystal clear to us was because one of the people who came forward during the course of this public debate and outrage claimed that he was the anonymous party who had published a criticism and had been referred to by the former attorney-general as someone who did not exist at all. It was clear to the opposition when this person came forward and said, 'Here I am; I actually exist; I made this statement and that's what I feel. I haven't got the authorisation and I would be someone who would be caught under this', that, even if—and we assume this for the moment—we assume the possibility that the attorney-general hadn't shared with the Electoral Commissioner or minister Holloway or possibly other members of his cabinet what his intent was, his intent was revealed. It was disclosed, and what he wanted to do became very obvious.

The crux of all of this is that the only logical explanation as to why the former attorney-general would want to require such an absurdly broad interpretation of what this was to apply to was because he wanted to know who was going to be criticising him, or the government, and he

wanted to be able to hunt them down and give them a barrage of his response, which he has done plenty of times before. When he has been able to find them, he gives them a bucketful of correspondence in response.

I myself have made statements, after which the attorney-general has sent off a barrage of correspondence demanding apologies, demanding this and that in lieu of defamation action, and so forth. It is just horrific. As a member of parliament, I can take it, but we had one person in my electorate of Bragg who had written to the attorney-general during the course of the preceding term about his concerns in respect to the David Hicks issue. I want members to appreciate how vindictive and nasty the former attorney-general can get when he finds out that someone has written to him and he objects to a statement that they have made.

The attorney-general wrote back to this constituent in Hazelwood Park and he explained what the government's position and policy were in respect to David Hicks. The first page actually seemed quite rational. It was an explanation of the government's position and it was quite clearly set out as to the position that the government had taken. On page 2, however, in the penultimate paragraph, this poor hapless member of the community gets a spray of abuse from the attorney-general—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Quote it!

Ms CHAPMAN: I am going to bring it in during the course of this debate—a spray of abuse—but how dare he even have the audacity to raise this issue in objection with the attorney-general. After all, he was a resident of Hazelwood Park so he should be complaining to the local member and not to him as the attorney-general. Let me remind members that members of the government are supposed to be there for all South Australians, irrespective of where they might live. If they live in Hazelwood Park or any other Liberal electorate, or whether they live in the Treasurer's electorate of Port Adelaide, they are entitled to representation. To be rudely responded to in a reply which utterly rejected and complained of the audacity of someone to even write to the attorney-general on this important issue—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: Quote it, Vickie.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will bring the quote in. It was a disgrace, an absolute disgrace. We know that the former attorney-general has got form. It was no surprise, in the end, that when this debate went wild in the public early in the election campaign and the outrage from the public that followed, we knew then what the attorney-general's form was like. He just corroborated it by his behaviour on radio subsequently. When he was caught out even in the simple case of someone he claimed did not even exist, eventually he comes crawling back with his response and that was, 'Oh, we put this through and this is my interpretation, but the Liberal Party supported it'.

I ask members to remember, as was evident from the other place, the undertakings that we were given in respect to this. It is a disgraceful situation when we are told one thing in a briefing, and even the parliament, and yet the attorney-general would come back and purport to introduce his new definition about what it should be. His behaviour is reprehensible. However, it occurred and possibly his announcement on the day after the election that he was retiring may have had something to do with how the rest of his colleagues thought about it.

Mr Pengilly: He got retired.

Ms CHAPMAN: He got retired, I am sure. The important thing is this: he asserted this and he was found out. He then said, 'Well, I can't do anything about this. It is not only the Liberals' fault because they consented to it, but I cannot do anything about this.' I pointed out on radio that there was a regulation power that he could use to remedy this, to ensure that it was not abused during the forthcoming election. In fact, what did the former attorney-general do? He came out and said, 'That is outrageous. I cannot possibly interfere with the parliament. I cannot possibly do that. That would be unconstitutional,' and that was his claim publicly.

Well, of course 24 hours later he came crawling back (probably beaten up by the Premier and other members of the cabinet, who must have been thinking by this stage, 'We've got a real problem here. This bloke has to go,') and said, 'Well, actually, she's right. I can do that, and I now will do that.' He then sent me the draft regulation that he proposed to put out to try to remedy this. Isn't it amazing? Never in the history of the eight years I have been here—and I have covered law and order in the lower house, either completely or as a representative for the party—never once did the attorney-general send me a draft regulation for approval—never once, and nothing during the caretaker period in 2006.

Mr Pengilly: He's gone the Adelaide Oval defence.

Ms CHAPMAN: That's right, 'I know nothing. Nobody told me, or I can't remember,' whichever applies, whichever is necessary to deal with it. However, the regulations were there. The regulations are in place which protect, at the moment, the abuse of this occurring. This bill introduces an amendment to ensure that it is dealt with at the parliamentary level. I mention that because I want members to be aware that, by sending this matter to a select committee, we are not leaving the public at risk. Even if a by-election were called tomorrow (possibly for Croydon, but who knows?), there would be no risk because the regulations are there. They are already in place, they have not been challenged by the parliament, they are being carried out, and so there is no risk of the people of South Australia being dragged into this during the course of this inquiry. That is the protection that we have in the meantime.

We agree that, ultimately, this issue should be resolved legislatively and that it is not a matter that should be within the parameters of regulation, but it has been utilised in the meantime in the emergency of the situation, and it is there to continue to provide that protection pending the inquiry by the select committee. During the course of the election, and subsequently, it became clear that there were other practices or events, which we had become aware of and in fact had been reported to the Electoral Commissioner, which clearly needed to have some attention given to them. That is why it is important that we clean up quickly all these issues related to the 2010 election.

We were disappointed to note that in another place, this motion being presented, attempts were made to bring up all sorts of other expanded terms of reference that predated the 2010 election. They are matters that can be the subject of a separate inquiry if they wish, but it was clearly the opposition's position, supported by other minor parties, that we needed to clear up the problems that occurred during the 2010 election, of which there are a number. Regrettably, this bill attempts to deal with only two, but the other clauses of the select committee's terms of reference of inquiry, including the provision of voting services, do need to be looked at.

The postal vote process, which apparently was inadequate to allow a sufficient number of people to get their postal vote before the requisite period in sufficient time to return it and cast a valid vote, was at risk during the election. There were a number of complaints in respect of that and, in relation to services to people with disabilities and residents of declared institutions and the accessibility to have an opportunity to vote, one example was the apparent omission of a number of prospective electors in the Flinders Medical Centre Emergency Department on election day who, it is alleged, were deprived of the opportunity to vote. It is very important that we quickly get to the bottom of the integrity of the role. The subsequent assertions, which form the basis of some litigation pending in the courts—a court of disputed returns hearing—relate to this question of the integrity of the role.

We have always had challenges in making sure that everyone who is legally entitled to vote gets a chance to vote, and everyone who is not on the roll and should not be on the roll, is excluded. There is also a category of electors on the roll whom we need to protect ourselves from; for example, multiple voters. These are aspects that we need to consider, and they have been the subject of correspondence and media coverage since the election. We need to make sure we have adequate measures and verification to ensure that we are protected against any abuse by an elector, whether it is by multiple voting or the use of a dead person's name to vote, etc. These are the sorts of things that we need to look into.

We suggest that the management of the election also needs to be considered. The Electoral Commission is a body funded by the government, and there needs to be a yearly review about whether it has adequate resourcing, because it is not only responsible for state elections but also for local government. For example, when the APY lands have an election, it is under the supervision of the Electoral Commissioner, and there are various powers under the act to refer other elections to be supervised.

The Electoral Commissioner has a very important responsibility to ensure that we have honest and fair elections, and he or she must have adequate resources to do so, and to particularly make sure that we uphold the high level of democracy on which this state was established, the history of which we are proud and want to maintain.

The inquiry also gives an opportunity for members, or other candidates—indeed, anyone in the public—to put forward a submission about aspects of this last election that may not have become apparent or published but which are of concern to them. During the course of the election,

there were complaints that did not necessarily receive formal status. I am aware of one, for example, where the member for Enfield—now Attorney-General—published a document which attempted to give himself some credibility by relying on the quote of the Leader of the Opposition, the then shadow attorney.

The member for Enfield made a statement during the course of debate in the parliament that he was the star on the other side. I would not have put that in a pamphlet, because it is all relative. If you are a star amongst a whole bunch of idiots, that is one thing. I would not have rushed to that. However, he did use it, and whether that was on the relativity argument or the accuracy of it, as I understand it, the Electoral Commissioner, in the oral inquiry, did not think it was inaccurate or misleading; in fact, it was merely a statement that had been made. However, as to the veracity of the statement or as to whether or not it actually helped him, I do not know. I think the member's vote dropped about 12 per cent or 15 per cent, or something incredible, like all of the cabinet members of the Rann government.

Fortunately for most of them, they had a sufficient cushion in voting numbers, which just confirms to me that clearly that was a strategy of the union movement in South Australia which was outraged with the conduct of the government over issues such as WorkCover and decided it would give them all a belting in their own electorates. That was pretty effective, especially when it came to the one in the marginal seat, the Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith, who was then the minister for education and held other portfolios. She suffered the same fate and, because she was in a marginal seat, she is of course no longer here in the parliament.

It is reasonable for candidates to refer to quotes from the parliament. What we say in here is to be accepted as a statement that is made; it is accurately recorded by our good friends from Hansard. I think one of the most effective that was used by the Liberal candidate against the candidate for the Labor Party in the seat of Enfield was the statement made by the candidate in which he said of his time in parliament, 'I usually sit here quietly, not really expecting to have to say anything.' That is his great contribution to the parliamentary debates during the course of his time previously here in the parliament. Sometimes they are helpful; sometimes they are not.

The Liberal candidate, Mr Westley, is now the Liberal Party of Australia's preselected candidate in the federal seat of Adelaide. I personally wish him great success, particularly as part of that electorate covers the state electorate of Bragg, as it also overlaps the state seats of Adelaide, Norwood and Unley. The state members of the house who represent those areas are all on the Liberal side, and we are very keen to support Luke in his endeavours in making sure that we bring back federal Adelaide to the Liberal Party. He was an outstanding candidate during the state campaign, and he will no doubt be an outstanding candidate against minister Ellis.

The position then is that we support in principle remedying these two defects that are the isolated and, we think, too-restrictive provisions of the bill. However, we want them to be properly investigated, with others, in the select committee inquiry, that the terms of reference of that select committee inquiry are sufficiently narrow to ensure that that can happen promptly and, finally, that we should come back with proper consideration of this matter and have a bill before us which remedies these defects so that we properly progress not only to the next state election but also any other local government or other elections of which the Electoral Commissioner is vested to supervise.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON (Croydon) (12:03): In the O'Connor side of my family the 1949 election campaign is folklore; in particular, that part of it when the member for the federal division of Reid, Jack Lang, accused Ben Chifley in the hours before polling in 1949 of being a moneylender. Jack Lang's accusation, completely false as it was and designed to get an Independent some publicity, was very damaging to prime minister Chifley, who was campaigning for the nationalisation of the banks.

As a result of that, according to O'Connor family folklore, the Menzies government that was elected at that election changed the law so that there would be an electronic media blackout for 48 hours before an election to stop people like Jack Lang making damaging false allegations that were calculated to affect the result of the election—not that I accept for a minute O'Connor family folklore that that is why Ben Chifley lost the election. That is my understanding of why the electronic media blackout came in. Of course, the commonwealth does not have the power to impose a non-electronic media blackout for 48 hours and that is why it is confined to the commonwealth constitutional power over electronic media.

It is important that material issued in the course of an election campaign, disseminated widely in *The Advertiser*, *The Australian*, the Messenger newspapers, and in an online journal like Adelaidenow, which is calculated to affect the result of the election, is labelled as being from a real person. It is important, in my view, that material issued under noms de plume or deliberately false names not be issued in the course of an election campaign because that material one day is going to affect the result of a general election, it is going to affect the results in lower house seats and it may affect the result in the upper house. If that material is issued, someone should take responsibility for it, and that is why I introduced the provision I did in the electoral bill.

I said on the eve of the campaign that the Adelaidenow website was a sewer of criminal defamation, identity theft and fraud. I said it without the cover of parliamentary privilege, and I stand by it. I notice that David Penberthy, the News Limited reporter, came out with a column after this controversy and said, 'Michael Atkinson is right about that,' because the online blogs have become just that: a sewer of criminal defamation, identity theft and fraud. I could give many examples in this house today that—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Sorry, I do not have an hour to speak like the member for Bragg; I have only 20 minutes. I could give many examples but I will give just one. Obviously, Paul Starick, Michael Owen-Brown and Colin James, who run the Adelaidenow website, thought it was appropriate that a blog should be published saying that the Premier is a friend and protector of kiddie fiddlers. That will give you the tone of the Adelaidenow blog site. It is not just Labor that suffers; it is also MPs from other parties and Independents. Who takes responsibility for that? Well, certainly not the author because it was published under a nom de plume or a false name.

When I talk about identity theft and fraud, even in the aftermath of this controversy when you would have thought Adelaidenow would be on its best behaviour, there were something like, it appeared, six different people using my name and my address to blog on the Adelaidenow website. I ask members opposite to think: is that a good thing; should that be allowed? Well, I don't think so.

I stand by the original intention which was to say that material issued in an online journal like Adelaidenow in the election period, and only in the election period, should carry a real name, checked by the publication, and a postcode. Of course, the requirement for printed material is greater than that: it has to be a real name and a home address. I think that is a good requirement for civilising political discourse. Someone has to take responsibility in the election period—and it is only in the election period. In the other four years, the law lets it rip. In the other four years, people can continue to criminally defame people online under false names or noms de plume.

So, it affects only the four weeks every four years during an election period. Nevertheless, because News Limited has a commercial interest, ultimately, in sexing up its online content and ultimately charging for it (making you pay for it), News Limited had a commercial interest in stopping this law, and News Limited came out and said, 'You will stop this law.' And even though all 69 MPs in this parliament agreed to this law, they ran like rabbits the minute News Limited came out and said, 'We want this law repealed.'

I found myself out there supporting this law and, really, no-one else backing me, least of all the member for Bragg who invented some story about not understanding it and blamed those splendid people from the policy and legislation section of the Attorney-General's Department for misleading her. I don't think so! We had the claim from Hendrick Gout of *The Independent Weekly* that, in saying that we would repeal this law after the election, we were somehow forcing him to break the law—no such thing.

What we did do, though, is pass a regulation which clarified the scope of the parent statute so that hardly anyone would be caught by this provision during the election period. The original contribution of the member for Bragg to this debate was to reverse her position, to fall into line with her News Limited masters and say that she was now against this law and that you should be allowed to defame people anonymously or under a false name during the election period in a way calculated to affect the result of the election.

The member for Bragg said that the then attorney-general (namely me) should suspend the operation of the law. Well, early that morning, I told ABC radio that I could not suspend the operation of the law because that was unconstitutional; and, indeed, the Glorious Revolution of 1688 had occurred so that the executive could not suspend the operation of laws passed by parliament.

Ms Chapman: The guillotine.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: No, they did not use the guillotine at that time; that was a century later, in a different country, for the benefit of the member for Bragg. But when the member for Bragg said that we could pass a regulation to limit the scope of the law and to clarify it, I said within hours that that was a good idea and I accepted it, and I did it in a display of holy bipartisanship, entirely matching my vulnerable political position.

We did pass that regulation, so neither Hendrick Gout nor any other publisher was at any risk of being prosecuted during the election period. The government was not encouraging anyone to break the law, nor did my public servants ever mislead the member for Bragg or anyone about the scope of the effect of this law. Indeed, minister Holloway quite correctly stated the scope of the law; and, indeed, for the member for Bragg to say that I ever issued an edict saying anything different is straightforward verballing, and the member for Bragg will be unable to find such an edict or introduce it to the house.

I notice that, in the aftermath of the murder of Carly Ryan, there is some concern about people such as her murderer misrepresenting themselves online, and the harm and the damage that can be done in our society by people using blogging, the internet and social networking sites to deceive and mislead people, in this case, leading to the death of Carly Ryan. I think Nick Xenophon has had some good things to say about how we should regulate this, yet we see here—admittedly on a much smaller scale—the same problem, that is, blogging sites being used to mislead readers. Things are being added to blog sites, calculated to affect the result of the election, that are blatantly untrue. The member for Bragg, and all those who live in servitude to News Limited, come into this house and change the law—quite a sensible law—just to pander to the commercial interests of News Limited.

I am not even exempting myself from this, because I am as guilty as the rest of you because I announced the change of policy on the eve of the election campaign. However, eventually, there is going to be a federal or state election, the outcome of which is corrupted or perverted by someone going online and making criminally defamatory allegations, that is, allegations knowing them to be untrue or recklessly indifferent to whether they are true, and doing so under a false name or a nom de plume. In my view, we are all going to squeal when it happens but, here we are, making it possible.

There is a man in our society who is something of an expert on information technology and he took me aside after all this happened and said, 'Mick, I agree with you. People who publish things online in the course of an election campaign ought to put their real name to it. However, mate, you have to realise this: you are about 50 and I am about 50, and we all think that because we have grown up with it.' But there is another generation coming along, my son's generation, who regard it as their right to be able to publish false and misleading material online under a false name, because that is what they do. They get a kick out of it. It is the nature of blogging. This man said to me, 'Mick, don't worry about it, no-one takes it seriously. They only read their own blog. They don't bother to read anyone else's. They only go online to see what they contributed, and no-one believes it. It's junk.' I think that man is giving me good advice. I think he is correct.

But the problem we have is that people such as Paul Starick, the editor of the Adelaidenow website and the blog site, pulls material off his electronic site and then tries to treat it as representative of public opinion. So, he will publish a story on Adelaidenow saying X number of people or this percentage of bloggers think this and the government should respond to it. We had the extraordinary poll that he commissioned on Adelaidenow asking people, 'Who is going to win the state election?' Most of them said the Liberal Party. The second largest group said Gamers4Croydon were going to win the general election, even though they did not have enough candidates to form a majority in the House of Assembly. Apparently, the second-largest number of Adelaidenow readers and bloggers thought that Gamers4Croydon were going to win the general election. Of course, the third-largest number thought the Australian Labor Party was going to win.

We also had the Adelaidenow online poll after the now deputy leader (then the member for MacKillop) came out and told the truth about the Liberal Party and the city stadium, and he said the Liberal Party has not promised that taxpayers' money is going to go into a city stadium. That was true but, because it was contrary to News Limited policy, the editor of Adelaidenow put up a poll saying—and I cannot remember the exact terms—'Mitch Williams is a wally, Mitch Williams is a git, Mitch Williams is a fool, Mitch Williams is a moron' and, if you agreed with Mitch Williams and thought he was a good bloke and wanted to vote for him, you did not have a button that you could press. That was not a choice available to you.

So, this is the quality of the publications that will cover civic life in South Australia from now on. Make no mistake: *The Advertiser* is the past, *Adelaidenow* is the future. We are now voting to give them a licence in the election period to publish deliberately false and misleading material under false names or under a nom de plume.

Turning to the second element of the bill, the so-called dodgy how-to-vote cards, I notice that the member for Bragg made no analysis of the figures in Mawson, Morialta, Light or Hartley purporting to show that they affected the outcome of the election. Nevertheless, I agree with this provision because it was me who put it up in the electoral bill before the election. If the Liberal Party and Family First had agreed to pass my electoral bill in its original form, what happened with the dodgy how-to-vote cards in Morialta, Mawson Light and Hartley could not have happened because it would have been against the law.

Why did I introduce this provision? Well, because the Liberal Party did the same in the state district of Mawson in 2006. Of course, that is why the Hon. Robert Brokenshire did not want this provision to go through—because it would have prohibited what he himself did as the Liberal member for Mawson in the 2006 general election. It is a good provision, and I hope it passes both houses of parliament swiftly.

One final comment about the dodgy how-to-vote cards: it is my experience that about two-thirds of Family First preferences normally go to the Liberal Party and about one-third go to the Labor Party, if one calculates it purely in two-party preferred terms. If Family First directs its preferences to the Labor candidate (as I am pleased to say it did in the state district of Croydon), then Labor can get a bit more than 33 per cent of Family First preferences. We might get 50 or 60 per cent, but we certainly do not get more than that.

Family First is a minor party and generally gets a pretty small proportion of the vote, and two-thirds of the preferences are predetermined, so we are only talking about the one-third of Family First second preferences in the middle of that admittedly small vote. We are talking about very small beer, and really I do not understand why it was done by the Liberals in 2006, and I do not understand why it was done by some of our candidates in 2010.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:23): I have greatly enjoyed sitting here this morning listening to the contributions of the members for Bragg and Croydon, the defunct former attorney-general. However, I do not know whether legislation will ever be able to outmanoeuvre those who seek to beat the system. I was greatly interested in what the member for Croydon had to say, particularly about blogs, websites and God knows what else, because I actually agree with him. I think the whole thing is totally out of control. Anybody can say anything and not be responsible or accountable; this is the problem. I have no argument with that whatsoever. It concerns me how on earth we will elect people to this place from any party in the future with this sort of thing going on. That is the worry of it.

