

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 21 May 2014

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **SPEAKER'S RULING**

**The SPEAKER (11:02):** Yesterday, the member for Morialta raised a point of order on the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion to the effect:

Point of order, sir. I think you need to assist the minister. She is reading an answer to a Dorothy Dixier. It was actually a question raised by the member for Morphett. It was quite specific but she is going nowhere near.

I have reviewed the *Hansard*, and the minister's answer was entirely germane; therefore, the point of order was bogus, and I accordingly call the member for Morialta to order and warn him.

### *Bills*

#### **ADMINISTRATION AND PROBATE (REMOVAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR SURETY) AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (11:02):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

This Bill amends the *Administration and Probate Act 1919* to implement the first set of reforms based upon the recommendations of the South Australian Law Reform Institute in the Final Report 2: Sureties' guarantees for letters of administration.

This Bill needs little explanation. It repeals sections 18 and 31 of the Act and amends sections 58, 66 and 67 of the Act, removing from the Act the requirements for, and references to, sureties' guarantees.

In 2011 the South Australian Law Reform Institute was asked to identify the areas of succession law that were most in need of review, to conduct a review of each of those areas and to recommend reforms. The Institute's Advisory Board identified seven topics for review and established a Succession Law Reference Group. One of the topics was whether the South Australian statutory requirement for sureties' guarantees to be provided before some intestate estates can be administered should be retained or modified. This requirement has been criticised as obstructing the prompt administration of deceased estates.

An Issues Paper, released by the Institute in 2013, explored the concerns about the requirement for sureties' guarantees. Submissions on the Issues Paper overwhelmingly supported the removal of this redundant requirement for sureties' guarantees because of—

- the unnecessary cost and time involved; and
- the difficulty in obtaining a surety; and
- the fact there is only infrequent recourse to sureties; and
- the degree of protection afforded; and
- the fact that they are required only when an administrator is appointed, and not when there is an executor.

Laws requiring a form of security against maladministration in South Australia were first enacted in the *Administration and Probate Act 1919*, which required every applicant to provide an administration bond. The Act was amended in 1978, following recommendations by the South Australian Law Reform Committee, and further amended in 2003 to replace the requirement for an administration bond with a requirement for a guarantee. The 2003 amendment also permitted the Supreme Court to dispense with the requirement for a surety guarantee where satisfied that it is 'beneficial or expedient to do so', require a further or additional guarantee or reduce the amount guaranteed. That has remained the current law.

In practice the Court, in almost all cases, takes advantage of the amendment and either dispenses with the requirement altogether or reduces the amount of the guarantee and sometimes appoints an additional administrator. There is no evidence that in South Australia anyone has suffered loss from an administrator acting wrongly or that anyone has enforced a surety's guarantee.

Although there are convincing arguments for doing more than simply removing the requirements for sureties' guarantees, the Institute recommends that in the interests of effective administration of deceased estates, this reform should not wait upon the preparation of other amendments for reform which are more complex and will need careful attention to detail.

I commend the Bill to Members.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Administration and Probate Act 1919*

4—Repeal of section 18

This clause repeals section 18 of the principal Act with the effect of removing the requirement for a surety to be provided before the sealing of administration under section 17.

5—Repeal of section 31

This clause repeals section 31 of the principal Act with the effect of removing the requirement for a person to whom administration is granted to provide a surety in certain circumstances.

6—Amendment of section 58—Proceedings to compel account

This clause deletes section 58(4) of the principal Act and is consequential on the repeal of sections 18 and 31.

7—Amendment of section 66—Effect of delivery etc to Public Trustee

This clause removes a reference to 'surety' and is consequential on the repeal of sections 18 and 31.

8—Amendment of section 67—Judge may dispense wholly or partially with compliance with section 65

This clause removes a reference to 'surety' and is consequential on the repeal of sections 18 and 31.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

#### *Address in Reply*

#### **ADDRESS IN REPLY**

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 20 May 2014.)

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:04):** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I do congratulate you on your elevation (or re-elevation, I guess) to the honoured position of Speaker of this house. For those readers of *Hansard*—and I know there are many beyond the walls of this place—the motion reads in part:

May it please Your Excellency—

1. We, the members of the House of Assembly, express our thanks for the speech with which Your Excellency was pleased to open parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to the matters placed before us.
3. We will earnestly pray for the Divine blessing on the proceedings of the session.

It gives me great pleasure to support the motion to adopt the draft address for this, the opening of the 53<sup>rd</sup> parliament. In June last year I had the privilege of being a delegate from this parliament, to the mother of all parliaments in Westminster, and I attended a seminar on parliamentary procedure.

It really gave me the opportunity to view all the pomp and ceremony and importance of what we do here and recognise the significance and the traditions that are involved in a parliament. That

is highlighted, I think, on the opening day. It was the second opening day that I have attended, having been re-elected in the 2014 election, so it is my second Address in Reply.

I was very pleased to be re-elected as the member for Flinders. It was a very pleasing result for me personally. This is public knowledge and obviously has been well noted, but I managed to achieve 72 per cent of the primary vote in the seat of Flinders and, sadly, the Labor primary vote was only around 15 per cent in Flinders. I polled 79.2 two-party preferred—an excellent result, not just for me personally but for the Liberal Party as a whole. I will thank the constituents of Flinders, not just those who voted for me but those who I will continue to represent, which will be all the people of Flinders.

I would like to thank my supporters and the Liberal Party members, particularly for their assistance on polling day. They do a lot of work right throughout each and every year, of course, but election day is especially challenging and it is challenging logistically because, as you would be aware, Mr Speaker, the seat of Flinders is extensive. I think it is in excess of 900 kilometres from one end to the other—not as large as either Stuart or Giles, of course, but we come in a close third, I think.

As a result of that we have 27 polling booths across the seat of Flinders—four in the city of Port Lincoln and then the rest beyond that, including one mobile booth which operates out in the Far West and takes in such places as Penong and the Aboriginal communities at Scotdesco and Yalata. What the Liberal Party members in Flinders and our supporters do is man those booths, and the organisation of that falls with the local branches and also our local SEC. As I said, it is quite a task, logistically, but we managed to do it. We managed to man each and every booth and hand out how-to-vote cards on that particular day. I do not think city members sometimes realise the challenges that distance create for us, not just on election day, but in our everyday lives as local members.

I would also like to congratulate and thank my parliamentary colleagues including Geoff Greene, our state director, and his staff at the Liberal Party secretariat. It was a hive of industry during the campaign and they had lots to do, obviously. It was managed very effectively and very efficiently, and I will actually say publicly thank you to Geoff for visiting Port Lincoln just last week and speaking with our local branch in Port Lincoln. It is always a wonderful opportunity to have people from head office come and talk to the grassroots.

I am also going to thank my electorate staff who have been with me for the last four years and, very kindly, have decided to stay with me: Jacqui, of course, my office manager; Aimee, who has been with me for those whole four years, is in the Port Lincoln office and I wish her well in the next 12 months because she is taking maternity leave in July/August to have baby number three so we wish her well for that; Simon here in Parliament House; Dianne in Ceduna, who does an extraordinary effort and holds the fort often on her own up there. I get to Ceduna when I can but, of course, much is left to her. Also Myriam Hyde who does some work for me in my Port Lincoln office and is president of our SEC. They all do a fantastic job and have been a fantastic support to me. As all members in this place would know, we cannot do our jobs well without good staff, so I thank them for that.

I say congratulations to all the new MPs on both sides. We have heard all of their maiden speeches and you will all be relieved that that is done. I am sure it is a good thing to have out of the way. It is an auspicious moment and I say well done to everyone. I mention particularly those on our side—those on the other side will understand me not dwelling too much on their new members, although I look forward to a working relationship with my electorate neighbour, the member for Giles. In fact, we have already had a couple of conversations about a number of things that impact on the Eyre Peninsula as a whole.

We welcome aboard the member for Hartley. At the age of just 27, I congratulate the member for Hartley. It is an extraordinarily young age to be elected to any parliament, to a place like this, so I congratulate him. I understand he has a legal background and has done ample community service, he has even been a local councillor at that tender age. This is the last time I will mention his age, I promise, but I think it is worth noting that somebody so young can be so capable as to hold a place in this house.

We also welcome aboard the member for Bright who has also done much community service. He is the national director of the Duke of Edinburgh Awards in Australia, has been the Deputy Mayor of the City of Marion and was, in fact, a public servant for a time, employed in the Department of the

Premier and Cabinet. Once again, he is still under the age of 30 at 29. So, welcome aboard to the member for Bright. I am sure we will get used to that lilt, member for Bright. He tells me these days his accent is more Irish than Scottish, but I will have to take his word on that.

Yesterday, we heard the member for Mount Gambier give his maiden address. He started his life as a school teacher and he and his family have been life-long residents of the South-East. He has been an educator for a big part of his life, but he has also been involved with business—so a resounding win there. I guess as a traditionally conservative seat we always knew the votes were there, we just had to get them and I congratulate the member for Mount Gambier on being able to do that.

We also heard the member for Mitchell speak yesterday. He is a former journo and TV presenter—I think he undersold himself a little bit during his opening address, but I did enjoy it. He has been a volunteer and active in local school and sporting communities. I particularly noted in the member for Mitchell's maiden speech his ties to the Eyre Peninsula. He has some roots there: both his parents were Port Lincoln people. His father (who I met for the first time yesterday) and my father played football against each other in the same little town of Cummins 50 years ago, he tells me. They both remember each other, so that is kind of nice. I think I am right in saying that his wife has connections in Ceduna, so strong Eyre Peninsula connections and I look forward to working with him on that.

In his maiden speech yesterday, the new member for Schubert spoke of his family business in the important sector, the vital sector of foods. He has been the chair of the local food industry association, Barossa Fine Foods, and he also mentioned that he has been president of the Young Liberals. The Hon. Andrew McLachlan—who, of course, we have not heard but he joins us in the other place on our side—has a background in law, financial services and in the area of superannuation, banking and finance.

Welcome aboard to you all and to those on the other side, I think the place will be better for your input. It is an incredible honour to be elected to this place. It is also an incredible honour to be re-elected and I wish you all well in four years' time. It is also a very emotional time and I was pleased that many of you were able to have family and friends come along. I think the diverse professional backgrounds of our new Liberal members, and they are diverse—they come from all walks of life and all parts of the state—bode well for an invigorated and energetic parliamentary Liberal Party. I have to say it is in contrast to the members and the candidates we see put up by the Labor Party, which have been historically and continue to be from a union secretary political-staffer genre. It is a very small pool. I think with our extended pool we have talent and we have enthusiasm that will make a great contribution.

It is an honour for me to continue to represent the resilient and hardworking people of the Eyre Peninsula on the West Coast. I have spoken many times about my electorate—the electorate of Flinders—as we all do. We all think our electorate is the best one, but I have no doubt in saying that Flinders is, in fact, the best electorate in the state. We have a community and business and regional economy based on agriculture and seafood, and strong primary production sectors. Tourism is also important, and we have been talking about mining for a long time but, of course, it has only ever reached the exploration stage. Whether it will go any further or not I do not know, but there is still a lot of activity on the exploration front at least and I think people need to understand how this works.

The Crown retains the mineral rights. The state owns the mineral wealth of this jurisdiction, and freehold landowners own their property and the tenure is known as fee simple which, in fact, gives them the top few inches of dirt. It is not absolute ownership and I think people from time to time forget that or at least are not prepared to accept it. What it means is that those mining explorers who gain access to tenements have an obligation to both the government and the people of South Australia to explore that tenement. If they do not, it is taken away from them.

I would also like to congratulate the member for Dunstan on being re-elected as the state parliamentary leader of the Liberal Party; my congratulations to him and to the member for Bragg on her re-election as the deputy leader. I look forward to working with them. They were both elected unopposed, and they obviously have our full support. I look forward to serving them. I am also pleased to be in the role of parliamentary secretary to the Leader of the Opposition, which I will enjoy doing and make the most of that opportunity.

I want to talk about the election a little bit because the remarks I hear from within the community and the electorate of Flinders is absolute disappointment that the current government has been returned and to a certain extent they are nonplussed. I would like to endorse some of the remarks made by the member for Davenport during his Address in Reply as they echo the sentiments of many of my constituents. Many people have expressed to me their dismay that the fairness test is not clearly being adhered to when you have a situation where 53 per cent of the vote goes to a party and it does not allow that political party to form government. I know we are talking about this time and time again, but it is important. It has angered people in my part of the world that such an outcome is possible in a modern vibrant democracy.

The member for Davenport said something else that resonated with me and that was that the people we are meant to serve—the voters—are not being served by the current rules. I do not think any fair-minded person could disagree with that. This parliament is meant to be representative of the communities that we serve and right now the collective democratic will of the majority of people in South Australia is being ignored. A much quoted figure has been that 92,000 more votes came to the Liberal Party than the Labor Party; that is a telling figure, but it is not the most important one. More important to me is that only one in three people across this entire state voted Labor, only one in three, and yet they were able to form government. Something is wrong.

I might also talk a little bit more about the election just gone in March because in one particular electorate I believe political campaigning reached a new low and that was in the seat of Elder where there was a campaign launched by the Labor Party against our candidate, Carolyn Habib, which I believe was unwarranted; it was deliberate and it was incredibly offensive. It was offensive because Carolyn Habib was offended. Sadly, and this is a poor reflection on everybody concerned, it worked; that is the extraordinary thing. I think we all need to take a breath, step back from this and remind ourselves that everybody in this place has come from somewhere else to be here. Remember that always.

Debt is still a concern. We will talk more about that in the Supply Bill, but I have heard our leader say this, and it is correct: businesses talk about profit and loss; government talks about surplus and deficit—it is exactly the same thing. When a business runs at a loss, debt increases. When government runs a deficit, debt increases. It is that simple. What is hard about that? Why do people not get it?

I am pleased to see that the government has a new-found interest in regional communities and regional affairs. We on this side have established a Regional Affairs Committee, and we will ensure that the job of creating prosperity in the regions is firmly back on the agenda. We could be slightly cynical and suggest that Labor have only just rediscovered the regions. The proof will be in the pudding as to how well they support them. Of course, we all know that 50 per cent of this state's exports come from the regions, and that may well increase. I think it is quite likely that more and more we will see an increasing percentage of our exports coming from the regional areas.

The big challenge, I think, for our export industries is remaining competitive, and it is a challenge under the current business environment. We compete with every other producer in the world—we have to remember that. We do not work in isolation; we work in a global financial framework. I compete as a grower against the growers in Canada, the USA and Europe. If we are constrained by government policy settings, we are going to be less competitive. It is all about the cost of doing business. If it is too expensive to do business in South Australia, we become uncompetitive and we do not survive.

As this parliament goes on, I will talk more about the issues confronting the seat of Flinders. I have spoken about water already in a grievance last week. There are challenges around the sustainability of the resource and the supply of water on Eyre Peninsula, and I do not think that the pressure is going to come off the basins until we source some new water. Of course, the previous Labor government way back in 2002 indicated that they would be prepared to build a desal plant somewhere on the West Coast. We have not seen that happen.

My intention as the local member is to keep driving for a change in water policy within this government, because I think the opportunity for the Eyre Peninsula community to grow is going to be really constrained sometime in the very near future. In fact, SA Water have themselves identified that demand is going to exceed supply in the next four to six years; it is only four years away. I think that is one of the big challenges, and it is a matter of some urgency.

As I said, we have been drawing our water supply mostly from the southern basins, which are underground lenses to the west and south of Port Lincoln; 85 per cent of our water comes from that rechargeable, renewable resource. However, the consensus is that those basins have been overextracted, and the findings of the parliamentary inquiry by the Natural Resources Committee last year found that that was a part of the reason for the drop in water levels within those basins. They also attributed some of the drop in water levels to climate change. There is much debate about that but, incredibly, I do not think there is going to be any change under the current situation.

Something that has been in the mix for a while, but has just come to my attention again, is the coastal conservation zone. Way back when minister Holloway was minister for planning, he decided that it would be a good thing to have a coastal conservation zone right around the coastline of Eyre Peninsula, all the way from Whyalla to the Western Australian border. I guess we were a trial in this sort of situation, the idea being that local councils (and nine or 10 are involved) would implement a coastal conservation zone. That really was that part of the coast that was vulnerable, exposed and subject to flooding. It possibly could be vulnerable to sea level rise sometime in the future.

The councils are at various stages of implementing this coastal conservation zone much to the chagrin of the local landowners, I have to say. A lot of the coastal land around Eyre Peninsula is farmland, a lot of it is owned under freehold title, and it has come as quite a surprise to the owners to find that their freehold land is within a coastal conservation zone. Of course, that means they can continue to farm and operate as they have been; however, there is now not the opportunity to do anything else with that land—for example, subdividing, which some had intended to do to fund their retirement, and there is nothing wrong with that.

Of course, the situation changes and, even as recently as last night, the District Council of Streaky Bay had a submission night for that, so it will be interesting to see where that goes. I think that security of tenure is a real issue for me right across the state. I think freehold country does not necessarily mean what it used to and people feel nervous about their tenure.

As to infrastructure, I have mentioned water already, but country roads right throughout this state have been run down. This country, this state, is carried on the back of a truck. It is imperative that we have good roads, good transport corridors, that are adequate for doing business and carting freight.

One of the real challenges for governments in this state will be the delivery of health services and education services, not just in the city but out in the country as well, where distances are vast, populations are small, and they are real challenges—I understand that. I am hoping that we can work in a bipartisan way to solve some of those problems. We have had a recent hospital spend in the hospital of Whyalla, Ceduna has just had a rebuild at some \$30 million, and Port Lincoln is about to have its rebuild finished at about \$40 million.

Our base hospitals have been upgraded and they provide wonderful service. My concern is always about the smaller hospitals that lie in between and how we are able to maintain the services to the local community. It is imperative that we maintain those hospitals. I have to say that people in a small country town have a sense of ownership towards their hospital and the health service. We need to understand that, recognise it and support them in that.

I want to refer back to the Governor's speech where he made mention of the government's strategic priorities and included 'for South Australia to become an affordable place to live'. We would argue that the current government has not managed to achieve that, given that we are the highest taxed state in the nation. State taxes, such as payroll tax and land tax, are exorbitant and a dampener on doing business, and that flows through. Not everybody has to pay payroll tax, not everybody has to pay land tax, but many do and there is a trickle-down effect that ultimately makes this not just an expensive state to do business in but an expensive state to live in.

Creating a vibrant city is a noble priority. Sometimes I walk down Leigh Street or Peel Street on my way to catching the bus home after a sitting day, and it is great to see those restaurants open but, seriously, what percentage of the population of South Australia goes to Leigh Street or Peel Street? A minuscule percentage, I would suggest. It is lovely for those people who can, but there is more to life than a vibrant city. As to bicycle lanes, I see more of them around the city. In June last year I was driving home from this place late at night when it was raining and dark, and I spotted three

cyclists over two nights riding in the dark without reflectors and wearing dark clothing. In many ways, I believe the cyclists are their own worst enemy much of the time.

Realising the benefits of the mining boom for all: there was great disappointment when the Olympic Dam expansion did not go ahead. It was a disappointment. We had spent a good part of 2010, I think—it might have been 2011—discussing the Olympic Dam expansion in this place, and unfortunately BHP chose not to go ahead with that. Exploration continues, but as far as the mining boom goes, we are not seeing evidence of that in this state. I think some of the problem is that we have some valuable resources but they are very deep below the earth's surface and in many cases it is prohibitively expensive and difficult to get that ore body out.

Safe communities, healthy neighbourhoods is aspirational stuff. I can tell you that I live in a town where I do not have to lock the car and the kids can walk to school. That is a safe community; that is a healthy neighbourhood. It is aspirational stuff. It would be nice if we could achieve that, but the reality is I think people are becoming more concerned and feeling less safe in their towns and their suburbs around this state.

Premium food and wine from our clean environment: I spent 30 years as a farmer and this is a wonderful aspirational target. The Governor also suggested that we will protect the pristine environment from which our premium food and wine is sourced. Well, of course, pristine is a word that is bandied around and often misused, I think. Pristine in the true sense means unsullied or untouched. Of course, most of the environment that we produce from is not that. It is not unsullied, it is not untouched and therefore it is not pristine; it has actually been developed. It has been developed, it has been managed and it is managed so that it is productive and sustainably productive.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** It is pristine compared to China.

**Mr TRELOAR:** It is pristine compared with China; I take that on board. I have been fortunate enough to visit China a couple of times over the last 20 years and I do agree, member for Newland; you are quite right. I think the point is that we do not have that pristine environment here, but it is a landscape that we can manage, manage well, and manage sustainably. That is the way to continue the production of our premium food and wine.