I come from a very conservative country electorate, and the vast majority of people in that electorate, whether they be 18 or 88 years old, could not have been bothered with that sort of nonsense, they really could not have been. It is interesting that, even in 2006, when I was first elected to this place, *The Times* newspaper in Victor Harbor ran a blog poll. From memory, I think it showed that the Labor Party candidate would get about 90 per cent of the vote and I was doomed. Well—and this is how stupid it is—our people got on there and levelled things up a bit. As it turned out, the Labor Party candidate in that election got beaten—and got beaten by an even larger amount in the election of 20 March; so I am quite happy about that.

It is an issue and, as technology and our means of communication change over the next five, 10, 20 or 30 years—and it is questionable whether they will improve, I might add—I seriously wonder whether people who stand for election in this place—if the federal parliament has not tried to get rid of us—will get a fair go and who will be elected to this place with all the stuff that is perpetrated online these days.

I find it extremely devious, and I was quite appalled at what was perpetrated through the last election in those seats where the artificial Family First T-shirt campaign and posters were put in place. I believe in a fair go. I come from a long line of Australians who believe in a fair go, and I suspect people in this place believe in a fair go. However, some of our political apparatchik do not believe in a fair go. They believe in 'win at all costs'. That's wonderful but let me tell you, Madam Deputy Speaker, that I would prefer to be on that side of the house than this side of the house, so things may change.

Quite clearly, this legislation has created a substantial amount of debate in the Liberal Party, as it rightly should. There are those from either side who watched with alarm the outcome of the election in some seats as a result of dubious practices by the Australian Labor Party, in particular, in an attempt to shore up its candidates in a couple of seats.

I will watch and listen with interest to further debate in this place. I am not sure whether we will get much more debate in this house, but I am sure that in the upper house, with the wealth of knowledge and the different members from different parties and the Independents in that place, it will be debated long into the night when it finally gets there; and I suspect that, if it is considered in a committee, it will come back in a different form from what it is in this place. It will not go away in a hurry. We need to try to get it as right as possible. I know that we will not always be in agreement on it, but I watch with interest the passage of the bill and how it eventually ends up.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:28): I will contribute briefly to this debate. This is an important issue, and I am pleased to say it was not an issue that played out directly in the electorate of Stuart. I was fortunate enough to be running against quite a decent chap from the Labor Party. We spoke early on—well in advance of a year of the election—and agreed that neither of us wanted to be part of anything dodgy, underhanded or personally malicious. I credit him with not having participated in anything like that (to the best of my knowledge) and if he did, it did not work.

This issue is more broad than just the electorate of Stuart and, clearly, the electorates of Morialta, Mawson, Light and Hartley were directly affected by it. I think the bottom line is that the Labor Party participated where it thought it might make a difference; with very few exceptions—which, I understand, includes the member for Bright, and I congratulate her on that—the Labor Party did it where it thought it would make a big difference. That is sneaky, deceptive and very disappointing.

It does give me the opportunity to show the leadership of our two parties in great contrast, because there is no way that this sort of thing would have gone on without the leaders of the parties, the then and current Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, having the opportunity to weigh into this and very actively take part in discussion about whether their parties would participate. It clearly shows a very contrasting style of leadership and a very contrasting style of electioneering, both before and after the election.

In the last election our leader did absolutely nothing along these lines, and I think that is tremendous. I think from the top down, all the way from the current Premier through to candidates at the last election, this was clearly a plan of the Labor Party. It might be possible that some of the candidates whose electorates would not be affected by this were unaware of it, but from the top down the Labor Party would have known exactly what was going on. I repeat: I am sure that—with very few exceptions, including the member for Bright's electorate—the party did it where it thought it would work. To try to stay on any high moral ground any more than that does not count.

The other thing I would like to say is that I was not aware of this; I was not aware of this at all until immediately after the election—that is okay; Stuart is a long way from where all this happened—but guess what? Neither was the public. The public was not aware of this either until after it was too late. It was clearly designed to be a sneak attack at the last minute to deceive everyone involved. Then, when the public outrage became so clear and when everyone was so angry and upset—and we all know that at the time the public view of the Labor Party and the government was very dim with regard to this particular issue—the government decided it was important to bring forward this bill.

Of course the opposition supports this bill in this house. Our position is that we also want to refer it to the newly established select committee in the other place, but of course we support opposition to anything to do with fraud and deception at any time, and particularly when it comes to the public leading up to an election. Another thing that I believe it is very important to say—if you will allow me to move a little off the strict topic here, Madam Deputy Speaker—is that the select committee will look into a slightly broader range of issues than this bill puts forward and, on behalf of the people of Stuart, I would like to say a few words about postal votes, which are related to this topic.

We had a great deal of concern about postal votes in Stuart. Because of the timing of the issuing of the writ it was actually impossible for the Electoral Commission to get all the work done that needed to be done between the issuing of the writ and the election date. What happened was that a lot of people in Stuart—and I am sure in a lot of other electorates, particularly the further

flung ones more distant from Adelaide—applied for postal votes on time, did everything expected of them according to the schedule asked but did not get their postal votes back in time to vote. So it was physically impossible for them to vote.

That caused a great deal of difficulty for a lot of people, and a lot of people contacted Graham Gunn's office before the election to talk about this issue specifically. This is a structural problem that needs to be addressed. I understand that the Labor Party would have looked to issue the writs as late as possible, quite likely with regard to causing this problem, but there were lots of people who did not receive their postal votes until during the week before the election—so, less than one week before the election. Now, you may have applied for a postal vote because you would be away on holidays or because you would be away working and would not be home to get it and, in a remote place in my electorate, you could not go to an alternative polling booth or a post office or something like that.

If you are in a remote place and you have applied for a postal vote and you get mail once a week, which happens in an enormous part of outback South Australia, you might get your postal vote back during the week before the election, and it is impossible, even if you have not gone away, to return your postal vote. So, that is a big issue, and I appreciate, Madam Deputy Speaker, your allowing me to talk about that for a minute. Going back to the core issue, I say that no-one can deny that the Labor Party pursued this strategy in the lead-up to the election because it thought it would work, not because they were manipulated or because any candidate in any particular electorate was allowed to twist someone's arm. It was a Labor Party policy. It was disgraceful and something I would like to think we will never enter into in the future.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:36): I rise to speak on the Electoral (Publication of Electoral Material) Amendment Bill. It is with great concern that I speak on this bill, because I think it is inadequate in relation to correcting the problem it sets out to fix. I think it is appropriate that we signal that this should be considered by the Legislative Council select committee, as the opposition has done. Having said that, I want to briefly touch on what that select committee will be investigating.

The select committee was brought about by a motion in the Legislative Council that predated the introduction of this bill, so I am very interested in what that select committee comes up with. The select committee's terms of reference are as follows:

- (a) the use of bogus how-to-vote cards and other election day material to mislead voters and measures that may be necessary to ensure that electors are not misled;
- (b) provision of voting services, including voting by post, services to people with disabilities and residents of declared institutions;
- (c) the integrity of the roll, including the identification of voters presenting and measures for subsequent verification; and
- (d) management of the election by the Electoral Commission, including the powers and resources available to the commission.

Clearly, as other speakers have noted, this bill deals with two specific issues, that is, the bogus how-to-vote cards and the publication of people's names when they place content on internet sites.

I do not have any particular comment to make in relation to the second point. However, in relation to the bogus how-to-vote cards, I stand here as one of the four members who represent electorates in which these bogus how-to-vote cards were used. I proudly stand here as the only one of those members who was not responsible for using those bogus how-to-vote cards.

As others have done, I congratulate the member for Bright on her integrity in refusing to allow her moral standing to be compromised, and I think she did a very good job for her electors in maintaining their faith. However, the point is that the electors went to the polling booth and were confronted by people who were presenting as Family First volunteers. In many cases, those electors who sought out the Family First how-to-vote cards were not provided with that how-to-vote card—those people who wanted to support that party were given a misleading and deceptive how-to-vote card by the Australian Labor Party.

Obviously, as a candidate at the election, I was not able to hand out how-to-vote cards on election day, because for a candidate to hand out how-to-vote cards election day is obviously against the law. However, I was keeping in close touch with many of the volunteers in the Morialta electorate who were handing out how-to-vote-cards for me. I think it is worth placing on the record the chain of events as they happened. Of course, in the morning, all of the volunteers from both

sides (that is, the Labor Party and the Liberal Party) arrived, often quite early in the morning and in most booths in Morialta the night before and they looked after the booths through the night.

At 7 o'clock the Family First people arrived and put up their posters as well, and they started handing out how-to-vote cards. At 8 o'clock, a separate group of supposedly Family First volunteers arrived wearing slightly different coloured T-shirts. They had the words 'Put your Family First' on their T-shirt, with the words 'Family First' in extremely large font to the point where they were clearly presenting as apparent Family First volunteers. Initially, we were wondering what was going on. We thought that maybe Family First had an idea that they would have some blue people and some red people.

About half an hour later, when people started coming back with questions, it became apparent that these were, in fact, bogus how-to-vote cards, they were preferencing Labor. Also of note is that they were presenting as Family First volunteers. I am looking at the Family First Hartley ticket here, which is along the same lines as the one that was in Morialta, but it does not even mention the Family First lead candidate in the Legislative Council. So, people were accepting this Family First how-to-vote card and they were not even being advised to vote for Family First in the Legislative Council. It could not be more deceptive.

At about 9 o'clock the Family First candidate in Morialta, who is a very fine woman and who I was in contact with (through my campaign team) regularly throughout the morning, was visiting polling booths to see what was going on. She was distraught at the fact that she had given up her time and made the effort to put herself on the line to offer herself for election, I think, it is fair to say, primarily in order to support the Hon. Robert Brokenshire as the lead Family First candidate in the Legislative Council. That the Labor Party volunteers would seek to completely devalue that effort was distressing to her, and she was distressed that in many booths the Labor Party's volunteers—and I use that term advisedly, which I will come to—were outnumbering the Family First how-to-vote card people, so as to suggest that maybe they were the legitimate ones.

We know from the public record that has been admitted in the media by a number of people involved, that we are talking about staffers for Labor ministers interstate, members of the Labor Party and close personal associates of people in the Labor Party presenting as Family First volunteers. I think the Family First Party is absolutely justified and it is totally understandable why they would be so upset. I note that the leader of the Family First Party, the Hon. Dennis Hood, described it as 'deceptive, misleading, and plainly shows nothing but contempt for the political process.'

In his comments earlier, the member for Croydon, I noted, was talking a little bit about analysis of the election, so I thought it would be appropriate to consider some of the analysis that was given to the election. The member for Croydon, in his speech, spent most of the time actively disapproving of the Adelaidenow website and News Limited and also had a go at Hendrik Gout, but I will leave that until later. I will start with somebody who is generally respected across the board as an astute political analyst, Flinders University political scientist Dean Jaensch, who said it is 'the worst example of its kind I've seen in a 40-year career' and 'it is deceitful, deliberately designed to mislead voters. No doubt at all.'

The Independent Weekly, when it was dealing with this, helpfully, on the front page of the paper, provided a definition of the word 'fraud' as 'noun: trickery, sharp practice, any deception, artifice or trick,' and it is difficult to consider this matter without actually bearing that word in mind, and many have not. Hendrik Gout, in his article, said:

South Australian voters have been deceived in an election that was largely about trust, by a political party that apparently has no moral qualms about duping its way into government.

How apt. The *Sunday Mail* took a similar line, explaining:

Labor candidates who participated in this naked grab for power by allowing voters to be deliberately tricked should consider their victories forever tarnished, if not illegitimate. While they enjoy the fruits of office, the damage that has been wrought on our political system is horrendous. The public's faith in those who seek office has been enormously eroded, and the price on that trust is beyond measure.

I take very seriously the standards to which our communities expect us to behave in this place. I think that it is a great shame that the Labor government, through its candidates and its party's head office, has chosen to act in this way and to disregard those principles and standards to which we should all hold ourselves. The *Sunday Mail* also pointed towards William Glasser's choice theory by pointing out that 'people are responsible for their own behaviour, including where they set their ethical bar'. Again, I congratulate the member for Bright in setting her ethical bar higher than the

Labor Party administration and those who have sought to retain power at any price; as Graham Richardson used to say, 'Whatever it takes.'

The member for Croydon, in his earlier contribution, said that the Liberal Party is being disingenuous by providing no analysis of the figures. I think he was trying to make the point that perhaps this poor behaviour by his side of politics did not change the results in any seats. Some people have described this to me as the attempted murder defence: I never actually killed him, so therefore what is the harm, what is the foul? The fact is, when people make a decision to behave in an immoral and irresponsible fashion, completely discarding the principles which we should hold dear as we pursue a liberal democracy, they are stepping over that line. They are responsible for their own behaviour, including where they set their ethical bar. They have been found to be unworthy.

I think that this warrants sincere consideration by more than a two paragraph press release from the Attorney-General, by more than a three-page piece of legislation that is introduced without any serious consideration of what the best way to go is; therefore, I support this being dealt with by a select committee. I hope that, over the next few days as the time draws near for the submissions to go to that select committee on 2 July, many people who feel as I do, that this behaviour is not good enough, will continue to do so. I hope that the government will reflect on its behaviour. It should not be the case that this sort of behaviour needs to be illegal in order that it not be pursued by a government that claims to want to represent the people of South Australia; they should know better than that.

Mr BROCK (Frome) (12:47): I, along with other members in this house, would like the opportunity to speak on the Electoral (Publication of Electoral Material) Amendment Bill. First up, I will make it quite clear that I believe in honesty, being upfront and giving all my opponents a fair go. I believe that everybody who puts their name up for an election, whether it is in state, federal or local government, should be honest and everything should be equal. They put themselves up to serve their electorate in whatever form, and the people of their communities will make their decision based on the information that is given to the media of that particular region and also based on what is in the state media. I have some grave concerns—and it did not happen in my electorate of Frome—and I was very surprised and disappointed when I saw some of the misleading information in other electorates of the state leading up to the previous state election.

As do other members here—and I will mention the member for Stuart in particular—I believe in allowing certain things, for example, what happens with the corflutes. Whilst time allowed us to put up those corflutes, I was on the road with three other groups, and we split my electorate into different regions. Basically, we were allowed to go in straight after midnight, but we got on the road at 7am. We went to some of my small communities in the electorate of Frome. In terms of my staff and volunteers, I am very appreciative of the 125 people who gave me a hand on the day.

We had to place my corflutes basically on every pole that I could grab in the small communities leading into that region. I do not think that is the best way to do it. If you have five candidates for an election, each one is entitled (if they are legally entitled) to put up that promotional material, ensuring that we all share the small amount of space and that we do not pollute the small communities. In the electorate of Frome everybody wore T-shirts, but the message on them was very clear. They very clearly showed the candidate's name and whether they were Independent, Country, Labor, Family First, or whatever they were; they were very clear messages.

So, when people come to the polling booth on the day, it is very confronting because, if five candidates are standing, and five people are trying to get there first to give out the how-to-vote cards, it is terrifying for some people, and some are so concerned or disappointed that they really fear going to a polling booth for fear of being intimidated. I honestly have to say that I pay tribute to every candidate in my electorate, because it was very fair. It was very clean and clear, with no misinterpretation to the electors. The only thing I would say is that, if you are handing out how-to-vote cards, the card should state the name of the candidate whose No. 1 vote is being asked for.

We had a how-to-vote card for the leader of one of the major parties, and I believe that is very misleading, as small communities are going to vote for the person who they think should represent them for the next four years. We do not personally pick the Premier of the state or the Prime Minister of our country. The parties pick those, and that is the democratic system. Similarly, the how-to-vote cards should be for the candidate themselves, not for the leader of the political party. This was very confusing and daunting to some of the older people, and to some of the younger people, who really do not understand the system.

I will now touch on the postal voting cards that went out. Both major parties send these out to as many as they can in their electorates, and it is very confusing for the voters out there. People came to me saying, 'Why haven't I got one of your postal vote cards?' I explained that I did not believe in doing that and that, if they wanted an application for a postal vote, they should apply to the Electoral Commissioner. However, it is very confusing because people see that card and ask why they need to send that application (they presume it is an actual voting card) back to the candidate of that electorate. Going forward, this is something that I believe we really should be putting a stop to, and I would love the committee to be able to look at that as one of those items.

On the occasion of the last election, one of the major parties (I am not going to name the party as they know who they are) sent how-to-vote applications to aged-care facilities in the electorate. I am a novice at this, as I have only been here for 14 to 16 months, but even I know that the Electoral Commissioner has people who go to hospitals and aged-care facilities. The major parties should not send application cards or applications for postal votes to aged-care facilities.

It becomes very confusing because what happens is, as you are probably aware, Madam Deputy Speaker, they get these cards, they think it is the only card they have to fill out and they send it back. When the Electoral Commissioner comes around on polling day with their staff, the professionals from the Electoral Commission, they are very confused because they then vote again, which puts more pressure on the Electoral Commissioner. If the polling in that particular electorate is very close, it can put the result in doubt or make it a long time before a decision is made. That is something that we really need to do going forward, and I hope that this committee will look at that.

The member for Stuart paid tribute to his opponents. I will do that with mine. I will compare this general election with the by-election. In February last year, the by-election was entirely different. It was very clear, very fair and we all got on very well. We all knew that we would put our hands up and the people would make the choice. I am grateful that the people of Frome gave me the opportunity to represent them for the next four years and I will be working with all the parties here to ensure that we go forward.

We have a couple of minutes remaining. One of the things is that, in the community, there is a fair bit of cynicism towards major parties and politics. I think we need to be very clear and upfront, because leading up to an election we all get bombarded with promises and lots of statements and commitments, and it is very confusing. If we had to pay for all the commitments made during the election campaign, I think we would be up to about \$1.5 billion, which is not going to help the budget going forward.

The last thing we should do is create more confusion for the electors on polling day. Electors should be able to come to a polling booth and, when they are approached, it should be in a friendly manner. There should be very clear—not misleading—information on people's T-shirts and/or the how-to-vote cards. The member for Stuart has just handed me a note; I agree with the member for Stuart. We get on very well, we have adjoining electorates and we will be working very closely together on various issues, as I will be with the member for Schubert and the member for Goyder, among others. I will finish by referring to the member for Stuart's note: 'The way you campaign indicates the way you will operate as a member if you are successful.' I thank the member for Stuart for that: it is a very good saying and I certainly endorse it. I rest my case.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:58): Thank you to the member for Frome for attempting to drag his contribution out to one o'clock. I, too, would like to echo the sentiments of the member for Frome and also the member for Stuart and say that, in the seat of Flinders, the election was fought as a very clean fight. In fact, all my opponents fought the clean fight. We saw a lot of each other during the election. In a country community, we were often all at the same event at the same time.

In many ways, we in Flinders were untouched by the election trickery that occurred on 20 March this year. I note that there were no dodgy how-to-vote cards in my electorate. There were no dodgy T-shirts used in my electorate. However, I would like to put on the record my absolute disdain for the deceitful conduct of the Australian Labor Party in those marginal metropolitan seats where bogus how-to-vote cards were used. In fact, I think it goes to the very heart of our parliamentary democracy, and I think South Australians were rightly outraged by what occurred at that state election. I believe that this bill seeks to ensure that such a deceptive practice never occurs again at any future election. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CREDIT (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CREDIT (TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

MEMBER FOR TORRENS

The SPEAKER (14:03): On behalf of the member for Torrens, I would like to thank you all for your kind wishes, thoughts, prayers, flowers and messages, etc., during her recent bereavement. She and her family very much appreciate all those messages and support that she received from this house. Thank you very much.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

BLACK HILL PONY CLUB

Mr GARDNER (Morialta): Presented a petition signed by 3,193 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to work with the Black Hill Pony Club in retaining land at Woodforde and to enable the continued operation of the Club.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I advise members of the presence in the gallery today of year 12 students from Woodcroft College Inc., who are guests of the member for Mawson. Welcome, and we hope you enjoy your time here.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Transport (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Motor Vehicles—High Powered Vehicle

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Public and Environment Health, State of—Annual Report 2008-09

By the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Mental Health—General

By the Minister for Education (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Education and Children's Services, Department of—Annual Report 2009
SACE Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2009

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Outback Areas Community Development Trust—Administration and Management

By the Minister for Environment and Conservation (Hon. P. Caica)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Natural Resources Management—Financial Provisions—2009-10 Levy Exemption
Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management—Designated Bank
Rate
Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation—General—Revocation of Regulations

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. M.F. O'Brien)—

Response to Economic and Finance Committee's Report entitled Consumer Protection for Farmers: Reaping a Fair Harvest
 Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Fisheries Management—Licence Fees
 Primary Industry Funding Schemes—Cattle Industry Fund
 Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes)—Food Safety Schemes—Seafood—Fees

By the Minister for Employment, Training and Further Education (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Flinders University—Annual Report 2009
 University of South Australia—Annual Report 2009

EDUCATION DISPUTE

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Minister for Education, Minister for Early Childhood Development) (14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: On Friday 25 June 2010—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Can we hear the minister in quiet, please.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: On Friday 25 June 2010, the Industrial Relations Commission delivered its stage 2 decision in the long-running dispute between the government and the Australian Education Union. The decision leaves a little work for the parties to do over the next few months but, essentially, brings the dispute to an end and so is welcome. The outcome is a good outcome for schools, our students and our teachers.