Every chance for every child is aspirational and very difficult, once again, to achieve when you have generational unemployment in places like the northern suburbs. I hear tell that there are families up there where there are three generations of unemployment and the outlook is pretty bleak. Youth unemployment in the northern suburbs is around 40 per cent. The extraordinary thing is, they keep electing Labor members of parliament. There is generational unemployment, there is 40 per cent unemployment amongst the youth and yet they keep voting Labor; nothing changes. What is going on? If anyone can answer that, I would be a happy man.

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

**An honourable member:** See, I am listening.

**Mr TRELOAR:** You are listening, yes. I think we have covered pretty well all the state's strategic priorities. In closing, I only have a couple of minutes left, Madam Deputy Speaker. It seems to me that—and this is just a comment and opinion—good government is like a good umpire in a footy match. You do not notice they are there. Unfortunately, we have got ourselves to a point in this state where the tentacles of government have spread into every single part of everyday life, and I would suggest that we do notice very much they are there.

A lot of the time they are in the way. You just talk to our farmers or our fishermen about how much of a burden this government is placing on them. It almost seems that the tentacles of government have extended into every single facet of our everyday life, in an effort to create some sort of socialist utopia, which is really a rather outdated notion, I think. The best thing in many instances that the government could do, regardless of their seven strategic priorities, is actually get out of the way.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (11:33):** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. Can I start off by extending my

congratulations to you in your new role. You are a great asset to the chamber and you look entirely the part in that setting.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No big pearls.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** There are no pearls presently, but that is the only—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** They will never happen.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** No.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I need a big brooch.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Madam Deputy Speaker, if you are alluding to another person in another place, I can assure you that I think you have a far sweeter temperament than that other person.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** I would also like to congratulate the Governor on his speech, which I thought was a very helpful opening to the parliamentary session, and I congratulate all the new members who are entering parliament for the first time. I recall when I first came here I wondered what the hell had happened to me. I imagine that a number of you are probably experiencing similar emotions.

For what it is worth, can I just say that the parliament is a place where you will find, over time, that collectively we have more in common than that which separates us and, even though there are bits of theatre here and there, some of the great work of this parliament is actually done on committees. It has been my experience—and I know that the member for Ashford is the chair of probably the premier committee, in my humble opinion—that great work is done on committees, and it is a great opportunity for members, first, to learn about things that many of us would never have known the first thing about but for being on a committee, and, secondly, to have the opportunity of getting to know your colleagues on both sides of the political divide in a context of informality without there being any particular aggro attached to it. That is a constructive thing.

I say to all members, particularly the new members, that you will find that, in terms of discharging your parliamentary duties, members of the government, in particular the ministry, are here to assist you as much as people on this side of the chamber. I think you will find that members of parliament of whatever persuasion are treated with respect and assisted as much as possible. As far as the ministry is concerned, it is probably the position that it is a universal viewpoint, so you do not have to be aggressive with us—we do respond to polite interaction in a positive way. As the member for Morialta will be able to tell you, we are all quite easy to get on with.

**Mr Gardner:** It depends on the minister.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Maybe. I congratulate the Government Whip. He has already demonstrated himself to be a thorough and very—

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** No amount of sucking up will get you that pair.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Okay, fair enough. I will not go on for too long then, but he is doing a splendid job anyway, and I congratulate him on his election to that role. He has some very large shoes to fill, following Robyn Geraghty, who very well performed that role for many years. I wish Robyn all the very best in her retirement: she was a fantastic colleague, and I am sure the member for Newland will do a great job in picking up where she left off.

I congratulate the Premier on his return to office for another term. There is no doubt that the Premier's determination and resolve through the period of his premiership, including a rather difficult and testing election campaign, is in no small part the reason for the government's having been returned. I congratulate him and express my thanks to him for his great leadership in the past years, particularly in the context of the election campaign.

I thank the electors of Enfield, who have again, in my humble opinion, returned the correct candidate. Obviously they have been, to my mind, well served. I intend to recommit myself to serving



them as a member of this house as best I can, and I express my sincere thanks to the electors of Enfield.

I also express my thanks to my parliamentary and ministerial staff. These people have worked tirelessly for me and assisted me through the whole of the last four years, and I say to each and every one of them: thank you very much for your efforts. No good work is ever done by a group that is not united as a team. I would like to say that I believe my staff, both ministerial and parliamentary, have been fantastic, and I applaud each and every one of them.

Supporters: there are a great many supporters whom I would like to name and there are literally so many that it probably would take up a large amount of time. If I get the wind-up from somebody in a while, I perhaps will resort to that. I will go through a few names because I think these are particular people to whom I should express personal thanks. Thank you to Senator Gallacher and his wife Paola, and the Hon. Tung Ngo. I might share with members that the Hon. Tung Ngo, who is now a member of the other place, and the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, appear to be populating many of the committees of the upper house, to the point where I expressed my concern that we were just seeing a rerun of the Tung and Gerry show.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** It's my own work: that's one of mine. Some of the later ones are better than that. That was just a warm-up. I also thank Mr Bob Harris; Mr Wasim Saeed; Mrs Minh Nguyen; Tim Walsh; Edgar Agius; Fiona Cheminant; Brian Woods; Gary Lockwood; David Entwhistle; Kevin O'Halloran; Tolley and Barbara Wasylenko; Mr Hanif Rahimi; Hafizulla Zamiri; Mohammad Rezai; Joe, Teresa and Giordana Cimino; Mirella and Romeo Iuliano; Anthea Pasilidis; and Maria and Rocky Labozzetta. As I said, there are so many of them I could keep going forever, but I just wanted to express thanks to them and also all the people who have served in my sub-branch over the last few years.

I want to say a few words about a couple of other matters now that I have dealt with those very important expressions of thanks. First, I want to say a few words about the election. Secondly, I want to say a few words about what my aspiration is for what I might be offering to the house over the course of the next year or two.

First, in respect of the election. There has been, on a number of particular occasions over the last few weeks, an attempt to ignite a debate around the theme of the two-party preferred vote. I recall, in particular, the member for Davenport having made a rather passionate contribution here a week or two ago expressing his concerns about the current system. I thought that, since the member for Davenport has had a crack, I might as well have a roll and see what happens. The views that I am about to express are my views: they are not the views of my party, necessarily. They are simply observations that I make about the process.

The first point I make is that the two-party preferred vote, everyone should remember, is a mathematical construct. It actually does not exist in the real world. If I were to compare it to something in the physical world, it might be something like Laurencium or Einsteinium that only exists in theory in a test tube somewhere.

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** And in a theoretical test tube somewhere. We know the periodic table has something that theoretically might be there. It is just that nobody has ever seen it, felt it, touched it or know anything about it, and I think Einsteinium and Laurencium fit in that category.

Thus, as they say, is the two-party preferred vote. It does not exist in reality. It is a mathematical construct. And, it is a mathematical construct which requires certain unnatural behaviour to enable it to work. The unnatural behaviour is that, in the event of one or other of the major parties not being the winner of a particular contest, there must be a count-through to determine this mathematical construct out of what does not in real life resemble this construct.

If what you want is an electoral system which is a proportional representation system, then we have an electoral system which is a proportional representation system, and we see it displayed in all its finery in another place. For those of you who wish to see that replicated here, I invite you to consider the consequences of that—two of them. Just imagine! One of them is bad enough, imagine two of them. That is where proportional representation leads.

The impure version of proportional representation that the member for Davenport was postulating about involves proportional representation only in so much as the two major parties get proportional representation. The rest of them can nick off because they are not relevant. You cannot be half pregnant. You are either into a PR system or you are into a single-member electorate system.

There is an alternative and it is a hybrid. This hybrid usually manifests itself in the real world in places where they have a unicameral system like, for example, New Zealand, where you have an MMP system. I do know what MMP stands for, but it is mad, mad politics, because what it means is you never, ever have a government as such: you just have a bunch of people who are friends some days and not friends others. Remember again this is a unicameral system, not a bicameral system.

With the greatest respect to the member for Davenport, I fundamentally disagree, first of all, with his unrealistic inflation of a mathematical construct of a two-party preferred vote being of any particular significance. Secondly, I put on the record that those who are so obsessed with this particular thing would do well to consider that there are other alternatives that might be considered in terms of the way the redistributions occur.

For instance, how much community of interest does the South Australian redistribution system take into account? Answer: not much. There is a whole bunch of electorates here which, by any definition, are bizarre when viewed from the context of community of interest. What voice does that get? None. How much concern did the member for Davenport have about that? None.

Why is it that the member for Finnis—who, of course, is a splendid member of this place—is now representing people who live in Sellicks or Christies, where they have to drive 40 kilometres to see him instead of driving two kilometres to see the member for Kurna? I will tell you why: it is that the 2PP 50 per cent mathematical construct has been imposed on the system over and above that. Where is the perfection there? Of course, there is not perfection.

We have dealt with PR; we all know what the consequences of that would be. Can you imagine this place with PR? My God! Imagine it. As the former member for Elder used to frequently say, there would be something about the bar room scene from *Star Wars* about it.

I have dealt with MMP. Can I make another little point as well? Everybody knows in South Australia that, since representative government, the name of the game has been majority of votes in a majority of seats. We all know that, years ago, during the period of the great Tom Playford, there became a non-alignment in terms of numbers between the seats, but it was ever so that a majority of votes in a majority of seats won government. It is just that, in Playford's day, one seat might have 20,000 people and another one 200. I exaggerate slightly; but nevertheless, the proposition did remain the same that, with a majority of votes in a majority of seats, you win.

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** We consistently won a majority of the primary vote but not in the right places. I make these points. In relation to the majority of votes in a majority of seats, it is not the government's fault that two things occurred at the last election.

The first one is: that is not the government's fault: it is that people like the member for MacKillop—yes, the member for MacKillop—and the member for Flinders are outrageously popular in their seats. They are so beloved by the people that nearly 100 per cent of them vote for them. Saddam Hussein is the only person I have ever heard of who is more popular than the member for Flinders.

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** No; the member for Flinders, in fact, I have heard it said, cannot walk through Flinders without rose petals being thrown at his feet. When one looks at the results of the last election, one can see why. The two people who voted against him, he knows where they live. He goes around there and he is so generous about it, he says, 'Look, it's okay, I don't care.' The amount of time and effort that is put into making sure that this wonderful man's immense popularity remains at astronomical levels, I do not know, but can I say that every penny that is spent on it is a penny wasted, because he is that good he does not need it. He is that good, and everyone in this chamber can tell you that. And, the member for MacKillop, again, another one—absolute walk up start.

**Mr Gardner:** Not much more than us.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Now, I ask this question: how much time and effort and money does the Australian Labor Party spend trying to dislodge the fabulously popular member for Flinders? Answer: not much. What was that?