Madam Speaker, you will recall that, at the heart of this dispute, was the government's desire to move away from the existing rigid schools funding formula. This formula dictates how funding provided for staffing to schools is to be used and so works as a straitjacket on principals' capacity to tailor funding to their circumstances. It is not a formula which works in the best interests of students. We sought to replace this rigid formula with what we called the student centred funding model. Under this model, we will fund schools a particular amount per student and give schools the discretion about precisely how that funding will be allocated to meet school needs and priorities.

It is a significant part of this government's move to devolve greater decision-making powers to schools because, if we are to seek greater accountability from schools and principals for results, we need to give them the tools to enable them to get the best results. Obviously, the old rigid formula had protections for staff numbers and workloads built into it and, therefore, necessarily, as we sought to move to a new system which does not have those inbuilt protections, there needed to be different protections for individual staff members around workload.

Our great concern in the dispute with the AEU and in the arbitration was that these protections not be so prescriptive as to unduly fetter principals' flexibility and to impose a massive burden on taxpayers. So, we are pleased that the decision does not go down that path. It appears to provide a good balance between the flexibility that schools and their students really need and protection for teachers and school staff.

There are a number of aspects of the decision to which I should refer. Perhaps in recognition of the good work the government has done in this area over recent years, the Industrial Relations Commission adopts essentially the status quo in relation to class sizes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Perhaps the opposition did not hear that, Madam Speaker. Perhaps in recognition of the good work the government has done in this area in recent years, the Industrial Relations Commission adopts essentially the status quo in relation to class sizes. The Industrial Relations Commission also, for the first time, formally recognised that teachers' work includes not just class time and preparation for class time but a range of other duties. This removes any doubt that teachers' roles in schools are legitimately broader than classroom roles.

The IRC has ensured that teachers have sufficient preparation time which, in this time of increasing attention to teacher quality, will be good for the quality of education for our children. The Industrial Relations Commission has also made provision for increasing conversion of temporary staff to permanent employment. The government agrees that this is an important matter to address. Last year it made more than 400 school service staff permanent.

Madam Speaker, you may recall that only a few weeks ago I announced that the government was already reviewing selection and recruitment processes with a view to making more of our temporary teachers permanent. So, we welcome the recommendation that a working group be set up to look at these issues. Overall, the decision opens up the real possibility of further reform of the way in which our schools and staffing arrangements are configured so that we can provide a better education and school experience for our students, as well as a better experience for our teachers.

NGARRINDJERI PEOPLE

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (14:11): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I rise to make this ministerial statement concerning an important matter for the people of South Australia. On Friday 18 June 2010 the Premier, the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation and I met with a delegation of Ngarrindjeri people and their legal representative, Mr Shaun Berg, in the Premier's office. At that meeting, representatives of the Ngarrindjeri people indicated a wish to have a further conversation with the South Australian government about matters relating to the Letters Patent of 1836.

As a sign of their goodwill, they presented the Premier with symbolic cultural objects to be held by him for the duration of the discussions. The Premier indicated that he wished to accord due respect to the delegation and to seek advice from the Solicitor-General in relation to the general topic raised. The parties left one another on the understanding that within a fortnight the government would advise the Ngarrindjeri people of how the matter was proceeding.

Immediately following that meeting I met with the Solicitor-General in my capacity as Attorney-General and requested he commence a consideration of all issues relating to the Letters Patent and, in particular, any matters raised in the published book by their legal representative, Mr Shaun Berg, called *Coming to terms*. The Solicitor-General indicated to me that, within the priorities of matters he is presently working upon, it would take some time to determine a response to such a large and undefined topic as the Letters Patent generally.

Therefore, it is necessary to seek further information about the precise legal nature of the matters raised by the Ngarrindjeri people, including any particulars as to the consequence or consequences which they believe may flow from whatever legal view they have taken of the Letters Patent. Therefore, I have further consulted with the Premier and the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and recommended to them that we therefore seek a written formulation from the Ngarrindjeri people providing particulars of the following:

1. The precise legal nature of their assertions regarding the Letters Patent 1836; and
2. Particulars of any or all consequences which they believe may flow therefrom.

I am hopeful that, upon receipt of such a formulation, the government will be able to more quickly, fairly and accurately respond to the questions raised. At the present time, for the reasons that I have just set out, these questions remain unclear; however, the government will be able to consider what response may be appropriate upon receipt of this clarifying information. I have written today to Mr Berg on behalf of the government to outline these matters and to invite him, on behalf of his clients, to assist the government in this process by providing these particulars in writing. I look forward to receiving and considering his reply.

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:15): I bring up the 31st report of the committee, entitled 'Inquiry into Dental Services for Older Australians'.

Report received.

QUESTION TIME**ADELAIDE OVAL**

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer now concede that the Adelaide Oval upgrade, which includes a FIFA compliant stadium, footbridge and car parking as promised on 2 December 2009, cannot be built for \$535 million, with the cost now exceeding \$700 million?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:16): That is simply not correct, and the leader knows it not to be correct. The government has already said that the footbridge will be part of the overall Torrens precinct. The figure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —mentioned in the paper today—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —is an extremely large figure for what is a very large structure, and I am sure that by the time my good friend and colleague the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, who will be responsible for delivering the project—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I will be sad. It will be a sad moment for me to hand over my baby, the Adelaide Oval redevelopment, to the Minister for Infrastructure, but I know that it will be in good hands. The minister has already indicated to me that he thinks that the footbridge is both too large and too expensive. With respect to the issue of the tennis centre, as I think Mr Demetriou and others and I think I have said from time to time, the architects can plan and design all they like, and it is a very exciting plan if one wanted to fund it, but we don't, and we won't. It is not central or critical to the upgrade of the oval, because the Adelaide Oval—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Crows? I will wait until I see the final designs, but the final designs, I am sure, will show a more than stunning facility for Crows supporters after the game—and Port Power fans. When we have a derby, I think we will get both lots in there. I wonder whether it will be big enough to have both Power and the Crows in the shed after the game.

Mr Bignell interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Ramsgate Hotel, as the member for Mawson says. Perhaps not. Those elements are not part of the redevelopment as it stands. On the issue of the car park, we have said many, many times that we are not funding an underground car park. If they wish to have an underground car park, they can either do it themselves, bring in a private sector partner or have a JV with the Adelaide City Council for a park-and-ride, but it will not be funded by the government.

We have said '\$535 million', and I am very confident that we will see an outstanding design which will give Adelaide a stadium of such quality. However, I will say that we are very close to the crunch point where the Liberal Party will have to decide: does it stand in the way of bringing AFL football back to the city? Ultimately, you will stand in the way of bringing football back into the centre of this city. This government is determined to deliver AFL football back into the city. It is what football wants and it is what the public wants. At some point, the Liberal Party will have to stop their nitpicking, knocking, criticising and obstructionist policies.

Madam Speaker, can I, with hushed tones, just say how serious this issue is becoming for football in this state and what serious damage is being done to the sport that so many South Australians love. This is what I am advised are the words spoken by Mr Leigh Whicker yesterday before the committee. He said:

I need to make a statement, Mr Chairman. The ongoing political debate has caused irreparable damage to AAMI Stadium brand, the confidence of its members and fans, and a great deal of anxiety amongst the Crows members.

Mr Whicker goes on to say:

In fact, the whole football community in South Australia is in a state of uncertainty and, from my point of view, this is unforgivable.

So, at the end of the day, the knockers in the Liberal Party, the destroyers in the Liberal Party, the members of the Liberal Party—because make no mistake—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Make no mistake. I know the Leader of the Opposition is not a fan of football and had not been to Football Park. Have you actually been to Football Park for a game, yet? Have you watched a game?

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: One game. There happen to be a lot of South Australians who love football and want it back in the city. Liberal Party, stand aside.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): I have a supplementary question, Madam Speaker. As the SANFL, the AFL and the SACA have indicated that they are not going to put any money into the project, does that mean it is dead in the water?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:21): Not only does the leader reiterate her absolute hatred for seeing football in this state improve, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —there are tens of thousands of South Australians from—

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

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. Member for MacKillop.

Mr WILLIAMS: Relevance. The Treasurer was simply asked: is the project dead in the water?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I don't believe it is, Madam Speaker, and I believe that the day of reckoning will come for the Liberal Party when we get a signature on the bottom line from the Crows, the Power, the SANFL and the SACA. What then will the Liberal Party do? What will you do? Madam Speaker, the leader speaks with a forked tongue.

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

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

Mr WILLIAMS: It is out of order to ask hypothetical questions and it is out of order for the minister to ask the opposition questions.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer. I do not uphold that point of order.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The Leader of the Opposition speaks with forked tongue—because, do you know what she told Andrew Demetriou—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No, let's hear this. I saw it reported. Do you know what she told Andrew Demetriou in a private briefing?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: This needs some silence, because it is an important point for members opposite to hear, because this is what your leader said to the head of the AFL. This is

what was reported on the television and in the media, that is, if football (Crows, Power) and SACA sign off, the Liberal Party will support the project. It will support the project. So, there we go. You will support the project.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You will support the project.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You will support the project.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The last question the leader asked as a supplementary. It was very close to a full question, I thought. However, I will give her the benefit of the doubt this time. The member for Ashford.

AUSTRALIAN WAR MEMORIAL EXHIBITION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:24): Will the Premier advise the house about the Australian War Memorial's touring exhibition entitled This Company of Brave Men: the Gallipoli VCs?

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) (14:24): On Friday night, 25 June, I was honoured to open the Australian War Memorial's special 95th Gallipoli Anniversary touring exhibition, This Company of Brave Men: the Gallipoli VCs, at the State Library of South Australia. The member for Morphett and other members of parliament from both houses and, indeed, the federal parliament took part in what I thought was a wonderful launch. It was great to see Keith Payne (one of the two surviving living VC recipients in Australia) attending, coming from Brisbane; and also the famous journalist Keith Dunstan, whose father was a VC recipient and was being honoured in the exhibition.

The Australian War Memorial describes the Victoria Cross as a rare award given when the nation is at war, facing peril or a great test of national commitment. It recognises individuals who by their extraordinary deeds of bravery and sometimes with the sacrifice of their own life provide leadership, courage and an example to all around them and beyond. The entire nation draws pride and inspiration from these brave diggers. Of course, there is no greater single honour, award or accolade. The Victoria Cross is not a gilded jewel or an ostentatious ornament. Rather than precious metals it is traditionally struck from brass recovered from historic old, captured cannons. Its inscription is limited to two words: 'For Valour'.

On 25 April 1915 Australians and New Zealanders (the Anzacs), together with Indian soldiers, landed on the Turkish Gallipoli Peninsula. In the hellish eight-month long Gallipoli campaign which followed nine Australians were awarded the Victoria Cross. Seven of these awards were made for actions performed during the Battle of Lone Pine. These nine Victoria Crosses displayed in this exhibition at the State Library and the lives they honour enlighten us as to the proper definition of heroism. The nine stories these citations recount are compelling tales of personal courage, of unflinching loyalty, of love of country.

Of course, many members would be familiar with the legend of Lance Corporal Albert Jacka, the first of the nine to be awarded the Victoria Cross. On 19 May 1915 Jacka single-handedly attacked enemy soldiers who had occupied his trench. He also performed brave deeds at Pozieres and Bullecourt and it is generally believed that he deserved two more VCs for these actions.

Less well known but equally remarkable are the feats of Second Lieutenant Hugo Throssell, who was educated at Prince Alfred College here in Adelaide, where he captained the football team and became a champion athlete and boxer. Throssell became involved in a fierce bomb fight at Hill 60. Despite terrible wounds he refused to leave his post for medical assistance and continued to fight seemingly oblivious to the bomb splinters embedded in his forehead and the fact that his arms were so badly wounded that he was unable to raise a cigarette to his lips when the fighting finally abated the next day. He was the only Australian Light Horseman ever to be awarded a Victoria Cross.

Captain Alfred Shout was awarded a Victoria Cross for his ferocious defence of captured positions. He was severely wounded when a bomb exploded in his hand. He was evacuated

immediately but died of his wounds on a hospital ship and was buried at sea. Two months later his Victoria Cross was gazetted.

On 9 August 1915 Private John Hamilton was aged just 19 when he lay on open ground between rival trenches for six hours with only a few sandbags for protection, telling those in the trenches where to fire as he fired on Turkish bomb throwers. Private Hamilton was the only one of his unit to be awarded the Victoria Cross during the entire war.

Lance Corporal Leonard Keysor was born in London and migrated from Canada to Sydney only a short time before the war broke out. For 50 hours in his trench during the Battle of Lone Pine, Keysor smothered or returned a hail of Turkish bombs, even catching some of them in flight and hurling them straight back.

On 9 August 1915 Lieutenant William Symons was ordered to retake Jacob's Trench at Lone Pine. Under continued attack from three sides he led a charge and retook the trench. Following one particular action during the fighting at Lone Pine three brave Australian soldiers were awarded the Victoria Cross. Corporal William Dunstan, Corporal Alexander Stewart Burton and Lieutenant Frederick Tubb fought relentlessly alongside each other to hold and rebuild a captured trench that was being repeatedly destroyed by deadly enemy bomb and gunfire attacks. Sadly, Corporal Burton was killed by one of several bombs which exploded, and his body was never recovered. He was posthumously awarded the Victoria Cross.

Last year I was honoured to meet Australia's newest recipient of the Victoria Cross, Trooper Mark Donaldson VC. Members will recall the courage and valour shown by Trooper Donaldson during Operation Slipper in Afghanistan in September 2008. Trooper Donaldson's combined Afghan, US and Australian vehicle convoy was ambushed by the enemy and the patrol suffered many casualties. Trooper Donaldson deliberately exposed himself to enemy fire in order to draw attention to himself so that wounded soldiers could be moved to safety. Realising that an Afghan interpreter had been wounded, he moved alone on foot across 80 metres of exposed ground to recover the interpreter and return him to the vehicles, where he administered first aid, while at the same time engaging the enemy.

The reality and brutality of war has been brought home to all of us in the starkest terms through the tragic events of recent weeks in Afghanistan, with five young Australian lives lost and an even greater number badly injured. There can be no greater act of citizenship than to put at risk your very existence for the benefit of others. Poignant and powerful, this outstanding exhibition helps all of us better understand and appreciate the sacrifice made by so many Australian service men and women. In fact, by honouring the VC winners from Gallipoli in this way it is very much a tribute, a silent handshake across the void between the living and the dead. The exhibition is open until 8 August. I urge all South Australians, and I hope all members will have a chance, to view this outstanding exhibition at the State Library, because theirs are the sacrifices upon which our nation has been built.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is again to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer now concede that the Adelaide Oval upgrade, which still does not meet all the conditions required by the SANFL and the two AFL clubs, as set out in the terms sheet, cannot be built for \$535 million?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:32): Madam Speaker, they ask the same question many times in many forms, but the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: They had Leigh Whicker before the upper house star chamber yesterday for two hours; I am sure these questions were subject—

An honourable member: We want your answer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: As I have said previously—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I am glad the Liberal Party will finally support this project, when we get sign off on it. That is a good move forward. Now, Madam Speaker—

Mr Williams: Answer the question!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: If you will stop interjecting I will; simple call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams: All you have to do is answer the question.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: If you stop interjecting, I will. Madam Speaker, what we have said repeatedly is that the Stadium Management Authority—and I am sure this was confirmed yesterday before the upper house committee—is still diligently working through final designs and final costings for the project. I think that was the evidence given yesterday; I was not there, but I assume that is what was said. So, the first point is that you do not know what the final cost is until you have the final cost. Secondly, this government has made it clear that its contribution is capped at \$535 million. If they—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Just listen; I am telling you. If they want to spend more money on the stadium they are entitled to do so through whatever other sources they can find.

SOCIAL HOUSING

Mr KENYON (Newland) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Housing. Can the minister advise the house of what the federal government's social housing economic stimulus package will mean for South Australians?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Families and Communities, Minister for Housing, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Disability) (14:34): I thank the member for his question, and am very pleased to inform the house of South Australia's progress towards its social housing commitments under the Nation Building-Economic Stimulus Plan. South Australia has been allocated \$352.4 million for the construction of 1,360 homes. The deadline stipulated under the Nation Building Program posed a real challenge. The federal government required 173 new homes completed in stage 1 by 30 June 2010, and in stage 2 a further 1,100 additional dwellings by the end of December this year, with more complex projects, such as the UNO apartment building I spoke about last week, requiring completion by 2012. In total, the building program will deliver 1,360 new homes.

It is with great pride that I advise the house that we have met our stage 1 target of 173 completed homes. Weather permitting, I am told we should have 200 houses fully completed and approved when the first deadline arrives tomorrow afternoon.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: We will talk about the Liberal Party's commitment to social housing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will listen to the minister in silence, please.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Bragg!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Not only have we exceeded our target, I am also advised that the building program is running under budget. This is a great achievement by all those involved and I would like to pay tribute to the Coordinator-General—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Waite!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —my staff in the Department for Families and Communities, Housing SA and the many builders and contractors who have cooperated to ensure that we successfully reached our target, providing better housing for those in greatest need. We know that the Nation Building Program was opposed by the federal Liberals, we know they opposed it, and we have faced opposition from members of this house to the new social housing in various parts of South Australia. On any given day, I receive letters from Liberal MPs (federal and state) seeking housing for constituents. Then, when we are undertaking the biggest build in 20 years, they scream—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —because they do not want them in their area, or they consider the area too good—

Mr WILLIAMS: I rise on a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for MacKillop on a point of order.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Croydon!

Mr WILLIAMS: The minister was asked a question about federal policy, but she is now debating the answer.

The SPEAKER: There is so much noise, I can hardly hear what she is saying. Minister.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am just making the point that on any given day I receive letters from members of parliament—on this side of the house, from that side of the house, from federal MPs—saying they want housing for their constituents, but when we are building these nation building homes in their areas they start screaming because they do not want them in their street.

Mr WILLIAMS: I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker: now that you have had the opportunity to hear the minister, I again make the point of order that she is debating the answer.

The SPEAKER: Minister, have you finished your answer? I refer you back to the question.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I wonder whether they tell the people they write to me about that they are happy to support them getting housing, as long as it is not in the so-called 'good' areas in their electorate, as long as they do not move into their—

Mr GARDNER: I rise on a point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr GARDNER: No. 127: the minister is clearly imputing motives on members on this side of the chamber.

The SPEAKER: I would ask the minister to return to the question.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: We have had submissions from councils wanting housing for workers. They want workers, they want housing for them, but for some: 'Not in our street, thank you.' The truth is that the Liberals are not supporters of public housing, or affordable housing, for that matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: Madam Speaker, the minister is again debating and there is no relevance in the answer to the question that she was asked: what would be the impact of the federal policy? Madam Speaker, every time that I make a point of order, the minister gets to her feet and rants on again, having a general slag at the opposition, before you have an opportunity to make a ruling.

The SPEAKER: I think the question is very open-ended—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Sit down, member for MacKillop. The question is very open-ended, but I would ask the minister to refer back to the question.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, Madam Speaker, but every time I get up to speak about housing I am bombarded—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —by interjections questioning this government's sincerity in delivering social housing. I am just trying to point out where they are coming from. It is this Rann Labor government, in partnership with the federal Labor government, delivering real outcomes in sustainable mixed communities—affordable housing and social inclusion. We are building houses that will accommodate people with disabilities, domestic violence victims and their children—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Here we go again—and they wonder. Can we talk about their policies? We are committed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I remind members that question—

Mr Hamilton-Smith interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Member for Waite!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: We are committed to affordable housing. Their policy was to scrap the 15 per cent affordable housing in new developments. Their policy was to move tenants into aged walk-up flats. Their policy was to have inspections whether or not the tenants were home. Their policy was to transition tenants into private rental—that was a good one. We are building houses that will accommodate people with disabilities, domestic violence victims and their children, children leaving care, people at risk of homelessness. These homes will be six-star energy rated and the vast majority will be disability accessible, and 20 to 25 per cent will be provided in country regions. I had the great pleasure a couple of weeks ago of meeting a grandmother—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Can we hear the minister's answer?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: —who received one of the first of our country houses to be finished. She had been living in a shed. She was caring for her grandchild who had a range of problems; a very good woman who had been doing it tough. This home meant the world to her. It meant both her and her grandchild were safe and secure, and they were living in their community. That is what this construction program is about delivering—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I think it is standing order 131 about interruptions. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition persistently interjects. I note that he is otherwise known to be a stickler for the standing orders. I wonder whether he could observe that one.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order. This is going on and on and on, and I draw members' attention to the time. Minister.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Member for MacKillop!

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: As I said, this woman felt she and her grandchild now had a safe and secure place to live in their community. That is what this construction program—delivering 1,360 new homes—means. These outcomes are being delivered on time and on budget, and I look forward to reporting on our future social housing achievements.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for MacKillop, you have a very loud, vocal voice; you must have been good on the farm rounding up the sheep!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not call the member for Davenport until there is quiet.

ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:43): My question is to the Treasurer. Why did the Treasurer say in his ministerial statement of 25 May that 'at the time of the original decision cost estimates provided by SACA and the SANFL were based on preliminary concept designs', when Leigh Whicker yesterday told the Budget and Finance Committee that 'the SANFL had no involvement in the preliminary plans or costings'?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:43): The government's negotiations were with Mr Andrew Demetriou, representing the interests of the AFL and the SANFL. Mr Demetriou took the role and requested that he be the negotiating person with government and that he would, in the process of that, deal with matters that were affecting the SANFL. The design and costings, it is my understanding, were the work of former prominent federal Liberal cabinet minister, Ian McLachlan (whom members opposite do not seem to hold in such high esteem any more); that the designs had been the product of work undertaken between the SACA as the oval managers, owners and operators and the AFL, where costings were prepared, I think earlier in 2009, further updated in July 2009, to the best of my understanding; and that was overseen by the AFL for and on behalf of the SANFL.