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Fair enough; good point. There is point number one. Can we help it if Middle Eastern potentate-style popularity attracts to members of the opposition? No, we cannot, we cannot help that; it is just the good fortune of them. Second point: why is it that a nice young man, a man who for all I know is a splendid fellow, was inveigled, or persuaded, or supported, to spend vast amounts of money attempting to remove the highly effective member for Enfield?

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** Why would they do that?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Why would somebody do that in the public interest? First of all, he is not a bad member of parliament and, secondly, realistically, it was going to be a little bit difficult. But now I can tell you that there could have been a better allocation of resources—theoretically.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** I don't think so.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** No, I know; that's true. Especially for the new members, this is one of the funny things here, how everything is connected. Why is it that His Worship the Mayor of Playford had the unspeakable privilege of being able to wear that large medallion at the meeting of the royal family out there not so long ago? Answer: the favour done to him by the member for Newland. If the member for Newland had not defeated him he would not have even been there, so there is that connectivity. The point is that instead of spending money where it might have made a difference, maybe, the money is spent in Enfield. That is fine. I am taking it for the team. I have been taking it for the team, absorbing the blows, absorbing the cash, but is that smart campaigning? I actually do not think so. So, do not complain to us about the fact that you spend money in the wrong place.

The next one—this is the real good one, this is the kicker—the proposition is that the Electoral Commission, had it done its job correctly, would have ensured that the Liberal Party, with more than 50 per cent of this non-existent artificial construct called the two-party preferred vote, would have had a majority of seats in this place. Well, guess what? If two of the seats, in which the Liberal Party definitely would get more votes than the Labor Party, were held by the Liberal Party you would be sitting here now; the Liberal Party would be sitting here right now. However, there are two Liberal Party seats that the Liberal Party cannot win. Again, do not blame the Labor Party for that.

I come back to my point about resources. When the Liberal Party cannot even win its own seats—and, by the way, if it had the Liberal Party would now be in office; do not forget that—and it has outrageously popular people like the member for Flinders getting over 80 per cent of the vote and being carried around his electorate in a sedan chair, and it still spending money on him and it is still spending money on me, why should we feel upset when they cry about it? Please just face the facts: the two-party preferred vote is a mathematical construct, and does not mean anything other than roughly something. Secondly, if you want to have proportional representation then good for you. This place will be like the bar room scene from *Star Wars*.

Point number three is that the actual result of the election, had it actually been that the Liberal Party controlled all the seats in which it could always outvote the Labor Party, would have been a Liberal government. That did not happen, and that is not the Labor Party's fault, nor is it the Electoral Commissioner's fault. My final point is: why spend a whole lot of money on seats you cannot possibly win when you do not win the ones you need to win, and have to win? Rhetorical questions perhaps.

I would like to make a point here, too, in respect of the upper house. I think that reform of the upper house is important. I know it is one of those things that are perennial conversations but, when I open up this topic with friends, it is the usual thing that happens at the barbecue. When you go to a friend's barbecue they start saying, 'What about the upper house?', because everyone is talking about it. They get quite excited, particularly when they have had a couple of beers: 'What do you think about the upper house?' Everyone has a view.

When they start rapping a bit about the upper house they have views, and I can give you a few views that come up quite often. Number one is, 'Who are these characters?' That is a view. Number two is, 'Are they really there for eight years? Are you serious, eight years?'

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** No, no. Number three is, 'What about the people in that chamber'—and not just that chamber; any upper house anywhere in this country, including the Senate—'who are there by basically'—and I will use a neutral term—'serendipity?' That is a real issue. Before the last election I put up two bills to reform what is going on in the upper house. One of those bills was to do what I call 'tinkering' (and it was not my preferred outcome), and the other one was to bring in something known as Sainte Laguë. For those of you who are not, like me, a linguist, you could actually say it is something approximating first-past-the-post.

The effect that would have had would have been that people who got most of the votes up there would get most of the seats up there, and the serendipity would be completely off the agenda. Unfortunately the opposition, at that time, was not prepared to go for it. We actually got very close when one of the members of the upper house—

**Mr Gardner:** You had four years.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Can I just tell you about a magical parliamentary moment? One member of the upper house moved a bill to introduce PR. We supported it, a few of the crossbenchers supported it, and then, at the critical moment when it came to a vote, guess who voted against it? The person who moved it. That was unexpected.

Anyway, that is why we do not have first-past-the-post yet, but I hope we can have intelligent conversation about that over the months ahead. It is important that we keep electoral reform in front of mind, and we do not just say, 'Oh well, it is over for another four years.' Why don't we get stuck into it early? Why don't we have a look at it early? I think that would be the intelligent thing to do.

Now that I have dealt with those very important matters, I will raise a couple of other things very quickly—firstly, my priorities for the next few months in terms of the work the Premier has asked me to conduct. I thought I would mention to the house that there are a few things on the drawing board; the first one is reform of WorkCover. Everybody in this place is aware that the WorkCover system we presently have needs to be improved. It is not satisfying the people who are the injured workers or the employers, and it has enormous problems associated with it. This needs to be a matter of attention for this parliament, and I hope, as I expressed to the member for MacKillop, that I will be in a position to bring something forward in the not too distant future for everyone's consideration.

The second point is that our justice system is in need of a thoroughgoing tune-up. I say this because there are too many instances where elements of the justice system are not acting in unison with other elements of the system. I am presently doing a lateral overview of the system, starting with the criminal justice system, from the point where a person is apprehended by the police through to the point where they finish being a customer of the Parole Board, and everything in the middle.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The whole experience.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Everything in the middle. Can I say that the member for Stuart has often raised important questions in this space, and I want to acknowledge that many of the questions he raises are important questions which do require answers. Unfortunately, he jumps to incorrect conclusions occasionally and blames the government, but there are reasons that many of these things do need to be looked at.

I know that recently the member for Stuart has spoken, for example, about prison numbers. Prison numbers are a function of many things. Let's keep in mind that prisons do not select their customers; their customers are delivered to them, and they are delivered to them by a system. The question is: how many people are being delivered and why, and need they be delivered to the prison or is there somewhere else they might be delivered that would give the community a better outcome, not create a risk to the community and save the system being clogged up by people who do not need to be there? I give that as one simple example. So, I am looking at that.

Finally, I will also be doing some work in relation to the ongoing project of developing the City of Adelaide, making it a vibrant city, seeing the opportunity for private sector development to occur in the city, to leverage off the considerable expenditure the government has put in in terms of things like the Adelaide Oval, what is going on now with the Convention Centre and suchlike.

I say to all members that I would be very happy to discuss any of these matters with you at any time. I do appreciate contributions from members. The member for MacKillop and I, for example,

have had many conversations about the WorkCover issue, and I pay tribute to him because he is genuinely interested in doing something constructive about it, and I welcome that. Likewise with the member for Stuart, about issues relating to those matters he frequently draws our attention to, I would again extend that invitation to him and be very happy to have a conversation with him about those matters at any time. With those few remarks and, in view of the fact that my time has nearly expired, I will sadly have to say, 'That's all for now.'

**Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (12:03):** Madam Deputy Speaker, may I start my contribution by congratulating you. We both came to this place on the same day, I think, back in 1997 and I am delighted to see you take on the role of Deputy Speaker. I congratulate the Governor, Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce and his wife, Liz, for the way that they carry out their duties on behalf of the citizens of South Australia—they do a fantastic job.

I also congratulate all new members and all members who returned to this place, but particularly the new members, and particularly those on this side. Amongst those, I congratulate my new colleague, the member for Mount Gambier. I am delighted that we now have that seat back in the fold. Whilst I am on this, I thank the good folk of the seat of MacKillop for returning me here once again and once again with an increased majority. I was musing on the fact that I have increased my majority at every election when I have stood and, if I stay here for another 20 years, I might get to 100 per cent. I do not know whether that is possible, but we are finding that those who are voting for the Labor Party, their numbers are dwindling.

**An honourable member:** There are not many left.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** There are not many left.

**The Hon. J.R. Rau:** You and the member for Flinders.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Yes, I am concerned about the member for Flinders, but I have a very important matter I wish to address in the time allocated to me, and I am going to get onto it. I am delighted to be following the Deputy Premier because the matter I wish to address is very much the matter that he addressed in regard to the electoral system in South Australia. I will point out that the Deputy Premier's views on electoral matters, particularly pertaining to the two-party preferred vote, vary substantially from those of other people in his party and, indeed, those who brought us to the electoral system we have here in South Australia today, and I will highlight those issues as I go through my address on this matter.

The Governor, in his address to the joint houses, talked about an urgent need to reform our democracy and then went on to talk about political donations. The problem with our democracy is not that which the Governor refers to; the problem is that it is not democratic. The biggest problem the citizens of this state have with our democracy is that they cannot get rid of a bad government, a government they do not want, and that they cannot get into power a government they do want. Whilst the Labor Party won more seats than the Liberal Party, the people of South Australia clearly wanted a change of government, as they did four years ago.

I am fascinated that there appears to be a general acceptance of the outcome—a small rush of letters to the editor lasting a few weeks, a begrudging acknowledgment by a few commentators and journalists that maybe the system is flawed, and a few comments from a few Liberals seem to be it. There seems to be an acceptance that the Liberal Party just has to work harder, as the Deputy Premier suggested. That is not the problem. The problem is that the electoral system in South Australia is seriously flawed, and it seriously disadvantages the Liberal Party whilst seriously advantaging the Labor Party.

I will delve into the state's recent history to illustrate the inequality of our system, how it came about, and what we might do to fix it but, firstly, let me make something very clear so that there can be no misunderstanding: although there is a clear disadvantage to the Liberal Party, it is the people of South Australia who are the losers. It is the mums and dads, the workers and retirees, and the young who have been stymied in their attempt to have a government and the policies of their desire. The electoral system should not be there for the parliamentarians. It should not be there for the political parties. It should be there for the people.

When confronted with the same scenario, the Labor Party's attitude to electoral unfairness was in stark contrast to its attitude today. On 5 March 1962, *The Advertiser* quoted the then leader of the opposition, Frank Walsh, after failing to win government, as saying:

We have received a mandate from the electors of South Australia to form a Government. My party has received an overall majority of the vote of the electors.

Another Labor spokesman stated that it was 'against the tenets of responsible government for a party to hold office when the vote was clearly against it'. That is very different from what we just heard from the Deputy Premier. On 18 March 1968, Don Dunstan was quoted in *The Advertiser* as stating:

The only way to get effective balanced development of the whole State is to have one vote, one value, so that no matter where he lives every citizen will have an equal say in electing the Government he wants and rejecting the party he doesn't want.

I contend that no-one observing electoral outcomes in South Australia in the last 20 years could accept that we have achieved those sentiments expressed by Dunstan, yet that is the foundation on which our current electoral system has been built.

At the election held on 15 March, the Liberal Party achieved a two-party preferred vote of 53 per cent and the Labor Party 47 per cent. On the numbers cast, an average of 19,971 electors supported Labor for each candidate elected, whereas 24,522 votes were cast in favour of the Liberal Party for each of the 22 Liberal members elected. On a statewide basis, it required just over 4,500 votes more to elect a Liberal member than to elect a Labor member. I challenge anyone on the other side of the house to reconcile those numbers with Dunstan's statement to have:

...one vote, one value, so that no matter where he lives every citizen will have an equal say in electing the Government he wants and rejecting the party he doesn't want.

Indeed, I am fascinated by the parallels between the 2014 election and the 1968 election. Other than the anomaly where, in 1968, there was a rerun of the poll in the seat of Millicent ordered by a court of disputed returns, at the end of that process the two parties had an equality of members in the house, with the deciding vote held by an Independent. The Labor Party had polled in excess of 53 per cent of the vote, yet the Independent (Tom Stott) sided with the Liberal Party, installing Steele Hall as the premier.

If we assume that the seat of Fisher were a Liberal seat, the result of the 2014 election is almost a mirror image of that in 1968. This result in 1968 created such public turmoil that it brought about a significant change in the state's electoral system. Historical facts show that the Hall Liberal government reformed the electoral system in South Australia knowing full well that it would be to the detriment of its ability to win the subsequent election.

I am not foolish enough to expect that the current Labor government shares in any way the idealism of the Hall Liberal government. In the late 1960s and into the 1970s, the Labor Party argued that the unfairness of the electoral system in South Australia was a result of the malapportionment; that is, where the state was divided into a country zone and a metropolitan zone, and the electorates in the country zone had far fewer electors than seats in the metropolitan zone. The Labor Party argued that, if the malapportionment was done away with, then a fair electoral system would ensue.

Joan Rydon, an election specialist, in 1963 published an analysis from the 1959 South Australian election which concluded that there was a bias against Labor of some 8.7 per cent. Her analysis, however, apportioned 3.5 per cent of this to the malapportionment and 5.2 per cent due to 'differential concentration of majorities'. As a check to her analysis, she applied the booth results from the 1958 federal election to those state seat boundaries. This analysis showed a disadvantage to the Labor Party of 8.8 per cent, with 4.7 per cent of that attributed to malapportionment and 4.1 per cent due to differential concentration of party support.

I mention this work because it shows that, at the time, it was recognised that the concentration of a party's support could have a significant impact on election outcomes. There has been in South Australia an ongoing argument about the meaning of 'one vote, one value'. The Labor Party by and large has suggested that it is about providing equality, that is, equal numbers of electors in each electorate. In reality, that concept ignores the impact of differential concentration of support.

Dr C.A. Hughes, in a paper entitled 'Fair and equal electoral districts—the problem at the state level', to a federalism conference in 1983 said, 'the concepts of equality and fairness are often confused'. Boundaries may be fixed so that exactly the same number of electors reside within each electoral district, yet in the end a serious gerrymander may have been created. The federal parliamentary joint standing committee in 1988 in its first report on electoral matters stated:

A gerrymander may be achieved with entirely equal electorates, that is, with equal numbers of voters in each electorate.

It went on to report:

A classic gerrymander endeavours to lock up one's opponent's voters into safe seats whilst spreading one's own vote so as to win as many marginal seats as possible.

I contend that that is exactly the situation we face in South Australia today, and I believe the Deputy Premier emphasised the point of the number of votes that we have locked up in some of our country seats.

Interestingly, it is my belief that Dunstan knew that the changes that he made to the Constitution Act in 1975 would indeed lead to an advantage to the Labor Party. I make this statement on the basis that those changes directed the Boundaries Commission, a newly formed independent body, to make subsequent redistributions with minimal changes to existing boundaries.

My belief is that Dunstan knew that the existing boundaries favoured the Labor Party, and as such he wanted them to be disturbed as little as possible. Dunstan knew that the 1975 election saw the Labor Party returned with a minority of the two-party preferred vote, yet the first report of the independent Boundaries Commission of 1976 was constrained in this matter.

The 1989 election saw the Labor Party return to office with only 48 per cent of the vote; notwithstanding, it was a minority government supported by two Labor Independents, Martyn Evans and Norm Peterson. Prior to that election, the Liberal Party had been campaigning about the inequality of the electoral system in South Australia and, subsequent to that election, continued with that campaign. Interestingly, part of that campaign was because of the malapportionment which had occurred between the previous redistribution of 1983 due to the rapid population growth in certain districts.

For example, at the 1989 election the Labor seat of Elizabeth had a mere 16,558 electors whilst the Liberal seat of Fisher had 27,027 electors. Notwithstanding the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission writing to both the premier and the opposition leader on 14 July 1987 pointing out the disparity and urging the parliament to take action, the then Labor government took no action prior to the 1989 election. Knowing that its electoral stocks were falling it eschewed its previous one-vote one-value mantra, allowing a malapportionment to remain when it favoured itself.

After the election of 1989, with the Liberal Party failing to form government in spite of achieving 52 per cent of the popular vote, Labor introduced legislation to bring forward an early redistribution. The Liberal Party believed that the further changes were necessary and with the support of Martyn Evans forced the matter to a select committee. A number of changes were made to the Constitution Act as a result of this work. The principal ones were:

- The insertion of a new subsection (1) in clause 83, known as the fairness clause, which obliges the commission to provide for boundaries which give each group of candidates which wins 50 per cent plus one vote an even chance of winning 24 seats and forming government.
- The changes to subsection (2) of clause 83, by substituting 'must' for 'shall' and repealing subclause (c) which obliged the commission to minimalise any disturbance to existing boundaries—the point I was just referring to.

These changes were adopted in a bipartisan manner and, as per the law, were only implemented after both had been passed by the parliament and agreed to by a referendum of the people. In my opinion, the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission of 1991 is by far the most interesting of any of the commission's reports. It concluded that there was a disadvantage to the Liberal Party. In paragraph 14.2 the commission states, amongst other things:

...that there is an enduring but uncontrived imbalance in the South Australian electoral process which operates to the disadvantage of the Liberal Party. As a result of this imbalance it has been more difficult for the Liberal Party than the Labor Party, ever since the 1975 amendments to the constitution, to gain the same number of seats with a given percentage of the popular vote. This disadvantage arises from a number of factors peculiar to South Australia which combine to isolate large surpluses of conservative rural votes in 'enclaves' where the votes cannot be 'mixed' effectively with Labour Party votes.

This is exactly what the federal joint standing committee (which I previously referred to) called a classic gerrymander. Interestingly, the report notes that section 83(1) is silent about the necessity to ensure comfortable majorities for the party which attracts a particular percentage of the popular vote above 50 per cent, nor does section 83(1) say anything about the cube rule.

The report goes to considerable length in analysing the meanings of the amendments created to the Constitution Act, noting that 'this commission is empowered by the new section 83(1) to look at the political consequences of a redistribution and to do something about the correction of this imbalance'—that being the imbalance against the Liberal Party. I repeat that the report says that 'this commission is empowered by the new section 83 (1) to look at the political consequences of a redistribution'.

As a final check in its redistribution process that 1991 commission reapplied the polling booth votes from the 1989 election to the new boundaries to check that, if those boundaries were used at that election, the Liberal Party would indeed have been able to form government. It is also of vital importance to understand that the commission did highlight the imperfections within the process and noted in paragraph 52.2, amongst other things, 'swings are usually not uniform'. I seek leave to insert a table into the *Hansard*.

Leave granted.

Election Year	Two Party Preferred Vote		Majority Seats
	Liberal	Labor	
1977	46.6	53.4	27 (Labor)
1979	55	45	26 (Liberal includes one National)
1982	49.1	50.9	25 (Labor includes one independent)
1985	46.8	53.2	29 (Labor includes two independents)
1989	51.9	48.1	24 (Labor)
1993	61	39	37 (Liberal)
1997	51.5	48.5	23 (Liberal)
2002	50.9	49.1	23 (Labor)
2006	43.2	56.8	28 (Labor)
2010	51.6	48.4	26 (Labor)
2014	53	47	23 (Labor)
Source: Electoral Districts Boundary Reports			

**Mr WILLIAMS:** The table shows the election results from 1977 to 2014, indicating the number of seats won with the percentage results. This evidence of the elections in South Australia over the last 40 years clearly shows that our electoral system is far from fair. Indeed, in the years of 1975, 1989, 2002, 2010 and 2014 the Liberal Party won the two-party preferred vote but was unable to secure enough seats to form government. Indeed, it seems that the problem has become worse since the introduction of the fairness clause. One must ask: why would this be so?

I now come to the most recent report of the Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission and draw the house's attention to chapter 10 and particularly paragraph 10.2—and this is what happened after they had made the redistribution and recast the previous election's votes on the new boundaries:

The pendulum shows that as a result of this redistribution when applying the voting pattern of the 2010 election a greater number of seats will be held by the Labor Party with 25 seats graphed to the Labor side of the pendulum compared with 22 seats to the Liberal side. The Commission recognises that the Liberal Party received 51.6% of the two party preferred vote at the 2010 election.

The Boundaries Commission absolutely failed in its statutory duty to fulfil the requirements of section 83(1). Its excuse is also contained in the same paragraph, as follows:

However, it is of the view that the boundaries upon which the 2010 election was held were fair. Had the Liberal Party achieved a uniform swing it would have formed Government. As quoted in paragraph 6.5 of this report,



'the Commission has no control over, and can accept no responsibility for, the quality of candidates, policies and campaigns'.

The Boundaries Commission claims that the 2010 boundaries were fair; they patently were not. The Boundaries Commission claimed that a uniform swing would have delivered a fair outcome, yet, as I previously noted, the 1991 commission clearly stated that swings are generally not uniform. The authors of the 2012 report obviously failed to read the previous reports of the commission and, worse still, the commission seems to make the judgement that it was the Liberal Party's fault because of its candidates and campaign.

Again, if the authors had bothered to read and understand previous reports, they would have noticed that the 1991 commission had already discounted the Labor Party's argument that it presents better candidates, better policies and better campaign methods—and I refer members to paragraph 14.14 of the 1991 report. It is my firm opinion that it is both scandalous and outrageous that the commission has failed to meet its obligations and has sought to excuse that failure in such a manner.