What I do know is that Mr Demetriou was in regular contact with the SANFL. I know that, in early November 2009, I think it was, there was a two-day workshop of the SACA, the SANFL and the AFL regarding Adelaide Oval. I was not a party to that meeting, but one would assume that they would have discussed designs, size and various other aspects of that project.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The figure of \$450 million was a figure provided to me, as the point of contact with Mr Demetriou, on behalf of the AFL, the SANFL and SACA as the request—the ask—from government.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): In light of that answer, my question is to the Treasurer. Did Andrew Demetriou tell his friend, Treasurer Kevin Foley, prior to 2 December 2009, that he or the AFL had received a letter dated 17 November 2009 from the SANFL indicating that the \$450 million would be insufficient to fund the planned Adelaide Oval upgrade?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:46): No is the answer. If Mr Demetriou, from the end of November right up to 2 December, said that the ask is \$450 million, that's the ask. What are you suggesting, that he would have said to me, 'Oh, no, actually'—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Madam Speaker—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: That is correspondence between the SANFL and the AFL.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: No.

ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:47): Before announcing the Adelaide Oval project on 2 December 2009, as part of the due diligence, did the Treasurer ask the SANFL whether the project could be completed for \$450 million and, if he did not ask, why not?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (14:48): Just in respect to that earlier answer, having got myself into trouble by giving an absolute, I will double-check my record, but I am certainly not aware of any notification at all on that issue.

Mr Pederick: He's changed his mind already.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Well, I got into strife last time I sort of gave an absolute, so—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I'm pretty certain he didn't because, if he had, it would have been pretty odd. You want 450, but the other day you said you wanted more.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The answer to the shadow treasurer's question is a simple one. Mr Demetriou advised me to advise the Premier to advise the government that a sum of \$450 million was sufficient. The Premier convened a meeting involving the SACA, the SANFL, the AFL, the Crows and the Power—

Mr Williams: Keep going.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —where we made the offer of \$450 million. It would be fair to say that they were delighted.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I ask that the leader withdraw that remark.

Mrs Redmond: Why?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Because there's a clear inference that Mr Demetriou has undertaken this work for personal financial gain. That is outrageous!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: There's nobody you will not trap.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Williams: It's a good deal on behalf of the SANFL.

The SPEAKER: Order! I did not hear the remark made by the Leader of the Opposition because of the noise in the background, but the member is responsible for her own remarks. Does she wish to withdraw?

Mrs REDMOND: No, Madam, I said nothing offensive.

The Hon. K.O. Foley interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Treasurer!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition.

Mrs REDMOND: Madam Speaker, if you want to know what was said, the Deputy Premier indicated that the offer of \$450 million made people very happy, and I said, 'Especially Andrew Demetriou, since he got a bonus for it,' which was printed in the *Financial Review* in May.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

Mr PICCOLO (Light) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister advise the house how South Australian patients will benefit from the introduction of new ambulance vehicles?

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) (14:50): I thank the member for Light who has a very strong interest in health services in his community and is a strong advocate for them.

Over the current financial year, \$6 million has been allocated to the continuing rollout of the SA Ambulance Service new fleet of ambulances. This is part of a five-year, \$21.1 million arrangement which I announced in 2007. As the financial year comes to its close I can announce that 53 new ambulances have been purchased and another five are in the process of being commissioned this year. This comes in addition to the 49 new ambulances bought in the 2007-08 financial year.

Nineteen of these new ambulances were placed in country areas. The member for Finniss will be pleased to know that this includes two in Victor Harbor, one in Strathalbyn, one in Goolwa and one on the Fleurieu Peninsula. There are also new vehicles in Mount Barker, Whyalla, Gawler, Berri and Renmark. Thirty four new ambulances have been placed in metropolitan areas including six at Fulham, three in Campbelltown, three at Prospect and four at Salisbury. I am also pleased to announce that a number of these new vehicles are now operating in the southern suburbs including one in Aldinga and four in Noarlunga.

The new ambulances are Mercedes-Benz Sprinter vans. The Mercedes has been selected because the van is brought into Australia already meeting many SA Ambulance Service requirements including 270 degree rear doors and interior dimensions that are large enough to be fitted out as an ambulance. All new vehicles will be the Sprinter 319 model which, for those with an interest in such matters, is a three-litre, V6 turbo-diesel engine which delivers the power required in a remarkably fuel-efficient way for a vehicle of that size.

Our major concerns are always patient care and the safety of both patients and ambulance officers but, as the SA Ambulance Service runs a fleet of more than 220 ambulances and responds to more than 246,000 incidents a year and travels around 2.6 million kilometres, we must also be conscious of cost. The ongoing replacement of the ambulance vehicle fleet ensures that all vehicles are replaced every five years.

The Rann Labor government is also in the process of renewing SA Ambulance Service stations. Since 2008, six new stations have been opened at Morgan, Kingston, Lock, McLaren Vale, Port Adelaide and Quorn. A new station is also due to open in Prospect shortly and construction is underway for country volunteer stations at Orroroo and Booleroo Centre. Planning is also underway for a major station at Parkside near the corner of Glen Osmond and Greenhill roads.

The government has also employed another 400 career ambulance officers since June 2002, a 75 per cent increase in that time. As I informed the house last year, according to a report released last year by the Council of Ambulance Authorities, SA Ambulance Service officers were the best in the country when comparing response times from the moment the ambulance crew actually start their journey to an emergency.

In urban areas, ambulance staff responded within 6.5 minutes 50 per cent of the time and 10.7 minutes 90 per cent of the time. All South Australia can be proud of the ambulance service. Our ambulance officers deserve our praise and gratitude for their dedication to the community 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. The government is committed to ensuring that the hard-working men and women of the service have the equipment and facilities they require to provide world-class emergency care to South Australians when and where they need it.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Does the minister think it is appropriate to meet with a parliamentary committee witness, Leigh Whicker, on the last working day before he gave evidence to the Budget and Finance Committee? Who initiated the meeting and what was the purpose of that meeting?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON (Elder—Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Minister for Energy) (14:55): I will go over things I have already said today and then explain a few things to my learned friend on the other side. The committee that is taking place before the upper house is, in my personal experience of these sorts of biased political circuses, likely to go for as long as the Liberals can wring it out.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: And never report.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: And never report, as the member for Croydon might well say. It is therefore not open to the government, if we are seeking to complete this project, to wait until the committee has reported or concluded before we speak to people who might be called. For example, Rod Hook is apparently going to be called to this august body, and if I did not speak to Rod Hook it would make it just a little awkward to deliver the \$5 billion infrastructure program we have.

I also indicate to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that in coming weeks I will be meeting with a large number of people who quite possibly have been or might be called before that committee, because it is my intention to attempt to bring that project to a successful conclusion. In regard to the specific meeting, my understanding was that it was a meeting sought between Rod Hook and Leigh Whicker.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: A meeting sought by Rod Hook with Leigh Whicker, for those hard of hearing on the other side. The purpose of that meeting was for Rod to talk to Leigh initially, and to further people, about the sorts of governance structures that will be necessary when we go from this stage of the project to actually building something; that is, how—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am quite happy to wait until you have finished with your inane interjections, but I am not going to talk over them.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I would have thought those on the other side would recognise that it is proper to put into place, as you moved into the phase where the project might be let and built, the proper governance structures; that is the responsible thing to do. Leigh Whicker is going to be an extremely important person in all of this, as will Ian McLachlan and a number of other people be.

Mr Williams: The day before he gives evidence.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: 'The day before he's given evidence,' he mutters. Can I point out to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that it is out of order to interject, you stickler.

Mr Williams: It is also out of order to not answer the substance of the question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If the Deputy Leader of the Opposition pro tem would desist, I will answer the substance. The meeting, as I understand it, was sought by Rod Hook with Mr Whicker to discuss those things. I called in to see Mr Whicker because, for those who do not know, Rod Hook's office is on the same floor as mine. I said hello; he is somewhat of a mate of mine.

The Hon. K.O. Foley: Good bloke.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: He is not a bad fellow at all. I said to him, 'We'll be talking a great deal in coming times.' The first thing I said to him was, 'It's absolutely essential, because this is going to be a very biased witch-hunt—I may not have said that to him, but that is what it is going to be—that we do not talk about any evidence you might give to their select committee.' That is why I called in to see him, and I have to tell you I am going to be doing that with everyone who I think might be called before that committee, but what I am not going to do is stop bringing this project to completion. Now, I actually left the meeting—I think, from memory, Leigh went on to point out to me that he thought it would be very wise if I were to meet soon with a number of people from the Crows, for reasons the details of which I will not go into.

The bottom line is that the government is not going to cease pursuing what is an extremely important job for South Australia, an extremely important outcome for football and a very good outcome for the overall precinct down on the riverbank—we will not stop pursuing that—because

the Liberal opposition decides to run a political sideshow in the Legislative Council. That is not going to happen. What I will do is protect myself from this political sideshow and those people who might be called by, on every occasion that I think someone might be called before that committee, saying to them that I do not want to have any discussions about anything they might be called to give evidence about.

It is inevitable that there will be something tangentially there that we are going to talk about, otherwise the simple way to stop the government doing a project would be to have some sort of committee on it. That is what occurred. I will point out that Leigh Whicker later came to a lunch with a number of us where he stayed for only a very short period of time, ate an orecchiette, I think from memory—

The Hon. K.O. Foley: A what?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: An orecchiette, with, I think, a pollo ragu from memory, and he left quickly. I think that the only football matters that were discussed there with the bunch of blokes at the table were about who the best coaches were and things like that. Let me give members opposite an ironclad guarantee: I am going to continue to talk to people that might be called before your august trial star chamber. I am going to continue to do that in the discharge of my obligations, because I am not going to let this circus you are running interfere with something very important to the people of South Australia.

ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:01): My question is to the Treasurer. After the Treasurer conducted a thorough record and document search before making his ministerial statement on 27 May, why is it that the two meetings of 19 February and 13 April, at which the cost increase of the Adelaide Oval project were discussed, were the two meetings that the Treasurer left out of that statement on 27 May?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (15:01): I have answered that question repeatedly. The mistake made, and I will take responsibility for that, was that we simply looked at the dates that the honourable member referred to in his questions. I did say in an earlier answer that for some weeks—and I guess that would be 19 April if I said that on the 25th—we were getting advice that there was likely to be a larger cost to the stadium.

ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:02): My question, again, is to the Treasurer. Is the reason the Treasurer went public about his misleading of the parliament that he became aware that on 25 May Leigh Whicker had indicated to Kevin Cantley and Bruce Carter that they were told on 22 February that he had briefed the Treasurer on 19 February about the cost blowouts and, if asked, he would be saying that?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (15:02): I have repeatedly said publicly in this place that my office was notified on the evening of the Thursday night. Now, I think that was the 26th, was it not? I think the 26th. I do not have a calendar in front of me. I was not aware that Mr Whicker had made such a telephone call to anyone. My chief of staff had received a telephone call which triggered us to find that piece of paper which reminded me of that meeting. As Mr Whicker said in evidence yesterday, consistent with what I said to this house, it was but a brief comment at the end of—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Six pages.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Six pages?

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You will allow the Treasurer to answer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: The shadow treasurer cannot mislead. Leigh Whicker did not say that he provided me with six pages of documents.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You just did. You just said 'six pages'. Mr Whicker in his evidence was consistent with my statement to the house that I attended a meeting with Mr Whicker

predominantly to talk about the Port Adelaide Magpies Football Club and the Port Power Football Club, and to talk about the dire financial predicament of the Magpies; and, clearly, one which one was to become aware of with Port Adelaide Power.

That was the purpose of the meeting, because I was taking a direct interest in the future of the Magpies, as one would expect as a lifelong member and the member for Port Adelaide, and I think I had already made, at that point, some public comments that I wanted the SANFL to save the Port Magpies and Leigh felt it was important that he have a chat to me about it. As Mr Whicker said yesterday, towards the end of that meeting he made a very brief comment to me about a figure which I did not believe to be a satisfactory number for which we would alter our position at all—it was early—and Mr Whicker confirmed that yesterday, Madam Speaker.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): My question is again to the Treasurer, in light of that discussion. Did the Treasurer or anyone from his office have discussions with Bruce Carter or anyone from the government steering committee about amending the minutes of the government steering committee meeting of 22 February?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Treasurer, Minister for Federal/State Relations, Minister for Defence Industries) (15:05): What they do is try to dirty me up. Fair enough, I am fair game, and in some part I deserve it for my terrible mistake of the other week—I acknowledge that—but then they try to dirty up Andrew Demetriou by saying that Mr Demetriou was motivated by financial gain. That is the inference of what—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: What was his motivation?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: It wasn't his motivation.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: You just did. You have been saying it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: —and that is an outrage. I am sure if the leader was so confident of what she is saying—and, as a sharp legal mind that she tells us all she is—she would say it outside and throw caution to the wind. But I will give this challenge to all the news reporters in this place: perhaps put that question to Mrs Redmond outside the chamber and look at her walk away.

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

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr WILLIAMS: This has absolutely no relevance to the question the Treasurer was asked.

The SPEAKER: I think the Treasurer has finished answering, have you?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What I am getting to, Madam Speaker, is now it is, 'Let's dirty up Bruce Carter. Let's say that Bruce Carter somehow was leant on to change minutes of a steering committee report.' This question was anticipated because the opposition was excited yesterday by an email trail that is a reflection on what followed, that is, that, as in every set of minutes from a meeting, individual members are entitled to put forward any editorial suggestions that they wish. My advice is that Mr Carter felt the minutes did not reflect the latter discussion that involved the comments around the table that these were preliminary figures and should not and could not be relied upon. Those minutes could not be altered at the suggestion of Mr Carter—and, I may say, with no input or knowledge of my office, that I am aware of.

Mr Williams: In no way, shape or form?

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: I take offence at the suggestion that my office would attempt to intimidate anyone.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: What then occurs—because, unlike former Liberal governments, we do follow proper and due process—is that the suggested amendments—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I have a point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Again, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition persists in interjecting, contrary to standing orders.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for MacKillop, be quiet. Treasurer, finish your answer.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: Mr Carter, who chairs the government's steering committee, suggested an amendment and that was circulated to all other members for agreement or disagreement. On my understanding, Mr Whicker agreed. I may be wrong, but I think Mr Whicker was one of the agreeing figures. Certainly, Mr Kevin Cantley, an outstanding public servant, the head of SAFA, and I think Jenny Hughes—what is her position, Michael? What is she?

The Hon. M.J. Wright: Rec and sport.

The Hon. K.O. FOLEY: She is a senior officer from the department of recreation and sport and she also agreed, and they are not people who would be part of any so-called conspiracy to doctor minutes.

MYLICENCE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Road Safety. What contribution will the new mylicence website make to informing novice drivers about the graduated licensing scheme?

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) (15:09): The new South Australian mylicence website (mylicence.sa.gov.au) has been launched this week on the internet. It provides useful tips and up-to-date information about everything driving related: from safe driving to what you need to make sure your car is roadworthy.

The website has answers for young people who want to know more about getting a licence and keeping it. There are sections dedicated to learner drivers, P1 and P2 provisional holders and full licence holders. It also provides information to parents and supervisors on what they need to know about being a supervising driver. Changes to the graduated licensing scheme will be introduced from 4 September this year. The new rules for drivers with a learner's permit or provisional licence are available on the mylicence website, including what high-powered vehicle restrictions will apply.

The website also has a practice learner's theory test and a hazard perception test to give young drivers an opportunity to practise and learn driving knowledge and skills. Safer driving tips are included and cover how to avoid the common mistakes that drivers make, warning on the dangers of using a mobile phone while driving, the hazards of driving at night and minimising risk while driving.

The SPEAKER: Order! Could we keep background noise down please?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Thank you, Madam Speaker. A subscription feature is available on the website for new and young drivers, parents and supervising drivers to register for regular mylicence emails, including updates and important driving information. This new website is just one part of a coordinated effort to reduce road trauma among young people by offering information and practical ideas for young people on how to be safe drivers.

ADELAIDE OVAL

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Did the minister know prior to the 2010 state election that the cost estimate of the Adelaide Oval upgrade had increased?

The Hon. M.J. WRIGHT (Lee—Minister for Police, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:11): I had not received any advice from either the government steering committee or the Stadium Management Authority that there had been any cost increase.

PRAWN FISHERY

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:11): Will the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries inform the house about the results of the recent report into the co-management model of the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs VLAHOS: —Spencer Gulf prawn fishery?

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Regional Development, Minister for the Northern Suburbs) (15:12): I thank the member for Taylor for the question, and I am sure the member for Flinders will be very interested in the answer. Last season the South Australian prawn industry had one of its best seasons yet. I met with industry leaders in Port Lincoln several weeks ago, and they informed me that the prawn industry had landed its total allowable catch in near record time. This is a testament to both the health of the fishery and its management.

As members are probably aware, the industry is based predominantly out of Port Lincoln, and from this city—reputedly the largest fishing centre in the Southern Hemisphere—harvests of the Spencer Gulf and West Coast prawn fishery are launched.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN: Different story, Vickie. In 2007-08 the fisheries produced almost \$33 million worth of prawns and directly employed over 200 people. The management of the fishery which has underpinned the industry was recognised last year by the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations, which determined the Spencer Gulf prawn fishery one of the best managed in the world. In its report, 'A global study of shrimp fisheries', the UN organisation praised the Spencer Gulf prawn fishery as a global model of fair, flexible and accountable management. On this note I commend our South Australian prawn industry on producing a new management model for the Spencer Gulf prawn fishery.

In a recent report entitled, 'Competition to collaboration: exploring co-management models for the Spencer Gulf prawn fishery', stakeholders from the Spencer Gulf and West Coast Prawn Fishermen's Association, PIRSA Fisheries, Fisheries Research and Development Corporation, and the Conservation Council of South Australia explored a range of different models to arrive at a co-management arrangement for the fishery. This innovative co-management model in Spencer Gulf provides a benchmark for the future management of other fisheries as it provides for shared management responsibility between government, industry and the conservation sector. I think this is the standout of this particular model in that it has brought the conservation sector well and truly into the management regime.

The co-management arrangement has been evolving over the past five years and will now be used as a national case study into how our fisheries should be managed into the future. I think this is a great accomplishment for South Australia, that we are being consistently seen as a national leader in fisheries management. It shows what can be achieved when industry, government and the conservation sector work together.

On the national front, this confidence in our co-management has translated into the South Australian prawn fishery being recognised by the Australian government as being managed in an ecologically sustainable way that meets the standards necessary for the granting of a licence for export. Without this recognition our South Australian prawns could not be enjoyed by people throughout the world. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Spencer Gulf and West Coast Prawn Fishermens Association, the Conservation Council of South Australia and last, but not least, PIRSA Fisheries Division for its leadership in managing our prawn fishery.

Mr PENGILLY: I rise on a point of order—122. During the course of question time both the Minister for Transport and the Treasurer, in answer to questions, referred to those in another place as being in a 'star chamber'. Madam Speaker, I ask you to rule whether those remarks are against 122.

The SPEAKER: It may be a point of order, but each house has always criticised each other, since the day the houses were created. I do not think I will take it too much further than that, but thank you for drawing it to my attention.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

SA WATER

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg) (15:16): Today I wish to bring the attention of the house to SA Water's \$400 million secret. I am referring to the proposed development known as the North-South Interconnection System Project, under the Network Water Security Program of SA Water and the South Australian government. This comes when I readily acknowledge the contribution made by the then Waterworks and Drainage Commission, the Engineering and Water Supply Department, and then finally SA Water to the quantity and quality of the state's water supply.

Regrettably, in the last eight years this situation has disappeared down the gurgler. In the time I have been in parliament alone I have seen SA Water stall the security access by one of their neighbours at an SA Water site at Burnside, I have seen SA Water spend \$47 million to refit a new headquarters for itself at Victoria Square while the rest of the state perishes, fail to supervise a contract with SA Water which, according to the Treasurer, has resulted in tens of millions of dollars loss to taxpayers of South Australia, to progress the doubling of a desalination plant solution for SA Water supply without seeing the saving of one extra drop of water from the River Murray.

We know that the cost of water we receive in the future will be excessive; energy use will be unsustainable and unacceptable. However, last night I attended a meeting at the Burnside Town Hall of residents from Simpson Road, Wattle Park. They attended for a briefing with representatives from SA Water about the north-south pipeline proposal. To refresh members' memory, in 2007 minister Maywald announced a \$403 million interconnection project, which was essentially a project to connect water supply for Adelaide roughly split between the River Torrens in the north and the southern system. SA Water is not currently in a position to transfer large volumes of water between these systems, and announced a proposal to do so.