Whilst I am referring to the 2012 report, another matter disturbs me: at paragraph 14.19, the report seeks to explain the Electoral Commissioner's comments on a radio interview on 31 May 2012, where she talked about moving as few people as possible as part of the redistribution. The report notes that section 83(2) of the Constitution Act gives the commission the ability to have regard to any other matter it thinks relevant. The report then states:

We consider that the desirability of minimising the number of voters whose electorates are changed as a result of a redistribution is a relevant matter for the Commission to take into account.

I have already noted that one of the important changes to the Constitution Act, made by this parliament after the 1989 election, was to delete the clause which sought to minimise the boundary changes.

Because the commission of 2012 has obviously failed to understand those changes made in 1991, it has failed to understand that the parliament specifically intended that the commission not consider that minimalistic changes were necessarily desirable. That may be of little consequence or, indeed, it may be of great consequence. What we do know is that the commission has failed miserably to provide for a fair electoral system within South Australia.

I now turn my attention to an article published in *The Advertiser* under the name of the Premier where he chides the Liberal Party for complaining about the election outcome because—to quote the Premier—'this is the electoral system that the Liberal Party advocated for and then secured in the aftermath of the 1989 election.'

I make two points. It is correct that the Liberal Party advocated for the fairness clause. Our argument is that the fairness clause is not being applied correctly. The 2012 commission report quite clearly shows that, with the 2010 electoral pattern on 2,014 boundaries, the Labor Party would win 25 seats while securing little more than 48 per cent of the vote. I ask the Premier: how does he reconcile that with the intention of the 1991 changes to the Constitution Act? How does he explain that that bears any resemblance to the intent of the parliament that the group of candidates gaining 50 per cent plus one vote should have an equal chance of forming government?

The second point I make is that the Premier arguing that, having won 53 per cent of the popular vote, the Liberal Party should not expect to form government. Is he arguing the opposite of what has been argued by his party over the last 40 to 50 years? If that is the case, it only adds to the litany of Labor's incredibly poor track record when it comes to advocating for fairness within South Australia's electoral system.

Whilst I started my remarks suggesting that the response to the election outcome has been somewhat ho-hum, I was delighted that no less than Dean Jaensch, in an article of 19 March, concluded that the outcome showed that our electoral system is flawed. He said:

...in three elections, 2002, 2010 and now 2014, the Liberal Party has won a majority of votes but not a majority of seats. This is simply not good enough.

He goes on to say that he makes no criticism of the commission and then he explains the process followed in making a redistribution. He claims that the commission draws the boundaries such that the party winning 50 per cent of the votes in the previous election will win a majority of seats.

I have just read from the 2012 report showing that the commission failed to do exactly that. Mr Jaensch, for whom I have great respect, has overlooked the simple fact that the commission has failed its statutory obligation, as highlighted in its own report at paragraph 10.2. Mr Jaensch concludes that the fault was with the process. I conclude that the fault is at the feet of the commission.

The Electoral Commissioner, Kay Mousley, was quoted after the election saying that it was an impossible task for the Boundaries Commission to achieve the legislated requirement. This remarkable revelation after the 2014 election debacle begs the question: if the Electoral Commissioner believes that there is a problem with the Constitution Act, why did she not write to the parliament pointing out her concerns?

I note the comments made by my colleague the member for Davenport in his contribution to this debate and I am quite supportive of some sort of top-up list system to provide for absolute fairness to the people of South Australia in our electoral system. It is worth noting that the select committee report post the 1989 election also recommended that a top-up option be reviewed following the first general election after the implementation of all the report's recommendations. Given the recent history of election outcomes in South Australia, given that the Electoral Commission seems to think the current system is unworkable and given that the review I just mentioned was never held because of the outcome of the 1993 State Bank election, surely it is time to revisit that option.

My concluding remarks on this matter are directed to the member for Frome. In the last 50 years, there have been three major changes to the electoral system in South Australia. The first was made in the late sixties by the minority Hall government in the knowledge that the changes would diminish its re-election chances. The second was made in 1975 by the Dunstan government after years of campaigning by Dunstan for such change. The third change was made post the 1989 election with an electoral outcome not dissimilar to what we have just experienced at the last two elections. But changes were only made because the then Labor government was in minority and Martyn Evans supported the principle that our democracy should be one that provided fairness.

I put it to the member for Frome that he finds himself in a unique position where he can provide something enduring for those disadvantaged rural and regional people of this state and that is to support changes to our electoral system to ensure that those people are no longer disenfranchised. After I heard what the Deputy Premier said with regard to our electoral system, I went back up to my office and I picked up this quote, which is what Don Dunstan said on 25 June 1968, standing in the leader of the opposition's position just here to my right. He called for:

...an immediate electoral redistribution and the holding of a general election in South Australia on a fair electoral distribution (a fair electoral distribution that would allow a majority of citizens to elect the Government they want and to reject a Government they do not want), an electoral redistribution that will not allow, between the voting support for the two Parties, the disparity which now exists in South Australia and which allows the minority Party to take office.

I happen to agree wholeheartedly with Don Dunstan. I happen to agree that he saw an unfair electoral system existing in South Australia, just as any, even casual, observer would see an unfair electoral system existing in South Australia today.

I have come to the conclusion, having been elected to this place now for five terms and observed five elections, three of which saw the Labor Party come to government having achieved minority support from the people of South Australia, that it is time to reform our electoral system. And as I said earlier, not for the benefit of us—the parliamentarians or the political parties—but for the benefit of the people of South Australia.

The reality is that by and large it is the country people of South Australia who have been disenfranchised by the electoral system. By and large it is the country people who have suffered because it is so long between drinks for them. Since 1975, the only times that South Australia has had a conservative government and a government that represented most of the country areas was in 1979 when we won 55 per cent of the two-party preferred vote, 1993 when we won 60 per cent of the two-party preferred vote and 1997 when we won between 51 and 52 per cent of the two-party preferred vote but also enjoyed incumbency in a number of seats. I believe that without that incumbency we would not have been returned in 1997.

So, we have a serious problem and that problem manifests itself in the way that people in a large portion of South Australia—all of those people outside of metropolitan Adelaide—are treated

by the government because they rarely have a government that understands them or has any sympathy for their causes. That manifests itself in things that we saw in recent years in my electorate: the Keith hospital, where the government of the day totally ignored the wishes and the needs of the people of that community. I see it right across my electorate in all facets of government service delivery where the delivery of service is somewhat less than desirable in many instances.

The reality is, as Don Dunstan said, the only way that we will have the delivery and the build-up of the state is if every citizen has an equal say in the government that governs them. The reality is that without a decent electoral system we will not have a decent government, and it is quite clear to me that for most of the last 12 years we have not had a decent government in South Australia and the people of South Australia have said exactly the same. They said it in 2010 when they had an opportunity, and they said it only weeks ago when they had another opportunity.

The problem is, irrespective of how hard they want to go about changing government, changing the direction of the state, they cannot achieve it because, in my opinion, the Electoral Boundaries Commission has failed its statutory duty and the parliament continues to fail to relook at the election system in South Australia to ensure that that situation ceases. There are many other issues which I would have liked to have canvassed today, but I think this is probably the most important issue facing South Australia today.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (12:33):** I am really pleased to speak just briefly on this debate in reply to His Excellency's speech and I would like to start by restating how fantastic it is that that august position is filled by a boy from Elizabeth, like myself. His family still reside in my electorate and it is obvious from every interaction that I have had with him and with Mrs Scarce that he has not forgotten his roots and he continues to exercise his responsibilities with both great energy and great dignity.

It is an absolute privilege to be re-elected to this place and before I go on, I congratulate all the new members. It has been an absolute pleasure to hear the speeches from both sides. It reminds us all of why we are here and that despite the bad press that politicians get—and I think the member for Colton talked quite a lot about this yesterday—most people, in fact probably everyone here, is here for exactly the right reason: we all want to make our communities better. So, it was a real pleasure to hear all of those speeches.

I also want to congratulate all of the marginal members and perhaps newly marginal members who have retained their seats in the fight of their lives—and I will not single anybody out. It was an absolutely sterling effort from those marginal seat holders and challengers on our side, and that is the reason I am standing on this side today and I want to thank them. As I was saying, it is a privilege to be re-elected to this place and to be re-elected in a seat that looks a little different to the seat that I ran for in 2010. It was a pleasure to get to know the people in my old stomping grounds of Elizabeth Park and Craigmore and also to spend a lot of time getting to know the good people of Elizabeth South for the first time.

I want to acknowledge and thank my Liberal opponent, Damien Pilkington, who is a Salisbury councillor. It was a clean and civilised campaign and I just want to acknowledge his hard work on that campaign. He drove me and my team to work harder than ever before and it has helped to make me more determined than ever to represent my community to the best of my ability over the next four years.

If there was one sour note it was on election day. There were some problems along the way with candidates canvassing votes along the campaign trail. I want to make it clear that I do not actually think that is a problem. The only problem was that I was not doing it on the day. I think that perhaps while we are talking about the electoral system as a whole that is one provision which we could easily look at so that candidates can canvas on the day in their own electorates and talk to the people who are voting for them. I think that is a pretty obvious change we could make among the many other changes that are being called for.

As the member for Napier said in his excellent inaugural speech, the impending closure of Holden is going to transform this state and it is going to particularly transform the northern suburbs and the north-eastern suburbs. I am proud to be part of a government which has a plan to keep diversifying the economy and to absorb the impact of the loss of jobs in the automotive and component sectors. I am proud to be a part of a government which has at its core a commitment to

workers and their families and I will devote my time over the next four years to helping facilitate the transitions that these families in the north will have to go through.

I will speak a little bit later in the Grievance Debate about the budget and some of the effects that the budget will have on the north and potentially on those very people who are going to lose their jobs from Holden over the next two or three years. Part of this is also going to be making sure that morale does not drop any further in places like Elizabeth. That is why I am newly committed to working with the executive government and the local councils on any initiatives that might improve the lives of people in the north and to explore ways for Elizabeth to realise its potential as a true CBD in the north.

I know that the City of Playford has some initiatives on the table that it wants to explore and I am happy to help it explore those. I know that others, like the federal member for Wakefield and my predecessor, the Hon. Lea Stevens, also have many ideas that are floating around at the moment and I think we should be entertaining ideas from all directions to see Elizabeth, and the northern suburbs generally, emerge strong and proud as it always does following hard times. In that regard, I look forward to working with the members in the north and particularly with the newly elected member for Napier who I know will devote the next four years to that very issue of the displaced workers from Holden's.

I just want to end my brief contribution by thanking a few people who helped me in my campaign: obviously my hardworking staff, Chantelle Keeris, Amy Ware, Derralyn Mulroney, Jade Ryan, Elyse Ramsay, Wendy Thomson, Wendy Gee and Michael Bombudieri, who have all helped me over the last four years, particularly during the stress of the last year or so. I want to thank the union movement as a whole, particularly Peter Malinauskas and Jason Hall; Reggie Martin, Steve May, Matt Ellis and everyone else at party office who ran such a sterling campaign, and obviously the Premier and the leadership team who pulled off a remarkable victory, it has to be said, along with those marginal seat members that I mentioned earlier.

Finally, I am forever grateful to my son Jimmy and my partner Ann for their love and support and their endless patience and forgiveness, particularly over the last six months. I hope we all got through it relatively unscathed. I want to thank my volunteers as well; they are too numerous to mention. Some of them would have overlapped with the member for Napier's volunteers, I am sure, because there is a northern Labor family up there, but I want to make particular mention of Phil and Cricket Fox, who were out there every single day letterboxing and doing everything they could to ensure that I and the member for Napier and the member for Taylor also got re-elected. So, with those few words I commend the motion.

**Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (12:39):** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I would like to start by congratulating you on your new role. I am sure you will do a fantastic job. I would like to thank His Excellency Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce for the opening of the 53<sup>rd</sup> parliament and for his speech regarding the future of our state. Both the Governor and Mrs Scarce have provided a great service to the people of South Australia. Many, myself included, will miss them both when their term ends in August this year. They have both shown such compassion and love for the people of South Australia, and for that I thank them both.

I would also like to express my concern and send my best wishes to Dr Bob Such and his family. I wish him a speedy recovery. This place is not the same without him, and what are we going to do on Thursdays without all his motions and private member's bills?

I would like to take the opportunity to congratulate our leader, Steven Marshall, for attaining 53 per cent of the South Australian vote. It is unfortunate that once again, despite gaining more than 92,000 extra votes than Labor, we still remain in opposition, against the wishes of the people of South Australia. Labor put immense resources into attempting to regain the seat of Adelaide, and although I had a tough battle in my electorate, I was able to improve my vote at every one of my 12 booths, with my first preference increasing by 4.7 per cent overall.

Being elected once again to represent the people of Adelaide in parliament as their member and to represent this great city is truly a great honour. The Adelaide electorate comprises a diverse and dynamic group of people, including 41.1 per cent of residents being born overseas: 4.9 per cent from China, 4.6 per cent from England, 3.2 per cent from India, 2.9 per cent from Malaysia, and 1.4 per cent from Italy. After English, the top three languages spoken at home are Mandarin, Greek and Italian.

The electorate has 15,080 volunteers and, on a side note, last week was National Volunteers Week. I would like to congratulate and thank all our volunteers, who form such a vital part of our community. I was proud to attend various functions and events in recognition of volunteers again this year, and I am extremely happy to play a role in representing their interests as now the parliamentary secretary to the shadow minister for volunteers.

As part of my regular volunteer work with various organisations, including the Lions and Meals on Wheels, last year I successfully worked with other service clubs in Prospect, including the Lions, Rotary and Kiwanis, to establish a Prospect branch of Operation Flinders. This gave students from two local high schools an opportunity to turn their lives around. I am very pleased to be part of the fundraising efforts again this year; this is a very worthwhile cause and one I am tremendously proud to support.

In my maiden speech, I supported Rundle Mall becoming a designated tourist precinct under the Shop Trading Hours Act, like Jetty Road, Glenelg, was at the time. My speech recognised Rundle Mall as one of our key tourist destinations that would greatly benefit from opening on a number of our state's 11 public holidays. Although my private member's bill to achieve this was rejected by the Labor Party in the lower house, Labor soon after passed a bill of their own to open Rundle Mall on public holidays, achieving the same result.

I thank them for following my lead and note the huge success and sales results that Rundle Mall has achieved since this change. However, I condemn the government for also introducing two extra part-day holidays on Christmas Eve and New Year's Eve as part of their bill in what was described as 'a pig of a deal'. This not only exacerbates the fact that we are the most expensive state to do business but also, in their effort to create a vibrant city, they have forced many businesses to shut down on what should be two of the busiest days of the year.

In addition to this, people in this state are struggling on all fronts. Our state continues to lose our highly-educated young people to other states due to a lack of jobs and career progression here. Whilst small bars add some vibrancy to the city, it is jobs that we really need. Where are the 100,000 extra jobs that Labor promised? In an eight-month period last year, 27,000 jobs were lost. What is the government doing for these South Australians?

There has been a lot of media and government attention, and rightly so, on the Holden workers who will be losing their jobs in three years; however, they have three years notice to retrain and reorganise their lives and have the support of both state and federal governments. This is great, but what are Labor doing for the businesses that are failing—the people who are not only losing their jobs, but their houses and every cent they have, those taking great risks to try and build a better South Australia, trying to give people jobs and provide a future for themselves? Where are the government's policies to help them?

WorkCover is a mess and charging double that of most other states. We have high payroll taxes, high land taxes (which increase the cost of commercial leasing), high costs of electricity, high costs of water, high costs of council rates, along with endless red tape to get anything done. Basically, Labor is making it as difficult as possible to carry on doing business in this state.

Now, adding salt to their wounds, city businesses will be lumped with an extra car parking tax on top of their already high costs. Apparently we want more vibrancy, as long as you do not try to drive into the city. How can the government expect to tax people who drive into the city when their next best option is public transport that fails them miserably? In 2012-13, there were 5.5 million less boardings on public transport compared to the 2009-10 financial year.

Surely it is much more logical to fix our public transport system before we tax people. If we had a transport system that was reliable, affordable, safe, clean and efficient, there would not be a need for a car parking tax. I believe people would be more than willing to catch public transport if that was the case. An efficient system would increase revenues and decrease the number of cars travelling to the city, thus eliminating the need for a car parking tax.

As a former business owner for over 18½ years, like all business owners I am well aware of hard work, deadlines, pressure, adapting, budgets, getting results and taking responsibility. Small business is a major employer in South Australia, with 148,277 registered businesses statewide, including 15,180 in the Adelaide CBD. Currently, too many government contracts are awarded to interstate companies over our own local businesses, taking profits and jobs out of South Australia

and damaging our businesses. South Australian businesses cannot compete on an equal playing field when they operate in a state with the highest business-related costs.

Things must change in order for our state to prosper. Labor needs to adopt some of the Liberal policies that support business, such as reducing payroll tax, halving the cost of the WorkCover levy to bring us into line with other states, abolishing the car parking tax and convincing their federal Labor colleagues to abolish the carbon tax to reduce the cost of electricity. I will continue to use my business experience and knowledge to assist others in business and support legislation to improve business conditions and cut red tape.

In addition to my passion for supporting local businesses, I have always had a particular interest in youth, including education, health, safety and self-esteem. I am thrilled now to be the parliamentary secretary to the shadow minister for youth as well as for families and child protection. This means that I can now further be involved in making positive changes for our state's young who are tomorrow's leaders.

Through my former businesses, Rachel's Model Management and Training and Rachel's Junior Models, I have met with, interviewed, taught and worked with thousands of young people. From this I believe that good role models, encouragement and self-belief are important basics to the wellbeing and future of our young. I personally believe that many problems, such as binge drinking, drug use and eating disorders, are a result of poor self-esteem. Since entering parliament in 2010, I have been keeping abreast of juvenile justice issues. I believe there is much work that can be done in this area to ensure our youth have the best chance at a great life.

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

A good education is a high priority of mine and something my mother instilled in me from an early age. While doorknocking during my first campaign prior to the 2010 election, I identified a strong demand for a second campus of Adelaide High School for the people of Prospect and Walkerville council areas. This demand still remains today, as parents worry about their child's educational future.

The Adelaide electorate contains a total of 17 primary schools, six of which are public and 11 are private. Of the 12 secondary schools in the electorate, only one is public and until recently was not zoned for any suburbs further north than North Adelaide. The Adelaide electorate has the highest percentage of families choosing non-government education for their children for secondary schooling, with 74 per cent of children attending private schools for their secondary school years, compared with the figure of 43 per cent statewide.

I believe this high figure can be attributed to the lack of adequate public high school options in the area. Prior to the 2010 election, Labor announced plans to expand Adelaide High School by 250 students by 2013. This was a desperate attempt to protect votes in Adelaide after ignoring parents for eight years at that time. We now find that only 50 extra students will enter Adelaide High School starting in year 8 by 2015, thus taking until 2019 to achieve their 2010 promise of 250 extra places, some six years later than promised.

I hope their proposed city high school on the old RA site due in 2019 will be delivered on time. It is not often that from opposition a backbencher can force the government to deliver an opposition policy funded to \$85 million to build a second high school for their residents. I am pleased to have achieved this and look forward to seeing the government's plans for the school.

Safety is another aspect that resonates with many people I represent. There is a high percentage of single people living alone in the Adelaide electorate, along with a high percentage of university students. There have been six sexual assaults on women in North Adelaide, and there have been bikie shootings and alcohol-fuelled violence issues in my electorate.

Given this knowledge, I was shocked to discover that the newly built Adelaide Oval and surrounds have 300 CCTV cameras. There are none in North Adelaide, and only 71 CCTV cameras that are surveilled by SA police in the city area, despite the constant claims of alcohol-fuelled violence in the city. Last year I successfully lobbied the federal Liberal government for \$255,000 in funding for

CCTV cameras and other safety measures for North Adelaide. I am pleased to announce that they were included in the budget and the money will be forthcoming soon.

I have also challenged the government's plans to sell the Women's and Children's Hospital car park and have advocated for expanded parking facilities for the safety and convenience of staff, patients and visitors to the hospital. This is a serious and ongoing issue for North Adelaide that is highlighted by the assaults in the area. I believe that providing health care also involves providing access to the service. Expanded parking will also be beneficial for Adelaide Oval patrons and local residents, who struggle to find parking near their homes.

I am a strong advocate and supporter of local existing Neighbourhood Watch groups and have strongly encouraged and supported new groups that are formed. From a safety point of view, these groups are an excellent way of informing residents on keeping safe and identifying potential trouble spots and problems, as well as engaging with the community. In terms of what is happening in the city, I have supported residents of Adelaide City Council in their actions against proposed changes to their ward structure and borders, which would have seen the loss of ward councillors in both the north and south wards and part of North Adelaide joining the central ward.