On 29 July last year the government announced a \$30 million advance for the establishment of the preparatory work for this proposal. To my knowledge there have been no public works in respect of this expenditure but, finally, in June this year, after the election, SA Water started to consult one-on-one with residents around the proposed pipeline and pump station upgrades. One of these is at Wattle Park, a very significant one is at Clapham in the member for Waite's electorate, and another is proposed somewhere in the vicinity of Vale Park, probably in the electorate of Norwood but possibly in the electorate of Adelaide (yet to be determined).

This is a public asset. It is going to spend public money, a hell of a lot of it, in respect of a public service to be provided for South Australians, and it is clearly in the public interest. Yet, when I attended this meeting last night to be further briefed and, hopefully, receive some answers to questions that had been raised in the district, all members attending that meeting were told that this meeting was to be confidential—information about a major public asset, of which hundreds of millions of dollars is going to be spent, and the people attending were expected to keep this confidential.

For the record, this is an absolute disgrace. It is starting to infiltrate not just SA Water projects but also other projects, one being the stadium authority. I read recently that the Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure was to give a briefing to the Parklands Authority, but because they said, 'We are not prepared to have this as a secret meeting,' DTEI refused to give the briefing. This is unacceptable. I ask the Minister for Water, in this instance, to act on this and ensure that future public consultation is not going to be secret and that people are not expected to keep what is important to them and their neighbours a secret.

The people in this particular area around the pump station are concerned about whether alternative sites have been considered, the design, the location, noise, amenity, wildlife, significant trees, etc. Security and traffic are issues about which they all were concerned. We have not even started yet on the pipeline. We still do not know of any consultation for the people who live in Glen Osmond, Beaumont, Stonyfell or Wattle Park, in respect of the pipeline that is going to be dug up and relaid, double the size, under this project. Why is it that SA Water should be so secretive about this? The government must act for the people of South Australia.

Time expired.

BURQAS

Ms FOX (Bright) (15:21): I notice, with some interest, that the member for Fisher has brought up the issue of the burqa in South Australia. You may ask yourself: why is this of interest to the people of Bright? Well, it is not. In fact, it is of no interest to the people of Bright or, indeed, the people of South Australia, because, as far as I know, not one Muslim woman in this state is currently wearing a burqa.

Ms CHAPMAN: I rise on a point of order. I do not doubt that this is a very important issue, but this is an issue which is the subject of a private member's bill before the parliament, and therefore I ask that the member move on to another subject.

The SPEAKER: I wondered about that myself, when the member started to speak, but I do not believe that bill has been introduced. Yes, the bill has not been introduced. The member has spoken about it publicly but he has not actually introduced a bill.

Ms FOX: I thank the member for Bragg for that, and it was a question that I asked myself, but apparently I can talk about this until such time as he puts it on the *Notice Paper*. Nevertheless, the member for Fisher has decided to make this an issue. Perhaps inspired by the federal Liberal Party's own Barnaby Joyce, Senator Cory Bernardi, the member for Fisher is going to come into this place—from what I understand in the media—and spend time and taxpayers' money debating an issue that was, until he raised it, not an issue at all.

As all keen followers of French politics would know, French President Nicolas Sarkozy has been grandstanding on this issue since the beginning of the year, and he proposes a ban on the wearing of the burqa in shops, markets, public institutions and, indeed, even in the streets. Mr Sarkozy seeks to impose his own values on these women, much as Senator Cory Bernardi did. It is ironic that in the same way that these political men accuse the Muslim partners of such women of oppressing their human rights—a point which is certainly debatable—they, in turn, seek to rob Muslim women of their own choices. Do not get me wrong; I am not that keen on the burqa, and I always feel a sense of pity and curiosity about the women underneath their voluminous folds, but I also recognise that my reaction is really imposing my own narrow values on those people, and I would certainly not seek to codify that vague kneejerk reaction into legislation.

Even the ultimate administrative authority in France, the State Council (the *Etat de Conseil*), has warned that the full ban on the burqa will probably be declared unconstitutional. Human Rights Watch, an outstanding organisation, points out that this law will probably confine more women to their homes, because for some Muslim women the burqa is actually viewed as a liberating garment. I cannot see it myself, but apparently it is. President Sarkozy maintains that the burqa 'suppresses women's identities and turns them into prisoners behind a screen'. Of course, the 2,000 women in France who do wear the burqa—and I would point out 2,000 women out of a Muslim population of six million, out of a population of over 60 million, so we are talking about a tiny part of the population—would argue that, in being liberated from the male gaze, they are becoming empowered.

Before I end, I would like to point out one rather nasty story that occurred very recently in France as a result of this debate. This debate brings up racial tensions that did not exist until the debate arose. This is what happened in a town called Trignac near a place called Nantes. Two women were walking down the street: one of them was a 60 year old lawyer and one of them was a 26 year old woman in a burqa. The 60 year old lawyer, who was very left wing and outraged by the fact that her sister was being oppressed by these garments, started making snide remarks about the fact that this woman was wearing a burqa. They entered the same clothing store, the snide remarks were responded to and, in the end, there was an attack of burqa rage. Yes, the 60 year old lawyer tore the burqa off the 26 year old woman, and both of them were arrested as a result.

It is precisely the kind of incident which we do not want to see occurring in South Australia and which we have not seen. The former minister assisting in multicultural affairs (Hon. Carmel Zollo) had an excellent relationship with the Muslim women of this state, as does current minister Grace Portolesi. Those excellent relationships should be maintained and I really feel very sorry that the member for Fisher felt he had to raise this at all. If he has to, perhaps he could look at the Belgium example, where in Belgium, at the end of March, the government endorsed a nationwide ban on clothes that do not allow the wearer to be fully identified. In this way, we do not discuss race, religion and gender.

BLACK HILL PONY CLUB

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:26): Today I draw the house's attention to the plight of the Black Hill Pony Club. Before question time, I lodged a petition signed by 3,239 residents of South Australia: members of the Black Hill Pony Club, plus supporters and friends and, importantly, hundreds of local residents with no connection to the pony club but who support the retention of that land as open space for community use through the pony club's activities. The federal member for Sturt, Christopher Pyne, has been working particularly hard for the Black Hill Pony Club and I acknowledge his support.

Although the pony club sits geographically in Morialta, the largest contingent of signatures on the petition come from the electorate of the member for Hartley. I urge her again to speak up for her local community and the pony club in the cabinet room in which she sits. However, at least the people of Hartley can be assured that they have a federal representative who is working hard for them in Christopher Pyne.

The pony club has had its home at Woodforde since 1984. It sits immediately above the Magill Youth Training Centre. A significant proportion of the land was a tip, full of car bodies, other scrap metal and thousands of bricks. Volunteers from the pony club and the local community worked tirelessly for months and years to turn a dump into an arena. The land was reclaimed and the whole community has benefited. Hundreds of local children in the metropolitan area of our electorates are living healthier lifestyles. Poorer children, many from single parent families, are subsidised by members who can afford to pay a bit more. Parents of a number of children with behavioural problems have written to me about how much their children have gained emotionally, socially and in their education since being involved with horses.

On a broader front there is the question of open space and the increasing pressure being placed on local infrastructure as urban infill and new development in the eastern suburbs are significantly increasing our population. Some development is inevitable, but a balance has been overshot by this government. The pony club's fate has been tied by the government to the Magill Youth Training Centre next door, which the Minister for Families and Communities is selling to pay for the new centre to be built at Cavan. As the government also owns the pony club land, the minister is taking the opportunity to sell it, too.

I am on the record many times as being in strong support of a new youth corrections facility and it is fair enough that, if the training centre land at Woodforde is surplus to requirements, then it may as well be sold. I have no doubt it will fetch a good sum. However, that is not enough for the government—it wants to sell the pony club land, too. The minister wrote to me a couple of weeks ago saying:

The Magill land is a high value site and as such the Government cannot ignore its value to the South Australian community and reinvesting the proceeds of sale in new Government infrastructure.

It is true that the land (at Woodforde, not Magill) is a high value site. In fact, its value to our community is far too high for it to be just another lot sold off for housing. At a time when other government ministers are spending millions of taxpayer dollars trying to get kids involved in sport and recreation, this decision will destroy a facility that is supporting those very activities.

How many hundreds of millions of dollars is the government currently throwing at creating a better venue for two elite football teams? How much money do we spend on programs to produce Olympic gold medals? Yet a community club that supports not only the early development of those champions and those gold medallists but also promotes healthy lifestyles amongst so many others seems to be considered without value by the government. Where will the future champions come from if they have no facilities to get them started as kids?

In her correspondence, the minister has said that the LMC and the Adelaide Hills Council have been working to find the club a new piece of land and that the club was yet to respond to those offers. I am told that this is, in fact, not the case. However, to save any more going back and forth, I can clearly inform the minister that the sites offered at Lobethal and Oakbank are not feasible for the mums—and occasionally the dads—living in Hectorville and Campbelltown who have to take their children twice a day to the facility.

The Chief Executive Officer of the Campbelltown council has now written to the minister following a resolution of that council. He states:

I sincerely hope that you will reconsider your position on this matter for the benefit of the local community.

The federal members, Christopher Pyne and Jamie Briggs, have been publicly calling on the minister to have mercy. The opposition in this place has been clear. Today, more than 3,000 people from our community have officially petitioned the parliament and the minister. On behalf of my community, I now beg the minister to revisit this cruel decision to sell off the land of the Black Hill Pony Club.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN WORKING WOMEN'S CENTRE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:31): The South Australian Working Women's Centre is this year celebrating its 31st year. I remember clearly the celebrations last year to commemorate 30 years of hard work on behalf of the Working Women's Centre staff and also its management committee, with a number of supporters both in this house and in the Legislative Council.

The Working Women's Centre is a leader in many campaigns, but part of its vision is to campaign for the achievement of access to work, fair play and conditions for all working women so that they may enjoy a balanced and quality life. It does sound a bit idealistic, but it is certainly a very important vision to have.

I was reminded at the Working Women's Centre's 30 year celebration—and more recently when the chairperson, Max Adlam, talked about the centre's successes over the years and put the birth of the centre in context—of the many initiatives that I am very proud to say the Labor government put in place in the 1970s and early 1980s to make sure that women had an opportunity to have a fair go. We still do not have equal pay and we probably do not have the support we would like with regard to parental leave, but certainly there have been many achievements.

As a former director of the Working Women's Centre—it seems like 30 years ago, but it was not quite that long ago—I was interested to read the centre's most recent report of 2008-09, supplied to me by the current director, the wonderful Sandra Dann. I would just like to take the time to acknowledge the great work that she does, along with the workers at the Working Women's Centre and its management committee. They work very hard to make sure that women in the paid workforce have an opportunity to access information and also, where necessary, get support for particular paid work issues that they may be confronting.

I note that, in the report, there were some 162 people who had come to or telephoned the Working Women's Centre seeking information, asking for training and also talking about particular issues concerning women in the paid workforce. Also, 1,695 individuals had contacted the Working Women's Centre with regard to many different issues, including: rights at work, sexual harassment, equal opportunity, discrimination, fair work, work-life balance, career planning, returning to work, workplace bullying, unfair dismissal, under-payment of wages, occupational health and safety injuries, contracts of employment, awards and agreements, and also looking at gender-based obstacles to women's leadership in the workplace.

Sadly, these are the sorts of issues that I was confronted with many years ago when working at the Working Women's Centre. The sad news is that all of those issues are still out there; the good news is that there have been, as I said, some major changes to try to ensure that women do have equal access to the workplace.

One of the areas that the Working Women's Centre has been working on (and, I think, it has made some headway) is bullying in the workplace. As people in this chamber would know, that can be a subtle problem but it can also be a very direct one. The Working Women's Centre has spent a lot of time looking at workplace bullying in the context of industrial health, safety and welfare and also, in some cases, the worker's compensation cases that come out of this behaviour.

I would like to commend the centre on the work that it has done all these years and also for providing a model in other places—for example, the education sector—and in the provision of other services. This is something that the Working Women's Centre has continued to campaign on. I note from the cases that the Working Women's Centre staff handle that most are in the employment conditions area and this is followed, sadly, by dismissal and redundancy. So, all power to the Working Women's Centre.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

LAND REZONING

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:36): I would like to talk on behalf of Trevor and Angelika Toune who are residents of Point Paterson on the outskirts of Port Augusta. They have a particularly difficult situation. They have lived on their land, which consists of approximately

60 acres about five or six kilometres from the centre of Port Augusta and a couple of kilometres outside of the main residential area of Port Augusta, since 1984.

In 2008 they subdivided their land and created two 20-acre blocks (in addition to their home block) and they wanted to sell them. The land, to the best of their knowledge, was zoned residential rural living. They had a buyer organised and ready to go. This was essentially their retirement package. These people are retired. When they went to sell the land they found, to their horror, that the land had been rezoned as industrial back in 2002, and they genuinely did not know about it.

What makes it more difficult for them—and they understand that this is technically still their responsibility—is that for the entire time they have been there (since 1984 right up until, I think, 2008) their council rate notice still showed that their land was residential rural living. They were just not aware of the change. It was not until the purchaser of one of the blocks was doing his homework and went to have a look that he then came back to the Townes and said, 'Look, this land that you're selling me as residential is actually industrial'—and that was, obviously, a very embarrassing situation and put the sale off.

These people are in a very difficult situation. In good faith, they spent \$14,000 doing the subdivision. They accept that, while their council rates said all along that their land was residential, that is technically not their saviour. They also say that they were never ever informed of the rezoning.

We all know that is a tricky issue and it may or may not be the case. There is no doubt that the rezoning discussions and public meetings and things were advertised locally, and they do not dispute that. However, Trevor was working away at the time—as a lot of people in my district do—and he is not aware of any mail or correspondence advising of the rezoning back in 2002 or shortly thereafter. It is always possible that a letter went astray, but he is pretty adamant that he was quite thorough in collecting his mail when he came back from working away, and his wife, Angelika, did not ever see it.

Their plight was raised in the DPA for Port Augusta I think six or so months ago, a few months before the election, and unfortunately their case was not able to be helped with. There were a few issues that were left outside that the government could not see its way through to helping them with. I have spoken to the planning minister about this and he is quite understanding and personable and he understands their difficulty. However, naturally enough, the impetus for this has to actually come from the council to suggest the rezoning.

I have spoken with Port Augusta council and they are actually quite on side too. They feel a bit of responsibility for the fact that they made that administrative error in their rates notices. So, they will make sure that there is a recommendation for rezoning this land back to rural living. As I understand it, they are quite comfortable to do that, and the minister has said that he will do his best to support them. So I just want to raise this matter on their behalf.

The difficulty, of course, is that their land is quite close to the Port Augusta power station. It is further away than some established residential blocks in Port Augusta, but it is quite close to the Port Augusta power station. What I have suggested to them is that they might not need to do any further subdivision but that their 20-acre blocks that they would like to sell could have two different zonings on the same block, which I am told is unusual but quite legal. So I really do urge the government to support that when that application comes through. They are retired people who are under an enormous amount of personal stress from this. Their retirement savings, essentially, have gone into these blocks of land. They have invested, they thought wisely, by doing a subdivision—and so any help that the government can give them would be greatly appreciated.

AUSTRALIAN DEFENCE FORCE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:41): Last week we were reminded painfully about the terrible impact of war and its consequences. We were reminded of the daily turmoil of the workplace reality of the serving men and women of the Australian Defence Forces. We again saw defence head Angus Houston and minister Faulkner undertake the melancholy duty of informing the nation that we had lost brave soldiers in the line of duty, doing what their training had prepared them to do in the dangerous war zone of Afghanistan.

Along with our brave soldiers there are some very loyal and special dogs doing serious and life-saving work, and they have been trained to do it in the proud tradition that has seen dogs truly become man's best friend. Just before 11am last Monday in the hot and dusty Mirabad Valley two

newly-arrived combat engineers on their first tour of duty, Sappers Darren Smith and Jacob Moerland, known to their unit as Smithy and Snowy, were conducting a routine—if there is such a thing in a war zone—route clearance ahead of an Australian patrol.

Sapper Smith's dog Herbie was by his side and detected an enemy bomb. As the two soldiers from the Brisbane-based 2nd Combat Engineer Regiment approached, a Taliban insurgent detonated the device via remote control, killing one of the men and the dog instantly and leaving the other man mortally wounded. He unfortunately died not long afterwards in an army hospital.

This tragedy was the first time since 1971 in the Vietnam war that more than one Australian soldier has been killed in action on the same day, bringing the total number of lives lost in the Afghanistan campaign up to 13. It is with a sense of overwhelming sorrow that we note the passing of these brave soldiers and my heart goes out to their families.

I also today want to make particular mention of the dogs of war. Herbie is the fifth dog to die in Afghanistan. His cremated ashes will be returned to the widow of his trainer, Sapper Smith, and I understand that, just as they lived together and worked together, they will be laid to rest together as well. Sniffer dogs are a highly-valued military asset in the front line in Afghanistan where the Taliban is increasingly turning to the use of roadside bombs to attack allied forces and the fledgling Afghan National Army.

The dogs have already saved countless lives by finding weapon caches, booby-trap bombs and unexploded ordnance dropped by allied war planes, which could have killed or injured locals or been used to make more roadside bombs. Bomb sniffer dogs often move at the front of the patrols as forces move through hazardous areas, and they are painstakingly trained not to touch or interfere with any suspicious object, instead sitting and staring at the source of the scent.

It normally takes around 15 weeks, which is an astonishingly short time, it seems to me, to train a young dog before they are front-line ready. Most come from dogs' homes or are donated by the public and work for around eight years before retiring from military life. These dogs start their day at about 7 o'clock with their trainers, going on either a run, an obstacle course or what is called agility training. The rest of the day involves organised search training before the dogs are walked, fed and returned to their kennels. The most popular breeds for this type of work include Border Collies or other working breeds like Kelpies, Blue Heelers and Labradors. Brave Herbie, who died so shockingly last week, was a Collie cross.

To ascertain whether the dog will potentially be any good at their job, they are first tested by someone letting off some cap guns to make sure they will not be gun shy, and if they enthusiastically play with a ball often it indicates that the dog has the drive and resolve to be trained. While the training is very important, a close bond between the handler and his dog is just as vital. Twenty-six year old Sapper Smith, who originally hailed from Adelaide, told the *Adelaide Advertiser* just last month what a great feeling it was to be serving his country and how the army dogs are great mates and part of the team.

On the weekend, hundreds of dogs and their owners gathered at the War Dogs shrine on the banks of the River Murray at Goolwa to remember Herbie and sappers Darren Smith and Jacob Moerland, whose funerals will be held in Queensland. The memorial service was conducted by the Australian Trackers and War Dogs Association. What they originally thought would be a small gathering at the memorial stone erected for the working dogs, the Army Tracking Dogs of Vietnam, between 300 and 400 people, and almost as many canine companions, came to pay their respects to a canine hero.

Vietnam veteran Chris O'Neill was quoted in *The Advertiser* as saying that he felt that all animal lovers and people with dogs could relate to Herbie. Himself in charge of a tracker dog in Vietnam, Chris related a story of a dog that he lost through heat exhaustion. I am sure that everyone was grateful to have had the opportunity to release their emotions and feelings around how important the work of dogs is in our defence forces. Herbie had alerted his mates to the bomb moments before it was detonated. Because of quarantine regulations, he was cremated before he was returned to Australia, where his ashes, as I said, will be given to Sapper Smith's family.

The image of Herbie and his master in the paper conveys the vitality of the bond they shared, and it is fitting that they will always be together. As a dog owner and lover, I have always been aware of the role of defence dogs, even when I had the opportunity to meet Peter Haran at the launch of his book, *Trackers* in 2000. Peter was interviewed on the radio yesterday. Unfortunately, I was not able to hear the entire segment, but I did hear him pay tribute to the dogs

that died in Vietnam where he was first posted in 1967 as a 19 year old handler with one of the army's first combat training teams.

Peter went on to become a trainer, returning to Vietnam in 1970 as an infantry section commander. He is a founding member of the Australian Army Trackers and War Dogs Association, which erected the memorial stone at Goolwa featuring a paw-shaped water dish used by dogs as they walk past that peaceful spot.

Time expired.

ELECTORAL (PUBLICATION OF ELECTORAL MATERIAL) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:47): I was speaking prior to lunch about the dirty tactics undertaken during the recent state/federal election. I think what has happened is that the faith of the public—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Federal election?

Mr TRELOAR: Sorry, my apologies: state election. I really think that South Australians expect and deserve better than the tactics that were undertaken during the last state election. It also, I believe, reflects badly on all of us in this house who have chosen this profession, and undeservedly so. In essence, I would like to echo the Liberal Party sentiments of support in terms of the importance of this select committee in relation to this matter. I would also like briefly to discuss one last matter, particularly in relation to my electorate of Flinders, and it has also been mentioned today by a number of other country members, that is, the issue of postal votes.

Unfortunately, the government decided not to issue the writs for the election until only one month prior to the date of the election, leaving just two weeks prior to the election date for the closing of candidates. In essence this meant that there were only two working weeks for the Electoral Commission to get postal votes out and returned to allow people to vote. Obviously, those two weeks are critical. It just so happened that there was a long weekend in there as well, so it came down to nine working days.

I have kept a record of the number of my constituents who contacted me in regard to this matter and who indicated that, despite having applied for a postal vote, either they did not receive in time or at all their form on which to lodge a postal vote. As members would be well aware, it is compulsory to vote in this state, in this country. By issuing the writs and closing nominations for candidates so late in the day, what we have done is deprive people of their obligation to vote and their opportunity to vote in the state election. With those few remarks I close my comments, Madam Deputy Speaker. I was trying to think, during your grievance speech, of the French word for 'grandstand', but it did not come to me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will go to a dictionary and report to the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Industry and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Gambling) (15:50): I rise to support this bill. I agree with its intent, as I did last year when we first attempted to do this. The Liberal Party, in their road rage for having lost another election because they cannot mount a strategy to save their lives, have attempted to blame the people who voted for their loss. What they are saying is that they engaged in a tactic in 2006 which they say in 2010 is reprehensible. So, when they engaged in that tactic in 2006 in the seat of Mawson with the then Liberal sitting member, this government attempted to stop that behaviour. The Liberal Party, led by members in the upper house, voted against this government's attempt—

Ms Chapman: If it was so reprehensible, why did you do it in 2010?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Let me finish and I will tell you. We attempted to stop that practice, yet the Liberal Party voted against it. So, any reasonable person would have the expectation that, when the Liberal Party designed this tactic in 2006, used this tactic in 2006 and when this government attempted to outlaw it and they then voted against it, the reason they voted against it was that they were going to do it again. Once bitten, twice shy.

It always amazes me that the deputy leader—sorry, did I call you 'deputy leader'? I meant the former deputy leader, the now shadow spokesperson for families and communities, who has responsibility for and carriage of all the things for the Attorney-General in the lower house, other than things that are important. She claims that this is so reprehensible, yet I think back to a little

account called Catch Tim, and I wonder where her morals and scruples and her sense of democratic duty were then. Obviously, as president of the Liberal Party, her main focus was raising money for the party and she did not really care how she did it or how she raised it. So, I think it is a bit rich for the member for Bragg—

Ms CHAPMAN: I have a point of order, Madam Deputy.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, member for Bragg.

Ms CHAPMAN: That is an outrageous allegation by the minister for whatever he is. The allegation about raising money, no matter how that was done, is absolutely disgraceful. It is not only not within the debate but also it is insulting and untrue, and I ask him to withdraw it.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are two things. First, you may make a personal explanation, I believe, if you feel that you have been misrepresented, after the debate. Secondly, minister, did you want to withdraw anything?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Unlike the member for Bragg, if she took offence, I will withdraw.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is very kind of you. Please carry on.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: But I will say this: dodgy accounts such as Catch Tim really started the ball rolling in terms of the quick dive into the gutter by the Liberal Party. I have always found it to be really funny when they turn up here crying with indignation about what happened in the last state election. What happened in the last state election was very clear: the Liberal Party and its team were rejected by the people of South Australia. The Liberal Party, not being able to cope with that result now three times in a row, have formed a sort of road rage about that decision and are looking to blame everyone else but themselves.

They will not look inwardly and say to themselves, 'Maybe our tactics weren't right, maybe we focused too much on our leader, maybe our broad "let's try to win all 47 seats" strategy was not the right one.' Call me crazy but I think targeting 24 seats rather than 47 might have been the issue. Perhaps it was the way in which resources were allocated. I understand that the Attorney-General had an amazing campaign run against him—one that you could be proud of in a marginal seat—and I think that young man received a 12 or 13 per cent swing in Enfield. What geniuses!

I understand that Julian Sheezel, the state director, the acting state director or the campaign director—whatever the Liberal Party title is for these people—has now been moved on to run the federal campaign, so we have informed members in safe Labor seats that the Liberal Party cannot win to beware of a massive campaign coming to them soon and that seats such as Port Adelaide will be campaigned like they have never been campaigned before. Members opposite should not blame us for losing but, rather, blame themselves and their own tactics.

Mrs Vlahos: What about Mitchell?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I thank the member for Taylor for reminding me of their militant stupidity. They were not only militantly stupid but they were also militantly stupid often. For the life of me, why the Liberal Party would prefer to have a Labor member in this house rather than an Independent is beyond me, but long may that strategy reign.

The way they targeted the seat of Mitchell beggars belief. We saw the frustration on the face of the former member for Mitchell at the declaration of the poll, when he engaged in a bit of backwards and forwards with Mr McCance, the father of the Liberal candidate, and said, 'You just don't get it.' That is true; they just do not get it. That sort of thinking within the Liberal Party is absolutely fantastic and should be commended. Long may they run these types of campaign, because the only people they have to blame for these losses are themselves.

A complaint was lodged with the Electoral Commission and it was rejected. The Liberal Party has done this in the past yet makes no apology whatsoever. In fact, my advice is that they try to deny it ever happened. That is simply not true. Members of the Liberal Party have been up to their necks in electoral skulduggery for a long time. Election signs have gone missing; they have put out unauthorised material; they have been letterboxing in the middle of the night. These sorts of personal attacks—

Mr Goldsworthy interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The strategist is back in the house—the mastermind, the man they go to when they are in trouble, the man they listen to, the member for Kavel, the marvel

from Kavel. When they are in trouble and need a bit of strategy they knock on his door. I personally hope he rises to the top. The sheer hypocrisy of the way they decried what happened in Mawson astounds me. I had things done to me in my electorate, but I just took it. I do not complain; I just take it and go about my job.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No; it is not my style. It is more in the tradition of the member of Unley, from what I understand of the history of that seat; it is not something—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And moving on.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is not something we do in the Labor Party. I think the hypocrisy shown by the Liberals in this matter is astounding, and how they do it with a straight face is beyond me, especially members of the upper house who voted against the government's attempting to rule this out before the last election. Any reasonable person who looked at this objectively would realise that members of parliament when defending their seats have been subjected to dodgy practices by the Liberal Party. When we attempted to outlaw those dodgy practices and the Liberal Party voted against it, one can only assume that they will do it again.

Let us forget this argument about how holy they are and how bad we are. The truth is that the Liberal Party has been up to its neck in this sort of thing for decades. You only need to go back to during that brief little split and what their members were doing to each other in campaigning, what they would do in terms of ringing up Labor MPs and Labor candidates and helping them with support for their campaigns to boost the Labor vote. I mean, really, if you cannot catch and kill your own.

I would like to finish on the myth the Liberal Party is putting around that it really won the election but was robbed because of a boundary drawing that did not reflect true democracy. I say to the Liberal Party that to get to that two-party preferred figure of 51.6 it has to exclude people whose votes were excluded—their votes were excluded.

I look to the members for Frome and Mount Gambier and Fisher, the votes of the people who voted 1 for those members were not distributed. However, the Liberal Party has no problem washing away the intent of those three electorates, what they wanted. They did not want the Liberal Party or the Labor Party candidate elected in those seats, they chose Independents; but the Liberal Party, in its road rage, its rage against losing this election again, three times in a row, is quite happy to wash away the intent and hard work of those three Independent members, who were elected to this house fair and square.

Is it not surprising that their main competitor was not the Australian Labor Party but the Liberal Party of South Australia? This is their thinking. When they make applications to the Electoral Commission for redistributions, they will say, 'They are not conservatives', but when they want to get up in the house and argue that they won the two-party preferred vote, they will then say, 'They are conservative seats, you have to count those votes for us; they belong to us, so therefore we won the election and therefore we want the boundaries redrawn.' Well, you cannot have it both ways. That is called hypocrisy, something the Liberal Party is exceptionally good at.

Those three Independents keep on hearing this rubbish about, 'We won the vote; we got 51.6 per cent of the vote, we should be in government'. It insults every single voter who voted for Don Pegler, who voted for Geoff Brock, and who voted for Bob Such, because they did not vote for the Liberal Party. Their votes were not distributed, and the only way you can arrive at that two-party preferred figure is to discount those votes. So how about a bit of fairness and honesty from the Liberal Party? Of course we will not have that; it just wants the road rage.

The Hon. R.B. SUCH (Fisher) (16:03): I support this bill, but I make the point that it does not go far enough. I have an amendment before the house, but I can indicate now that I will not pursue that amendment because, having talked to the Attorney, he has said that once the Electoral Commissioner's report is complete we will need to revisit the whole area of matters pertaining to elections. So, I think it appropriate that I withdraw that amendment.

The Attorney also raised concern (and I have discussed this with one senior member of the opposition) that the amendment in its current form may create problems for some people by way of threatening behaviour in the community. So, I think it would be wise to withdraw that amendment, wait to see the report of the Electoral Commissioner, and then respond accordingly.

This particular bill, which is fairly brief, deals with a couple of matters. As I said, I support it, but I would like to quickly mention some other things that concern me. Obviously, one is the how-to-vote cards and the way they were used in some circumstances in the last state election, and the other matter relates to the mechanics of the election—this was touched on by the member for Flinders—that, in effect, there were only nine working days for the commission to deal with postal ballots. I think that issue needs to be addressed.

I do not think people need the lengthy amount of time that is normally provided to get their nomination in. If you do not know that you are going to stand for state election, when it is already set down, in law, at a four-year interval, if you do not know that you are going to run as a candidate then I think there is a bit of a problem. So, that issue needs to be addressed.

The closing date for the close of nominations effectively restricted the commission and, therefore, some people were denied a postal vote, which in other circumstances, I think, they should have, or would have, received. There is an issue too with people who are suffering from dementia. It is a difficult one, but people are guided—I will use a polite euphemism—in their vote by relatives, and that result could be critical in a tight election. I am sure the commissioner will address the integrity of the roll in her report.

Members would be aware that in Victoria they have just introduced, or are about to introduce, measures which allow electors to enrol and update their details on the day of the election. I do not have a problem with that, but I would be interested to hear what the commissioner has to say about the mechanics and feasibility of it. There are some other measures that are being introduced in Victoria, and I am sure the commissioner will have a look at those. The ID card (so-called) that was introduced this year was a useful mechanism and I think that needs to be explored.

The final point which concerns me is that in my electorate, at the last state election in March, one candidate put out material claiming to be a local councillor, the actual words were that the person claimed to be a local councillor, even though they did not live anywhere near the electorate. I wrote to the Electoral Commissioner, and I do not believe that the answer I received is satisfactory. The answer was that it demonstrated the candidate's community participation and ability to juggle work and family commitments.

That is not really the issue. The issue is that it is misleading to claim that you are a local councillor when you are not on the local council—you are on a council but it is not local. That is one of the reasons why I sought to have the addresses of candidates available for those who wanted to check them out, rather than what is often the case, which is a post box number, which does not tell people whether someone is local or not.

I do not have a problem with people living outside their electorate. I think it depends on how they relate to the electorate and the job they do. I do not live within my electorate because the boundaries have changed and unless I get a caravan, with central heating, I do not intend to change every time there is a boundary change.

There are a whole lot of issues that need to be addressed and I await the report of the commissioner. I look forward to the Attorney-General, at that stage, looking and responding to those recommendations so that we can have a comprehensive look at this question of the conduct of elections. Ideally, any review should be chaired by a retired judge, or someone similar, because I think the temptation is too great for people who are actually involved in elections and electioneering to seek an advantage. I await with interest the Attorney's response to the recommendations of the Electoral Commissioner.

Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:09): Thank you, Speaker—I know you prefer to remain sexless, so I shall try to deal with that by addressing you as 'Speaker'. The bill we are discussing today obviously came about because of the behaviour of the South Australian Labor Party. I find it interesting that the Labor Party and the State Secretary of the Labor Party, Michael Brown, confirmed this; that is, they will stop misleading people only if it is made illegal. The constant argument from the Labor Party is that they will stop doing this only if it is made illegal.

What does that say about the morals of this Labor Party—the premier Mike Rann and the ministers who work with him; those who worked to deceive South Australians on so many different policy areas in the lead-up to the election, starting with the Adelaide Oval—and what a saga that is becoming? What started off as being a \$300 million government contribution now looks like we are heading to \$750 million—and all because of a forgetful Treasurer (we are led to believe) and only the Treasurer knew anything about it.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. I am wondering what the relevance of this contribution is to the bill.

Mr PISONI: Let me explain: it is about honesty and integrity, something that the Labor Party does not have, and that is why they need to change the rules to protect themselves from themselves. That is the relevance, Speaker. It is interesting that the former attorney-general, the member for Croydon, would enter the chamber—

Mr Pederick: Of blessed memory.

Mr PISONI: Of blessed memory, thank you, member for Hammond—and his first contribution to the debate this afternoon would be a frivolous point of order—the same type of distractive tactics they used throughout their election campaigns. Whether they push the boundaries or whether they are morally wrong, the only time they will not use them is when they are illegal. That is what the what Michael Brown, the Secretary of the Labor Party has said: 'We need to protect ourselves from this act. We need to protect ourselves from—

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr PISONI: Do you want to talk about something like that outside? I have no idea what you are talking about, but perhaps you could tell people about it outside. Why don't you do that?

The SPEAKER: Order! If the members would like to talk outside, I suggest that the member for Unley sits down and they go and talk outside, but if not, could you continue your remarks?

Mr PISONI: I ask for your protection.

The SPEAKER: I will give you the protection. The member for Croydon is being very naughty over there, but you may like to stop responding to his interjections and finish your remarks.

Mr PISONI: I am fearful of using incorrect grammar also, Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I am very aware that would probably be the biggest threat from the member for Croydon if you did. You could threaten violence and it would not worry him, but if you use incorrect grammar, then you will get into trouble with the member for Croydon.

Mr PISONI: I fear for his constituents expressing their concerns when he knocks on their door and they say 'less' instead of 'fewer'—God help them.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: No, I tend to cut them some slack.

Mr PISONI: Of course, you want them to vote for you, but 14 per cent of them changed their mind last time. This bill is all about the Labor Party saving face. You only have to look at some of the interviews that occurred immediately after the election. The member for Mawson was on 891 radio and he was asked by one of the commentators:

...did you cheat your way to a seat in Parliament?

The member for Mawson responded:

No I didn't. I'm very sorry if people feel that way about what happened. What was done—

He went on to try to blame other people. Then Mr Bevan again asked him:

So should it be changed because it's wrong [the legislation], or should it be changed because it's messy?

The member for Mawson responded:

Probably because it's messy.

Not because it is wrong but because it is messy. He was given a second opportunity to say it was wrong. Mr Bevan said:

Not because it's wrong?

The member for Mawson responded:

Well, probably because it's messy.

On two occasions he had the opportunity to tell the 891 listeners that it was wrong to do that.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr PISONI: Speaker, I ask for your protection.

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Croydon, be quiet. Member for Unley.

Mr PISONI: Still, he refused to acknowledge that it was wrong. We are here in this chamber today not because the member for Mawson thinks it is wrong but because it is messy. That is why we are here. It is messy for the government, it is messy for the member for Mawson and it is messy for the member for Hartley. It is not because the government believes it is wrong; it is because it is messy and now the government is covering its backside. The government said it would do this, and it is doing it in hindsight. The government took all the benefits of abusing the situation, and that was morally wrong, and now it says, 'We've won our third term, so we are happy to take responsibility and change the legislation to protect ourselves.'

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

Mr PISONI: The interjections coming from the member for Croydon make him sound like he is very proud of those actions. Let me tell you, it is nothing to be proud about, member for Croydon. The Labor Party does have form, and its members take any opportunity that they can twist to benefit their political ambitions. You have to congratulate them. They are a machine; it is all about winning elections. Members do not know what to do when they get there; they do not know what to do for the people when they get there, but they know what to do for themselves.

Amanda Rishworth, the member for Kingston, was at it today, sending out a scare campaign that started down in Noarlunga: 'Risky Abbott set to cancel Noarlunga to Seaford rail extension.' Amanda Rishworth, the member for Kingston, said, 'The Noarlunga to Seaford rail extension is now'—

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Point of order, ma'am.

The SPEAKER: What is your point of order, member for Croydon? The member for Unley will sit down for a point of order.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: My point of order is that it is not immediately apparent to me what the relevance is to a bill about not being required to disclose names on a blog site and dodgy how-to-vote cards in discussing material issued by the member for the federal division of Kingston yesterday.

The SPEAKER: I will listen very carefully to the member for Unley and see the relevance.

Mr PISONI: You will find it very relevant, Madam Speaker, because it is about the integrity of the Labor Party. That is what it is about, and that is what this whole legislation is about. It is about making sure that we can force by law some sense of integrity in the South Australian Labor Party. That is what this legislation is all about. Amanda Rishworth goes on to say:

...with the federal coalition admitting that if elected later this year they will have to cancel projects like this in order to fund the many road and rail promises they've made elsewhere in the country.

Why is this true? According to the member for Kingston, it is because Anthony Albanese said so. He told the parliament, so it must be true, and that is why it is here. This is typical of the type of campaign that the Labor Party runs, because it is interested only in benefiting its own political means. That is why we are here today: to protect South Australians from the immoral actions of the Labor Party by making that action illegal.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

HEALTH PRACTITIONER REGULATION NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) BILL

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

No. 1. Clause 4, page 7, lines 26 to 33—Delete clause 4 and substitute:

4—Application of Health Practitioner Regulation National Law

(1) In this section—

South Australian Health Practitioner Regulation National Law text means—

(a) until a regulation is made under subsection (3)—the text set out in the schedule to the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Act 2009* of Queensland as in force on 1 July 2010;

- (b) thereafter—the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)* set out in the Schedule inserted under subsection (3) (as in force for the time being).
- (2) The South Australian Health Practitioner Regulation National Law text—
 - (a) applies as a law of South Australia; and
 - (b) as so applying may be referred to as the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)*; and
 - (c) as so applying, forms a part of this Act.
- (3) In connection with the operation of subsections (1) and (2), the Governor may, by regulation, insert a Schedule into this Act that sets out the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)*.
- (4) If, after the commencement of this section, the Parliament of Queensland enacts a provision to make an amendment to the schedule to the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law Act 2009* of Queensland, the amendment does not apply in South Australia but the Governor may, by regulation, modify the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)* text to give effect to that amendment as a law of South Australia.
- (5) The Governor may, as part of any regulation made under subsection (4), make any additional provision (including so as to modify the terms of an amendment that has been made by the Parliament of Queensland or to provide for related or transitional matters) considered by the Governor to be necessary to ensure that the amendment made by the Parliament of Queensland has proper effect under the law of South Australia.
- (6) A regulation made under this section may, if the regulation so provides, take effect from the day of the commencement of an amendment made by the Parliament of Queensland in that State (including a day that is earlier than the day of the regulation's publication in the Gazette).
- (7) Section 10 of the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* does not apply to a regulation made under subsection (3) (but will apply to any subsequent regulation making a modification under this section).

No. 2. Clause 7, page 8, after line 21—Insert:

- (2) To avoid doubt, subsection (1)(g) does not apply to a regulation made under section 4(4), (5) or (6).

No. 3. Clause 13, page 10, lines 30 and 31—Delete subclause (1) and substitute:

- (1) A person may be appointed to be the Registrar or a Deputy Registrar of the Tribunal on a basis determined by the Minister.

No. 4. Clause 13, page 10, lines 34 and 35—Delete subclause (3)

No. 5. Clause 26, page 17, line 3—Delete 'to practise'

No. 6. Clause 26, page 20, after line 32—Insert:

- (8a) However—
 - (a) a trust cannot be a trustee pharmacy services provider for the purposes of this Part unless the trust conforms with each of the following:
 - (i) each trustee must be—
 - (A) a pharmacist; or
 - (B) a prescribed relative of a pharmacist; or
 - (C) a person of a prescribed class; and
 - (ii) at least 1 trustee must be a pharmacist; and
 - (iii) any beneficiary of the trust must be a pharmacist or a prescribed relative of a pharmacist; and
 - (b) a trust ceases to be a trustee pharmacy services provider for the purposes of this Part if the trust ceases to satisfy the requirements of paragraph (a) in any respect.

No. 7. Clause 43, page 28, after line 30—Insert:

- (4) In this section—

pharmacist means a person who holds a current authorisation to practise in the pharmacy profession (other than as a student) under the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law*.

No. 8. Clause 81, page 48, after line 11—Insert:

- (2) A National Board may, in addition to the persons referred to in section 239 of the *Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)*, appoint a person employed in the Public Service of the State, or by an agency or instrumentality of the Crown, as an inspector under that Law.

No. 9. Schedule 1, clause 2, page 50, line 3—Delete 'of another State or a Territory'

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I indicate that the government has accepted all of the amendments that were agreed to by the other place. They include amendments that were moved by the government and amendments that were moved by the opposition. If I can perhaps just briefly explain. This bill that comes back from the other place seeks to include South Australia within a national scheme to regulate a number of medical and health professions. The scheme will come into place on 1 July (so we were cutting it a little fine) but I am pleased that we have now got to the stage where we can be part of that national scheme. I thank members for dealing with this in a prompt fashion.

I think there was general agreement on the merits of having a national scheme. The difficulties arose as to the means by which we were to achieve that. Unfortunately, this national scheme legislation got caught up in a debate about states' rights. That is an issue which is of interest but it is kind of irrelevant to the content of this scheme. The worry I had was that the scheme itself would get lost in the intricacies of debate about whether or not states should continue to have direct control in a day-to-day sense over these areas.

The reality is that if one wants to have a national scheme, through a cooperative legislative framework, then all of the states have to agree to the same legislation. The mechanism by which the government sought to achieve that was similar to mechanisms that were introduced into other parliaments and meant that we were to adopt the Queensland law and then automatically change that law (if it were to be changed) after passage of that law through the parliament.

The opposition parties wanted to maintain a state control and originally the way that they were seeking to do that would have meant there would have been a hiatus between what was happening in other states and what was happening in South Australia. I thought there were considerable risks in relation to that. Parliamentary counsel has come up with a compromise mechanism by which the regulation can be made to enact changes made by Queensland, by the minister, and then laid before the parliament, and the parliament will then have a right to reject that regulation. So, we will reduce the hiatus, if we do it properly, to a very small period of time. So, that is an acceptable risk. The danger for us was that, under the original proposition that the opposition moved, we would have potentially ended up with long periods of time when South Australia was operating a different scheme from the rest of Australia.

There is still a risk with this arrangement that, if the parliament here were to reject recommendations made by the states, our scheme will eventually deteriorate and we will end up not having a national scheme but going back to state schemes, but obviously that is matter for the parliament of the day. If that is what the parliament in the future wants to do, that is what the parliament in the future wants to do.

I thank those members of the other place that supported the government's original measure. In particular, I refer to the Hon. Kelly Vincent and the members of Family First who were prepared to support the government's legislation. I thank them sincerely for that. Unfortunately, we did not have sufficient numbers so we had to go to a compromise. I thank Richard Dennis of the parliamentary counsel for devising a mechanism which gave this—

An honourable member: Sir Richard Dennis.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Yes, Sir Richard Dennis. I take this opportunity to congratulate him on his recent award, and a well-deserved one at that. Richard Dennis came up with a mechanism which gave the government pretty well what it wanted but also maintained the opposition's position, so I think it was a good compromise. The Hon. Stephen Wade in another place came up with another version of that and then the parliamentary counsel came up with a version, so this has

been worked on. It has been workshopped and we have come to a sensible conclusion, which we are very happy about.

I have one final point to make to the Greens members of the other place who rejected the government's proposition. I am happy that they rejected it, but what interests me is that the Greens party, which is continually telling parliaments around Australia to put aside state interests and think of the national interest or the international interest, to put aside parochial concerns and vote for the national interest, were prepared in relation to health regulations to vote for a states' rights position. I am happy that they have put their colours on the mast that, when it comes down to it, they are a states' rights party, along with the Liberal Party and other conservative parties in this state.

I am happy that they did that, and I want them to be known as a states' rights party. So, when they come in here and say we should put the interests of the River Murray first and we should give up states' rights and put it across to the commonwealth and no longer have a say in it, I want to remind them of what they did when it came to reform of the national legislation which looks after the health of Australians, because they were prepared to put state rights before the interests of Australians when it came to health. Apart from that, I thank all the members for their cooperation; I think we have reached a consensus which we can all live with, which is a good thing, and that is what the parliamentary process should be all about.

Dr McFETRIDGE: This is an interesting amendment, because it achieves in a roundabout sort of way exactly what the opposition was trying to highlight. We have not achieved corresponding legislation, but we have highlighted in more ways than can be read into this one clause that this is about not only the legislation but also states' rights; it is about this parliament. It is not about the executive, the minister or the shadow minister: it is about the state's ability to elect a parliament which is going to represent them.

More and more we see ministerial councils taking over and making decisions, legislation being dictated to the states by ministerial councils and the power of this parliament being devolved to national legislation, whether it is corresponding legislation or adopted legislation. It is becoming more and more of an issue for parliaments not only of Australia and our states and territories but also all around the world, with the EU and the United Nations continually imposing more and more international agreements and legislation onto parliaments. I do not want that to happen in South Australia; I am a states' rights person.

I am a member of the state parliament and a proud member of this parliament, elected by the people of the electorate of Morphett, to come here and advocate on their behalf as a member of the Liberal Party. I make no excuse for that at all. That is why we had to draw a line in the sand here. We had to say, 'Well, hang on. Enough is enough of those devolving the powers of this parliament to ministerial councils.' It was not then the unanimous agreement of the ministerial council: it was the will of a majority, even consensus (I read somewhere) of the ministerial council, including the commonwealth minister. They were going to dictate to this parliament what should happen. We were not going to be able to disallow regulations. We were really being neutered.

Originally I wanted to have this legislation introduced as a piece of South Australian legislation, corresponding legislation. That has not happened. What we have done is included the 308 pages of Queensland national legislation into this piece of legislation as a schedule. Minister Gago in the other place said that this will be completed within six weeks. She gave us an assurance that this will happen within six weeks; but, more importantly for this place and the national scheme, the scheme will not be held up in any way, shape or form.

I think that we are the last parliament of the states and territories to put this legislation through. It is five minutes to midnight for this legislation, because by the time this is redrafted, redrawn and taken across to the Governor it will be very close to the death knock. The need to make sure we get this right is not just about this scheme, it is about the way this parliament is being overridden, if we allow it to be. God bless the upper house. Queensland does not have one. That is why this legislation was put through there first. You can run it through there and then try to run it out and bluff the other states and territories into following along.

As I said in my second reading contribution, the other states and territories did not follow along—they did not. This is not a uniform, seamless piece of legislation. A doctor can register more cheaply in New South Wales than anywhere else in Australia. National legislation. We are going to have a three-year review here in South Australia, but it is a 12-month review in the ACT and it is a five-year review, I think, in Western Australia. It varies all over the place.

There are many other ways in which our complaints procedures are going to be handled across the nation. It is not seamless, it is not smooth and it is not without its variations on the theme. For others to want to take control of this I do not think is a bad thing at all. God bless the Greens. I do not think they quite intended it to go this way—

The Hon. J.D. Hill: Are you suggesting they are stupid?

Dr McFETRIDGE: Not at all. Like a lot of people in this place, I am not a lawyer (and I am boasting, not apologising there), but to grasp this complex legislation does take time. In opposition we are not exactly over-resourced, certainly I think that some of the minor parties would like a little more resource. The need to make sure that you understand exactly where you are going and the procedures and protocols in here, I think, does take a little while. What happened in the other place was a bit of, not confusion but some variation in opinions were put. They thought they had the numbers up there; they did not, so our amendment got up.

That was not acceptable to the government, so it recommitted the bill with a further amendment which was not satisfactory to us. It still did not achieve our aim of bringing forward the 300 pages of Queensland legislation to a place of prominence in state law. We have achieved that by the hard work of Richard Dennis, an excellent parliamentary counsel and well-deserving of the Public Service Medal. I asked him whether I should genuflect or just tug my forelock when I approached him the other day. I think that I should actually bow deeply because he has worked very hard on this. Other lawyers have become involved in this, and they have varying opinions.

As a humble veterinarian, I said that I wanted to see national legislation because in my profession there are issues. We did not want to hold this up. I am pleased that we have come to this landing. I am pleased that the people of South Australia have legislation they can look at as a whole—not have to go to a web page or to refer to the Queensland government to try to find out what the heck is going on. I am pleased that we do have a degree of control over any amendments that may happen in the future. I thank my colleagues for their work with me on this, particularly in the upper house and, once again, Richard Dennis. I also thank the ministerial staff because they have been quite patient on this. They have been under the gun and have had to answer questions and make sure that I, as a humble veterinarian, have my head around the implications of this.

The scheme is a good one, and let us just hope it works, because my office phoned AHPRA in Melbourne yesterday asking questions about some of the transition protocols that are in place and they were not able to answer anything. I understand many of the forms have not been printed. So, I just hope that this gets off the ground without becoming an absolute dog's breakfast in the meantime. I wish this legislation well and I hope it achieves what it sets out to achieve, that is, the protection of people in Australia from dodgy health practitioners. It improves the ability of health practitioners to move around the country and practise their profession, as they should, in the great nation of Australia.

Ms CHAPMAN: I place on the record my glee that this bill will be concluded, but I also wish to place on the record that the reason we are doing this at the eleventh hour is because, first, notwithstanding a universal desire to have national registration, there was a vast chasm between the opposition and the government on the question of quality of training and the like.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson: As distinct from a small chasm.

Ms CHAPMAN: What happened is that, after considerable acknowledgment—I think, ultimately, by the federal minister and then at the state level—that the position had gone too far and there had been a further inquiry to support that, eventually we came back to attempt to deal with this.

Secondly, the government has elected to explore the new structure for how this is going to occur in a novel way. It attracted criticism, quite rightly, and now the government has acceded to a compromise position. But the fundamental flaws arise out of the fact that the government wanted to introduce a novel and defective model as to how we establish cooperative legislation when we want to have a national, consistent, harmonised position on a particular law. Historically, when we have considered the subject matter to have merit at a national level, to be consistent, we have transferred state power to the commonwealth.

We have also employed a model where we have nationally consistent laws around the country that are complementary to commonwealth legislation, and that has been a time-honoured and well-used model. This model, again, is subsequent to a COAG agreement. That is not unusual, these days, and that, in itself, I do not criticise, but it is still necessary for the parliaments to debate

the matter and to be able to identify the benefit of what has been agreed by COAG. I do not have a disagreement with that. I think it is overused, but the responsibility still rests with us.

The government attempted, in concert with other state health ministers—Labor ministers and the federal Labor minister—to introduce a model that meant we were not only beholden to legislation that had not had, I believe, proper consideration through the Queensland parliament (that parliament not having a house of review), but we were also left with a mechanism of reform and review that left South Australia's parliament out of the picture. I found that unconscionable and unacceptable, and so did many of my colleagues on this side of the house. So, I emphasise to the house the significance of not setting a bad precedent for future lawmaking in this parliament.

I will say that in the course of introducing this novel model the government tried to claim that it was a model that had some precedent. I suggest that is a nonsense, and I have detailed in the debate why I think that is a nonsense. Nevertheless, the government has obviously seen the importance of passing this legislation and acceded to a sensible compromise that has been presented by the opposition, supported by the Greens and ably drafted by Mr Dennis, who has been acknowledged already. I thank the parliament for its time.

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for Bragg. I think you can have a small chasm—you just can't have a shallow one. The very nature of a chasm is that it is deep. That is not to be argued with. However, you could have a small chasm as opposed to a large chasm. This is my feeling on the matter, thank you.

The Hon. M.J. Atkinson interjecting:

The CHAIR: I have been reading the dictionary to check up on your comments.

Motion carried.

ELECTORAL (PUBLICATION OF ELECTORAL MATERIAL) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (16:41): There have been quite number of contributions from that side, but I do not know that anything new has been said since the remarks made by the member for Bragg in response. However, I do want to touch on some new and quite serious matters which were alluded to by the member for Croydon. I share his concern about the provisions relating to contributions to the internet.

At the time the act we are now amending was considered, we were faced with this situation of having a new media for the expression of people's opinions and the exchange of information, and looking at how that fitted into the protocols that have been traditionally used in relation to the publication of letters in the lead-up to an election. As everyone knows, at any time during the cycle of an election, other than during the election period itself, people can write to *The Advertiser*, *The Australian*, *The Australian Women's Weekly*, or anywhere they like, and they do not have to disclose their name and address.

However, during an election period it is a requirement that name and address be disclosed for the traditional reason of ensuring people's identity can be determined and that people, if necessary, can be made to stand by the statements they make. On the internet and in the world of blogosphere people invent any sort of name. I fear that Redhead No. 795 might be taken already, but I can adopt any identity I wish and contribute anything I might like to say.

I recognise that there are times when the ability to use the internet without disclosing your identity can be quite useful. For instance, the world knows about some atrocities in Iran and the death of a young woman protester because of the internet. We would not expect those people to disclose their identity, as we know that their lives would be put at risk. I understand there were also some very interesting disclosures from a recent Liberal Party meeting, at which someone made some very interesting comments about the member for Sturt.

I do not actually stand by the notion of people being able to distribute that information without disclosing their identity; I would prefer that people stood by their comments. However, the fact that during the election period people using the blogosphere objected to having to disclose their identity raises several points of concern. It indicates that either they just want to make mischief and throw anything they like into the campaign period—which is not, I think, a good response to democracy—or they are living in a situation of fear, such as happened in Soviet Russia, etc. That is also not healthy for democracy.

However, my main concern relates to the messages that are being sent to young people. At the moment, teachers in all our schools are trying to talk to young people about responsible use of the internet, and there have been some very serious incidents in which children have been very badly affected by material that has been posted on the internet. There was a recent incident in South Australia involving a fight at a school, where film of the fight was loaded onto YouTube, and the mainstream media got hold of it very quickly. The person who had posted the item on YouTube was identified and told to remove it, which they did; however, the principal checked the Adelaidenow site only to discover that Adelaidenow did not just have a link to the original YouTube site, but had copied it and was continuing to show this unedifying exhibition. It finally decided to remove it after very strong representations from the Department of Education and Children's Services.

Every school has programs to remind children that they have to stand by every single thing they put on the internet, and they are reminded of the damage it does to other children. One of the strong messages is that if you are not prepared to say something to someone's face, do not think you can just put it in a text or on the internet and it does not mean anything. I am very concerned that on one hand we are trying to teach children to take responsibility for what they put on the internet but on the other we have a group of—presumably—adults who have demanded the right to put anything they like on the internet without taking responsibility.

Of course I will support this bill, because it results from an election commitment, but I sincerely hope that before the next election we will have another amending bill, as we better learn how to cope with the responsibility that we should all own as a result of the new media. It is no good to simply say, 'I can do anything I like and I demand the right to say anything I like, and I want to be Redhead746', and say—well, I will not even bother to invent the sort of thing that equates to some of what I have read on those internet sites. They can only be described as irresponsible, mischievous and adolescent; very rarely is there a contribution of any value or merit. It seems to me to be a total waste of electricity and, often, employers' time.

As a community we need to come to far better grips with this wonderful tool we now have. However, in doing so it is very important that we as adults think about what we demand for ourselves and how that reflects on what we ask children to do. At the moment the two messages are not very consistent, and I would like to see that they are and that we behave as responsibly as children.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:49): I rise to support the passage of the bill through this house. I want to speak to the paper put out by Jenni Newton-Farrelly entitled, 'Wrong winner election outcomes in South Australia'. In mentioning this report that was put out by the Parliament Research Library, I want to reflect on comments made by the member for West Torrens. He was going to explain during his tirade why some members opposite resorted to using the bogus how-to-vote cards in the seats of Light, Mawson, Hartley and Morialta, but in the whole speech I do not think I got that explanation. Be that as it may, this report, which talks about 2010 and non-uniform swings, states:

At the recent state election of 2010 South Australia has recorded another wrong winner election result. The Labor Party has won a majority—26—of the Assembly's 47 seats with only 48.5 per cent of the two party preferred result across the state.

As mentioned further down in the report:

The 2010 election in South Australia raises constitutional issues for the state—it is clearly a wrong winner election...

Having been elected to this place twice and gone through one redistribution, I know what the redistribution cycle tries to fix, but it is working on historic election results. I am still not certain how, in this modern day and age, trying to do that every four years, when clearly it is not working—as it has not worked until now—is appropriate. My personal opinion is that it would be far better if these things were done, perhaps, every two terms, but it does seem not to get the right results. So, I think some reform is needed there.

I note that the member for Croydon, the former attorney-general, was making comments wondering why these bogus how-to-vote cards, these 'put your family first' cards were used in the seats of Light, Mawson, Hartley and Morialta. This was a party that had come to the conclusion that it did not have 10 months ago, and some commentators did not have 10 months ago, when they thought that the Liberal Party was going to be a walkover. However, under the leadership of Isobel Redmond, we actually got 51.6 per cent of the vote and should have won the election.

It is interesting that some people were that horrified that they might lose their seat that they would resort to these tactics. The only reason the Labor Party is giving us for resorting to these tactics is that, allegedly, it is not illegal. I believe it to be immoral, if nothing else. At the end of the day, in those respective seats, it may not have made a difference. For all the outrage, and rightly so, that has come against those members who employed these tactics, you wonder why they bothered. I reflect on the Electoral Act 1985, part 2, section 112B—Certain descriptions not to be used:

- (1) A person must not publish or distribute an electoral advertisement or a how-to-vote card that identifies a candidate—
 - (a) by reference to the registered name of a registered political party or a composite name consisting of the registered names of 2 registered political parties; or
 - (b) by the use of a word or set of words that could not be, or may not be able to be, registered as the name, or as part of the name, of a political party under Part 6 because of the operation of [the relevant sections]...

From my reading of that—and I am not a lawyer, I come from a humble farming background—I would have thought that the how-to-vote cards would have been illegal. However, when it was put to the Electoral Commissioner, she deemed it not to be so, which I find very interesting to say the least.

I note that this bill inserts new Section 112C—Publication of matter regarding candidates. Subsection (1) states:

If, in any matter announced or published, or caused to be announced or published, by a person on behalf of any association, league, organisation or other body, it is—

- (a) claimed or suggested that a candidate in an election is associated with, or supports the policy or activities of, that association, league, organisation, or body; or

Further subsections boost the legislation to make it absolutely sure that this cannot happen again. It is interesting that members on the other side deem that, because it is not illegal, we can use this practice. It is a bit like, if we did not legislate which way to get out of bed in the morning, you might lean to the left or the right; and then we note some members shifting their allegiances on the other side as well. It seems to be that morality goes out the window and we will do what we think is best in our position.

It was interesting to note during the election the former attorney, the member for Croydon, alleging that a person did not exist, then we found out that he was one of his own constituents. That was very interesting reading in the paper and viewing on the media. It is interesting that many people seem to want to write blogs and remain anonymous for a whole range of reasons. We are in a new age. I mean, I am not a twitterer or a blogger—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Tweeter: the thing is Twitter but the verb is 'to tweet'.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I am always learning more in this house, but it just goes to show how keen I am to get involved in some of these new social media like Twitter or to tweet. Quite frankly, I think I have far better things to do with my time, but that is only my personal opinion. It is interesting and I recall the member for Reynell sounding the note of caution on this. So long as people are not making disingenuous remarks, I think the way we are heading with this legislation is the right way, but yes, I do agree, we do need to monitor it, as we do with everything that happens in our lives, especially with electronic mediums.

I mean, 20 years ago, in certain places the internet was in its early stages and, over time, it has reached the point where you can access your emails via your mobile phone. Now we have the introduction of iPads. The electronic world is just booming along. So, certainly we will need to keep a watch on the use of electronic technology, but I think that is the aim of this place: to keep a watch on all these things and all relevant matters to the state.

Just reflecting on the postal votes issue, it was certainly a major issue during the election, especially in country electorates, and my electorate is not that far from the big smoke. The boundaries of electorates start near Goolwa and at Monarto and then head out east towards Pinnaroo. Quite a few people contacted my office to say that they had not got their postal vote applications and then, down the track, some of these people received a letter from the electorate office asking why they had not voted. I think that is an issue with timing: from the time the writs are declared, postal vote applications go out.

I think the Electoral Commission really needs to change the way it is doing this. Instead of sending correspondence to the address it has listed, it needs to send it to the person's postal address. The postal address is what is vital here. I know there was some confusion with people getting their postal vote applications. I think there were twice as many postal vote applications as last time, from memory. The Electoral Commission needs to have a good look at how these are handled next time.

I noted the comments from the member for Stuart. People need to be timely and accurate in getting these applications out because, as he said, they get their mail only once a week and they may not get the opportunity to vote. The right to vote is something that we cherish in this country, and long may it be so. When handing out how-to-vote cards at polling booths, you occasionally have the odd person who thinks they are forced to vote. They roll up, jump out of their vehicle and say, 'Oh, we've got to vote again.' They should be thankful for that. It is what so many of our countrymen and women have died for overseas: the rights of democracy. I certainly respect what all those people have fought for.

In moving forward, I note that the select committee in the other place is underway. I hope it looks long and hard at all electoral matters—especially the matters being debated today—so that we can get a fair result in elections and so that we can get people operating in a just and moral way. You would like to think that some people would not need legislation to point them in the right direction, and I commend the Deputy Speaker (the member for Bright) for not taking up the offer of dodgy put-your-family-first cards.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (17:03): I want to make a few comments in relation to this bill. Let us not mess around with this issue. We have to actually look at this for what it is. If there was ever an admission of guilt by the Australian Labor Party, this is it. This is about bringing in a law to try to control the Labor Party's behaviour because, under its own admission, it cannot control itself. We saw a number of dodgy, shonky practices throughout the election campaign, but this practice started well and truly before the election campaign itself commenced, which was back in January, if my memory serves me correctly.

We saw this dodgy law and order card put out highlighting some issues by the ALP. It had the return mail address care of Isobel Redmond; however, the postal address was that of the ALP headquarters. Now, if that's not a shonky practice, I do not know what is. Then we saw it start through the election campaign. A letter went out to a number of people in our constituencies claiming that assistance for new mothers was going to be withdrawn. That message was absolutely fraudulent in its intent. I do not think the Liberal Party had ever discussed that as a change in policy at all, leading up to and including the election campaign. So, for the ALP to float those notions it was absolutely dodgy and deceitful. That was part of the practice leading up to election day.

What do we see on election day? We see at least four electorates running out these dodgy how-to-vote cards: the ALP in Light, Mawson, Morialta and Hartley. It was quite blatant that the ALP had set out to deceive. This was a deliberate attempt to deceive voters. The whole campaign run by the ALP was littered with deceit. People with dark glasses were standing there wearing shonky T-shirts and handing out how-to-vote cards purporting to be from another party. That occurred in four seats, as we know. Some anecdotal evidence was provided to me (as the Liberal candidate and then the re-elected member for Kavel) from somebody from one of the minor parties after the election that at one of the big booths in the electorate this activity was taking place in the electorate of Kavel.

I cannot stand here and say that it is a cold hard fact that that took place, but somebody reported to me that they saw that activity early in the morning of 20 March and then, obviously, something happened and that activity ceased. I want to put that out there as well. However, this exposes the Labor Party and its campaign for what it is. It puts in the glare of the spotlight what the ALP is when it comes to campaigning. There is no integrity, no morals and no honesty, because handing out these how-to-vote cards was a deliberate attempt to deceive. You cannot put any other inflection or inference on it at all.

The member for Bragg highlighted that, to your credit, Madam Deputy Speaker, you were one of the candidates who was running (and, I understand, the member for Newland was as well) and who were approached by the ALP campaign machine to run these dodgy how-to-vote cards on election day, and you refused. That is a sign of integrity and honesty of at least two ALP members—but not the four, because one lost. The member for Morialta lost her seat and we on this side of the chamber have a newly elected member for Morialta who is doing an outstanding job

in the parliament and for his constituency. It is an outstanding job that the newly elected member for Morialta is doing.

However, what do we see after they were exposed, after this deceit and dishonesty was exposed? From memory, the ALP person who was heading up the campaign basically said, 'Well, if we had the opportunity to do it again, we would do it again.' So, we see the government bringing in a law to stop the ALP from recidivism—if you like, from repeat offending. That says a lot about the ALP when it comes to campaigning. It plumbs to new depths of deception, a new level, a new low. It is my opinion that the ALP is the only party that can actually get there. What did we see after this deceit was exposed? We saw a couple of members put in the spotlight in the media and they said, 'We're sorry. We're really, truly sorry that this took place.' I might be a bit difficult to get on with sometimes and a little bit hard of heart, but I do not think that that apology was really made in—

Mr Gardner: Insincere.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Yes, insincere. The member for Morialta has explained it very well. It was an insincere apology, because really what does it say? The ends justify the means. It does not matter what the ALP needs to do to win, they will do it, and this is a glaring example of that. I see the member for Croydon has been an active participant in this debate, and what did we see take place in relation to the member for Croydon? He actually got pulled off the campaign. He got silenced because he had that embarrassing backflip in relation to the issues with posting comments on websites such as Adelaidenow and the like. The poor old beleaguered then attorney-general had to come out and admit he was wrong, and from that point on he was taken off the campaign by the campaign heavyweights.

It is only my interpretation, but as a result of that he was so incensed that the day after the election he decided to resign from the front bench and go to the back bench, and then on the same day say that he was not going to contest the next election in 2014. However, more recent events have brought about the circumstance that I think the member for Croydon might be reconsidering that initial announcement, but time will tell.

Let's not be fooled about this: the ALP took a conscious, measured, strategic approach to this sort of campaigning. It was not something that they dreamt up; it was something that they put in place in a measured, strategic way, and what we find ourselves debating this afternoon is a law to stop this activity occurring again. As I said, it says something very clear about the ALP: that it cannot trust itself to actually not engage in this type of activity again.

As I said, we saw people dressed up in dark glasses. The press reported that it flew them in from Queensland and so on so there was arguably some anonymity about these people, but they were certainly identified as—I think they were staffers.

Mr Gardner: Interstate ministerial staffers.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: Interstate ministerial staffers, flown in with dark glasses, a cap on and these dodgy T-shirts purporting to be other than ALP representatives. So that is the situation we find ourselves in: a pretty poor set of circumstances, in my opinion and the opinion of members on this side of the house. As I said, it puts this issue front and centre, as a glaring example of the ends justifying the means when it comes to ALP campaigning. Let's hope that this legislation will clean the mess up for what it is and so that we do not get a repeat occurrence of what took place leading up to and including 20 March.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (17:14): I will not speak at length, but I just want to say a few words in relation to what happened at the 2010 election.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, take your time, member for Schubert.

Mr VENNING: I have been around for 20 years and I have seen some skulduggery.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have 20 minutes; you should make use of them.

Mr VENNING: I reckon 97 per cent of the skulduggery has been on one side of the parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Indeed, and if you wish to talk about that you may.

Mr VENNING: Or higher than that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What I am saying, member for Schubert, is that you have 20 whole minutes.

Mr VENNING: In three elections out of the last six, the party that achieved more than half the vote did not win it, and that is a fact. I do note the work of the library's Jenny Newton-Farrelly and the paper she put out. I congratulate her on an excellent paper, which really does highlight a few salient facts, namely, what the heck is happening here in South Australia? Labor snuck in again with, and I quote the media, 'the more effective marginal seat campaigners'. Yes, that seems to be the case—well, at least that is the case on the surface. We now know of the dodgy how-to-vote cards and coloured T-shirts with people masquerading as someone from another party.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr VENNING: I am not aware of any of that. This is a deliberate act to mislead the voters, to win at all costs. It is a disgrace in a modern society that a major political party with history would get out and do that. As it turned out I do not think it changed the result terribly, but the fact is that they did it and there were critical people on the other side—yourself included, madam—who knew that this was happening. I just cannot believe that could happen.

This is a deliberate attempt to mislead the people of South Australia. We have already heard during the last two weeks of parliament how the people of South Australia were being misled by the Treasurer, who has not only misled the house but also, worse than that, I believe, he misled the people of South Australia because of the two major project cost blowouts. If these facts were known, if these people were straight and I am sure that if the Hon. Lynn Arnold was still the premier, this would not have happened. It did not happen under his watch, I can tell members, because the guy is credible and he is straight. It did not happen under him, nor did it happen under John Bannon. Just check back on the credibility of certain people and why this has been allowed to happen.

I do not believe that it should happen on either side of parliament. It is not right, it is not fair and it is not straight. People expect us in this place to play honourably. The people of South Australia, after all, are entitled to make a decision on straight, honest information, and the grand architect is poking his head through the door—that is the member for Croydon. I think that he is quite proud of it. He does not dispute it. He is quite proud of his record here, and it goes back many years.

As a person with some sort of Christian ethic (me and others), I cannot believe how people can allow their Christian ethic to get mixed up with the sort of shonky business that goes on here. You should not do that but, in this instance, I have difficulty splitting the two. Where is the government's credibility?

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me. I am sorry, member for Schubert. The member for Croydon.

The Hon. M.J. ATKINSON: I have just entered the chamber and it appeared that the member for Schubert was accusing me of being the grand architect of violations of the Electoral Act, or things that should be violations of the Electoral Act, and I ask him to withdraw that offensive innuendo. I am, of course, the grand architect of the electoral bill that passed the last parliament.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not know that those were his—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have not even had a chance to speak yet. Please sit down, member for Schubert, because people keep talking when clearly it is my turn.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I was just waiting for you. I do not think that the member for Schubert actually used those words, member for Croydon, and you yourself have pointed out that

you were not actually in the chamber at the time: you were sort of hovering outside, so, in this instance, I think that we shall move on. The member for Schubert.

Mr VENNING: Thank you. I did not say that. The honourable member's conscience has got to him, because he has revealed exactly the situation himself. I did not have to do that. Anyway, let it be; it is on the record, and I have said before what I think about the whole deal. Where is a government's credibility? I do congratulate the Attorney-General on attaining his position; he should have had it years ago. I honestly believe that this man is honest and straight, and I do not know how he fits with all this. No doubt it would not have happened in his electorate; it did not happen in mine, either.

Where is your credibility in relation to a matter such as this? Labor has a history of this over many years. In the 20 years I have been here we have seen it on many occasions. We have seen some very scurrilous activity. People have been personally vilified. One who comes to mind is the member for Florey at the time, Mr Sam Bass. Four days before the election there was a picture of him and a machine gun and the caption was: your member loves these. Then there was another photograph of him sitting on the beach at Nauru, of all places—he went there on parliamentary duty. The caption was: here is your member swanning on this beach at Nauru. If you knew Nauru, you would know there is no beach on Nauru: it is just one big quarry. That cost Sam Bass that election, and he contested it and won, but he did not get his seat back. You do not reverse the result.

This is the sort of dodgy stuff that has been going on for many years. I still see those pamphlets and they are horrific. They are designed to mislead and put a very bad light on people. Particularly in a society in which we force people to vote, people are undecided about who they are going to vote for and they are not really dedicated, because it is compulsory voting. They get there and see this sort of stuff and, suddenly, it turns them. There are some tacticians in this place who certainly know how to do that, and they do it very effectively, with this sort of result. I say that if you are going to do that you are not credible.

They have done it three times out of the last six and we have had a wrong result. I plead with the commissioner. I do not know how the commissioner draws boundaries, but I agree with the member for Hammond that it is wrong that we should redraw the boundaries after every election. I say that at least we could change that and I think we could agree that it should be after every second election.

I have been savaged by boundary changes. In fact, I recall my seat in an interim report disappeared altogether. I can recall the day I was with Dale Baker in a pine forest in the South-East and it was the day the boundaries would be announced. We were having a cup of coffee and Dale had his phone in his hand and the phone rang and he was talking away and he started to stir his coffee with his phone and I thought, 'Something's a bit off.' We were in the middle of the Tarpeena pine forest. Members will know how cool Dale is, and I thought, 'Something has upset him.' He said, 'You are going to get a phone call, Ivan.'

About two minutes later my phone rang and, sure as eggs, Custance, as it was then, had gone. It had disappeared altogether. I had nowhere to go. So, I have been savaged. Anyway, as it turned out, thanks to the workers and supporters of the Liberal Party and a good lawyer like the Hon. Robert Lawson, and others, we created a new seat—the best seat of all—Schubert. Again, from adversity, the phoenix rose to become this beautiful seat I have now. I was very upset at the time. I was pretty upset—'devastated' would be the word—and look what happened.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me for one moment, member for Schubert. Attorney?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am very reluctant to interfere with the honourable member's trip down memory lane. It is a great yarn and I think, if he is really quick about it (that is, finishing what he is about to say), there will be a grievance, possibly—you never know, there could be—where he will be able to give us a lot more information about that topic. I was becoming very interested in it but, unfortunately, not in the context of the bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is possible that the Churchillian nature of the member for Schubert's wilderness years are not exactly germane to the matter we are meant to be discussing. I can see your fingers, member for Schubert. Yes, carry on.

Mr VENNING: Thank you. I will get back to the point. I was distracted and got off on a side track. We need to consider introducing a system where a party that gets 50 per cent of the vote, plus one, should govern. We have to do that. I know the German system works well, that is, a party

that gets 50 per cent, if it does not govern, has members at large and they put them in until that party has enough to govern.

The Hon. J.R. Rau: Have you got that on the *Notice Paper*?

Mr VENNING: Yes. That is exactly what we need to do, because we cannot have this result where the whole state now is targeted in four or five marginal seats. That is where all the emphasis is and that is where all the money is spent, and it is wrong. No wonder we cannot get a new hospital in the Barossa Valley. Why? Because there are no votes there for the Labor government. To the credit of the previous Liberal government, we got a lot of things in my electorate—purely because I had to work hard and use skulduggery and get heavy with several ministers who were friends of mine—Olsen included. Otherwise, my seat misses out both ways, with a Liberal government or a Labor government. We have to change the system to take away the emphasis from marginal seats, and we should do it before I leave this place because it is crazy. Why don't we go down the path of random ballot papers?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I have a point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker. We are dealing with a relatively confined question about two matters. I know the honourable member is interested in these matters—and fair enough—but he has put a matter on the *Notice Paper* which deals with this particular issue. I am sure when that is debated he will be able to give us a lot more information about those topics, but they are not strictly relevant to this matter—or vaguely relevant, to be fair.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No point of order, but the vague relevance criterion is probably a good one, member for Schubert. Let us get back to the vaguely relevant.

Mr VENNING: I congratulate you, Madam Deputy Speaker, for deliberately saying no to the dodgy T-shirt brigade that masqueraded as another party. It is unbelievable that they did that, particularly when you see what was written on the T-shirts. Good on you for doing that. Also, a shonky letter was sent out with Isobel Redmond's face and credentials on it, and the details and address on it of course were that of the Labor Party. I thought that was outrageous. That is not even smart funny.

Ms Chapman: It's desperate stuff.

Mr VENNING: It is desperate stuff, and it is terrible. The fact is that the government can rise or fall on four or five marginal seats, and I think we need to change that. How hypocritical is it that the government now introduces legislation to outlaw what it did—not what we did but what it did? It is really a bit rich. We saw huge swings against many long-term ministers in this place, purely because they did not do dodgy work there—and they did not do much work anyway. There was huge a swing of up to 20 per cent in Adelaide. When you see the swings across the state you must question what happened. Why was it so? Who was the architect of all this? Did the Premier or the Deputy Premier know? No wonder people do not trust politicians. In the light of this, where did the dodgy documents come from? We discussed that matter earlier.

We must look at what we do here. I certainly support any legislation that tidies it up. We should not need to do it all. I think it is unnecessary legislation, but if we are going to have dodgy parties then we must have legislation to stop them. It is a bit rich that they were the big offender. I believe that the South Australian people in the 2010 election got absolutely hoodwinked, because 51.6 per cent of them did want a change of government, 51.6 per cent of them did not want the government's plans for the Royal Adelaide Hospital—ask the former member for Adelaide—and certainly did not want the government's sports stadium scheme. It is an interesting time, and I support the legislation.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Attorney-General, Minister for Justice, Minister for Tourism) (17:28): It is a great pleasure to bring this phase of the debate to an end. First, I thank the member for Fisher. The member for Fisher indicated that he did have an amendment in relation to this matter.

I understand from speaking to the member for Fisher that the object of the amendment—which, I must say, puzzled me and I think, also, the member for Bragg was not entirely clear about it because we were discussing where it might be leading—was his concern that people might be misrepresenting themselves as being local when they were not. I think that is a matter that can be cured by far more direct means than compulsorily putting their names and addresses out in the public domain, because there may be good reasons why they should not be. I thank the honourable member for reviewing his position and withdrawing that amendment, which should make what comes after this hopefully a little simpler.

Secondly, I thank the member for Bragg and the other speakers for the opposition who, amongst saying a great many other things, have indicated that they wish to support the bill. I do not want to lose sight of the good things amongst the other bits and pieces. I appreciate the support offered by members of the opposition. I must say that I lament that support was given at such length and so many times but, nonetheless, support is support and when it comes one should be grateful. I wish to make a couple of remarks about some of the matters raised, in particular matters raised by the member for Bragg who, I must say, thoroughly covered all the issues addressed by any of the members before others, basically, returned to it.

The first question is putting this in some context. Before the election there was an issue about the AdelaideNow website. Both the member for Bragg and the former attorney made public statements about this issue, and it was clear that both parties were committed to dealing with it after the election, whoever won. That is one part of this. The second part is the question about the so-called 'dodgy' how-to-vote cards. That matter arose on election day; it was the subject of controversy, and an undertaking was given by the returning government early on in the piece that it would be dealt with. I think it is important for members opposite to understand that from the time I became Attorney I was committed to delivering on these promises as quickly and as effectively as possible.

The history of the matter is that on 6 May—which was the day that parliament resumed—I gave a notice of motion indicating that these two matters would be the subject of a bill that would be brought forward the following week. On Tuesday 11 May there was a press release about it, and the bill was introduced on Thursday 12 May. So, in no way was this legislation responsive to the moves in the upper house; indeed, if we were to analyse it in terms of a time line, what happened there was that the Hon. Stephen Wade initially introduced a motion on 12 May, which was not subsequently carried until 26 May with amendments.

That actually came after what we foreshadowed here, so it is in no way any sort of reaction from the government to the upper house inquiry. Quite the contrary: by the time line it seems that the upper house inquiry postdates it. Whether that was a reaction to it or not I do not know. In any event, these two provisions were deliberately chosen to be brief and to the point, because undertakings had been given; first, before the election by both parties, and, secondly, with both parties expressing their unhappiness about the how-to-vote cards issue after the election. It seemed to me that the sooner we got these things into the parliament and passed the better.

The second thing I would like to say is that I expect, in the fullness of time, that the Electoral Commissioner will provide a report to the parliament and the government about the way this last election was conducted, and it would not be at all unusual for that report to contain some remarks about things that the Electoral Commissioner regards as areas that might be looked at for improvement or change, or whatever.

I think I made it clear before, but I would like to repeat it: it seems to me that when that is received, that would be the appropriate time for us to review what the Electoral Commissioner has to say. If, in so doing, other people have contributions to make—for example, the members for Stuart and Flinders both talked about problems with postal voting, particularly for people in remote areas—that sort of thing could be taken into account in a broader review.

What I am concerned about is that we will have this piece of legislation—which is quite discrete and which everyone agrees with—perhaps held up in a parliamentary committee of the upper house, which will inquire into this but not into the matters which, in due course, will be subject of comment, perhaps, by the Electoral Commissioner. I think the sensible way forward would be to get these two pieces of simple legislative change fixed and on the books—so from my point of view I will have discharged my responsibility to make good on an election promise—but also incorporate any opinions, questions or matters of other broader reforms to the Electoral Act at a time when the Electoral Commissioner herself has advised all of us about what she thinks should happen. As I said, that goes not only for the remarks of the member Fisher, who identified a number of matters of concern to him, but also for those of the members of Flinders and Stuart, who raised very important points about postal voting which need to be considered.

The only other matter I would refer to, and I guess I probably should not, but the member for Bragg, in making some very complimentary remarks about the current opposition candidate for the federal seat of Adelaide, took a little trip down recent electoral history and spoke about things that were going on in the seat of Enfield in the last election. It is true that the then candidate for Enfield put out some material in the seat saying that the sitting member had described himself in terms of: 'I usually sit here...not really expecting to have to say anything.'

Unfortunately, neither Mr Westley, nor those who work with him, appreciate the concept of irony. To fill out 'irony' a little bit, they might care to have a look at the *Hansard* of Thursday 7 April 2005. All they have to do is go on to the next couple of sentences to see that, if I do say so myself, it was one of my better efforts. I say:

I usually sit here quietly, not really expecting to have to say anything. Then something marvellous happens, such as the member for Bright—

the former member for Bright—

making another one of his magnificent contributions on the subject of the national electricity market, and I have to say that I always enjoy listening to the member for Bright when he talks on the subject of electricity.

The Hon. Peter Lewis then said:

It is shocking, isn't it?

And everyone agreed with that. I then made the point, relating to the then member for Bright:

What a magnificent thing to hide behind: a brazen outrageous attack on something of which you are, in fact, the author. Who else but the member for Bright could conceive such an audacious plan and put it into place? But [there it is] he has done it again.

I did not think that was a bad contribution, and quite accurate in respect of him. It just shows you that lifting little bits out and moving them around can produce odd results. Member for Bragg, it is annoying to have these things quoted back at us, I know, but in the end, what does it matter? If they are accurate, so be it.

The only thing I would say—again, in relation to the question of what is a fair and accurate representation—is that this is a broader question. The member for Fisher has touched on it, to some extent, in his question about this fellow claiming to be a local councillor when, in fact, he was not a councillor in the member for Fisher's area. The candidate in Enfield claimed to be a third generation resident of Enfield, and in another publication, fourth generation. It turns out that until about 18 months before the election he lived in Blackwood, or Happy Valley, or somewhere.

So, these things happen quite often. I can understand why people get annoyed with them, but this is something that we will need to consider after the Electoral Commissioner has brought forward her report. She has had to listen to all of the complaints from everybody throughout the whole of this election about what everyone thinks is misrepresentation or unfair. She is in the best position to give us an overall view of what sort of complaints were there.

I can indicate to members, and others may have had this problem, that I had material which had been produced two years before the election which simply had my name and my office address and phone number on it which was seen during the election period. The material had been produced years before but it did not have the postal address. Members would be aware that when material is to be sitting around the place it has to have a postal address, not a PO box, and so forth. These are some of the requirements.

The only point I make is that the way the laws are presently standing, you could put out a calendar now, for example, and if a silly interpretation was taken of it, in four years' time if that calendar is still on someone's fridge and it has a PO box for you and not your address, somebody might complain about it. Obviously, it would be silly for the Electoral Commissioner to waste her time on that, but these are little matters which will need to be finetuned after the Electoral Commissioner has had a chance to digest all of the material.

If I can just finish up by saying what I started to say. I appreciate the support of the member for Fisher and his withdrawal of the amendment. I understand why he put in the amendment. I have sympathy for the proposition he is putting, but I do not think this is the time or the opportunity for that to be addressed.

I thank all the members of the opposition for their support, and I would simply say to them, to the extent that my wishes in the matter make any difference, can we please just get this legislation passed? Do whatever you wish to do or need to do through your colleagues in the other place in that committee, but let us look at a proper comprehensive review of the legislation after the Electoral Commissioner has had an opportunity to provide a report, because, after all, the Electoral Commissioner is an impartial individual who should be in the best position to at least give us some neutral guidance about these matters, and let us then have a debate about whatever you wish to have a debate about.

These matters are quite discrete. They are matters about which there is no dispute between the government and it would appear the opposition. I appreciate the support of the opposition and I hope these matters go through quickly, and, in due course, as I said, if a broader debate about the electoral act needs to occur, then, by all means, let it occur, but that is a matter that I think logically should await the report from the Electoral Commissioner.

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

At 17:42 the house adjourned until Wednesday 30 June 2010 at 11:00.