I am very concerned about the government's plans for the Parklands, particularly the new Riverbank authority, which I believe adds yet another layer of bureaucracy when the Capital City Committee is well placed (after the addition of the member for Adelaide) to establish the right use of the precinct, with all its members answerable to the public, unlike nominated committee members.

I also have grave concerns for the Hajek Plaza, which I believe should be predominantly an open public area designed for and by the Festival Centre, in consultation with Adelaide City Council and the residents of South Australia. We need a balanced approach to the protection of the Parklands, as they are an important state asset, along with considered activation and enhancement of underused or neglected areas of the Parklands.

I organised a protest rally on the steps of Parliament House and successfully blocked a government regulation which would have enabled the \$40 million footbridge to bypass proper planning processes, which would have seen it equated to minor home improvements, such as a car port, and therefore not requiring planning approval.

There have been many other issues resulting from the government's development plan amendments. In particular, city residents have been hit hard by changes. I have supported, and will continue to support, city residents who have been adversely affected by the changes. I attended and addressed a protest rally organised by the residents of the south-west community in the city against the government's development plan assessment amendment that allowed building approvals using an interim provision while consultation was still ongoing, along with the introduction of catalyst sites for land over 1,500 square metres to have unrestricted use.

I have also assisted Prospect residents with their own actions against high-rise, submitting their petition to parliament. In addition to their fight against high-rise, I supported Prospect residents who objected to the removal of ward councillors.

In 2009, Mayor David O'Loughlin broke convention to use his casting vote to remove wards, despite receiving 400 submissions against the change. I have supported residents and councillors to have these wards restored.

During this last election, I was overwhelmed by how many people were keen to ensure I retained my seat; people who were not Liberal members and even some who had voted Labor all their life were keen to assist in keeping their hardworking local member. I would like to take this opportunity to thank all my branch members, helpers and supporters, of whom there are too many to name individually. I would especially like to thank my SEC campaign team for their assistance over the last term of parliament and particularly around the election.

I have been impressed and amazed by the speeches given by the new members of parliament—and I welcome all new members to this house, in particular the members for Bright, Hartley, Mitchell, Schubert and Mount Gambier, and the Hon. Andrew McLachlan in the other place—that show their varied and extensive experience and passion to represent their community. It is to be applauded, and I although forward to seeing them progress over the years.

In regard to this term of parliament, you can expect that I will continue to advocate for substance over spin, continue to put my constituents first and foremost in all deliberations and always to do my very best for the people of the Adelaide electorate, whilst considering the state as a whole.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

[Sitting suspended from 12:57 to 14:00]

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to the parliament today students of Pulteney Grammar School, who are guests of the member for Adelaide; also, members of the Prospect Centre, who are guests of the member for Adelaide; and students from the Adelaide Secondary School of English, who are guests of mine. I am told that students from Unity College Murray Bridge, Mercedes College and the Mannum Community College are with us today as guests of the member for Schubert.

**SPEAKER'S RULING**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:03):** I wonder if I may raise at this point a matter that I raised yesterday in respect of the tabling of a document which I think you have had an opportunity now to peruse and identify that it appears to be a document which is a commentary on a certain agreement as distinct from being an abridged agreement. If we could perhaps hear your assessment of that because, in the event that I am correct, I would be asking you to call on the Premier to correctly identify the document.

**The Hon. J.W. Weatherill:** It is a summary of the agreement.

**The SPEAKER (14:03):** Thank you. I did seek out the member for Bragg yesterday to tell her that I had read the document and sought advice on it, and I think the member for Bragg is correct to say it is probably not an abridgement but a summary or commentary. I do not think much turns on that, because it will be inserted in parliamentary papers nevertheless, because ministers can, without leave, table documents and they go into parliamentary papers.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** I thank you for your advice on that matter and, indeed, the Premier's indication of what the document actually is. What we do not want to be left with is some misunderstanding that a part of the actual document has, in fact, been tabled by the government, and that clearly was not the case. Thank you, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes. I think we would all accept the deputy leader's point. The Premier.

*Mr Gardner interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** That would be an opportune moment for me to say to the interjector—the member for Morialta—that I found, on reading his point of order and, in particular, the Minister for Communities' answers to a question that led up to his point of order that her remarks were not at all irrelevant to the question. They were, to use the term of the member for Flinders, germane and therefore, the point of order was bogus. Therefore, the member for Morialta's presence here today is very much on probation. The Deputy Premier.

*Ministerial Statement*

**JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON ELECTORAL MATTERS**

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:06):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and thank you for your kind compliment about earlier in the day. I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** The Governor spoke to this parliament of the need for South Australians to have confidence in our public institutions and in the way these institutions arrive at decisions that affect everyone's lives. We understand the potential for a growing sense of estrangement between politicians and the people they are elected to represent, and we want to build new and stronger bonds to reverse this perception.



Today, I can inform the house that the government intends to establish a joint standing committee on electoral matters. It is intended that the committee will not be controlled solely by any one political party, with appointments reserved for members of the government and the opposition, as well as Independent and minor party members. It is the government's intention that the committee will have a role similar to that of the commonwealth's Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters. The commonwealth committee is established to:

...inquire into and report on such matters relating to electoral laws and practices and their administration as may be referred to it by either House of the Parliament or a Minister. The matters that may be referred by the House include reports by the Commonwealth Auditor-General. The Committee could also inquire into matters raised in annual reports of Commonwealth Government departments and authorities.

The committee will have a natural role to consider the conduct of each election, but it will have a broader role of inquiring into reform of the state's electoral system to continually seek to improve our democracy. This will replace the haphazard select committees into electoral matters that we have seen in the past.

I will be having discussions with members of this place and the Legislative Council in the coming days about this committee. It is a responsibility of all of us to live up to the trust that has been placed in us by the people of South Australia, and this joint committee will help to raise the public's confidence in our electoral processes.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Health.

### **SMOKE-FREE OUTDOOR EATING AREAS**

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Health Industries) (14:08):** Thank you, sir. I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I compliment you, sir, on the House of Commons brocade today—very fine. To reduce the number of people smoking in South Australia, I am introducing smoke-free outdoor eating areas in our restaurants, pubs and clubs from 1 July 2016. I also intend to reintroduce funding to quit smoking mass media campaigns from 1 July this year.

In 2013, smoking prevalence rose significantly to 19.4 per cent, up from 16.7 per cent in 2012. Banning smoking in outdoor dining areas by July 2016 will help protect the health of our community. We aim to reduce exposure to potentially harmful levels of tobacco smoke for nonsmokers and people working in the hospitality industry.

On 2 March 2011, the former minister for mental health and substance abuse announced that the government's clear ambition is for 100 per cent smoke-free outdoor eating and drinking in South Australia, and we want to achieve that by 2016.

The government has been working with the hospitality industry to progress smoke-free outdoor eating areas in South Australia. In 2011, the government wrote to 6,000 South Australian liquor licensed premises and all local councils encouraging them to take voluntary steps towards providing smoke-free establishments.

On 9 August 2013, I released the Smoke-Free Outdoor Eating and Drinking Areas Discussion Paper. Forty five submissions were received. The majority of submissions supported introducing smoke-free outdoor eating areas at hospitality venues. Population surveys show a high and increasing level of support for restrictions on smoking in outdoor eating areas. In 2011, 91 per cent of the community supported some form of smoking restriction in alfresco dining areas. By 2012, this had increased to 93 per cent supporting a ban.

South Australia and Victoria are the only Australian jurisdictions currently without smoke-free outdoor eating areas, or legislation to introduce them. It is now time for South Australia to make the change. Some concerns were raised in the discussion paper about the business impact on pubs and clubs, but research shows that a long-term reduction in revenue from the introduction of outdoor smoke-free regulations is unlikely.

When smoke-free enclosed areas were introduced to hotels and clubs in South Australia, research found no impact on monthly turnover. However, I recognise that the hotel industry in

particular has invested in outdoor alfresco areas after the banning of smoking inside hotels. That is why we are allowing time for the industry to adapt to the new measures. The 2016 commencement date will ensure a smooth transition by allowing hotels to plan separate outdoor drinking areas where food is not served, if that is what they wish to do.

I also intend to reinstate funding for the anti-smoking social marketing campaign. High levels of social marketing correlated with a decrease in smoking prevalence, but since we ceased social marketing last year smoking prevalence has risen. It is appropriate to respond to this increase by reintroducing a social marketing campaign. This will begin in July. Together, these actions will help South Australia to meet national targets, including the National Healthcare Agreement performance target of reducing the national smoking rate to 10 per cent of the population and halving the Indigenous smoking rate by 2018.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Disabilities (Hon. A. Piccolo)—

Training Advocate, Office of—Annual Report 2013  
Training and Skills Commission—Annual Report 2013

By the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, on behalf of the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Premier's Climate Change Council—  
Ministerial Response to South Australia's Climate Change Vision—  
Pathways to 2050  
South Australia's Climate Change Vision—Pathways to 2050 Report  
Response by the Government—  
85<sup>th</sup> Report—Natural Resources Committee—Eyre Peninsula Water Supply Final  
Report—Under the Lens  
87<sup>th</sup> Report—Natural Resources Committee—Upper South East Dryland Salinity  
and Flood Management Act 2002 Report for the period July 2012 to  
June 2013

*Parliamentary Committees*

**LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:13):** I bring up a report of the committee, concerning subordinate legislation.

Report received.

*Question Time*

**LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Is he concerned that the attack on the President of the other place by a member of the Labor Party undermines the Premier's commitment to deliver the most stable government possible?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:14):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. As everybody knows, we wait for the call from the Speaker, and that's what I was waiting for. First up, to the honourable Leader of the Opposition: yes, I am disappointed in what has happened in the upper house, but we shouldn't talk about what happens in the other place. I made a decision with the Premier to form a stable government. I see no issues with the current government at the moment and its stability. What happens in the upper

house is not my concern. However, there has been in this house over many years issues similar to this here, and it will happen again, but I am very comfortable. I have not been informed—

**Mr Whetstone:** Did you write that answer, Jay?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** —of any instability in the government of the day, and I am continuing to support it.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is called to order.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Point of order: I think the member for Chaffey interjected, 'Did you write that out, Jay?' for the answer there. My point of order is that it is an offensive assertion that has been made against the Minister for Regional Development.

**Mr Gardner:** Sir, this is bogus.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta is on thin ice. I will take advice. Would the member for Chaffey care to withdraw the offensive imputation that the Premier wrote the Minister for Regional Development's answer?

**Mr WHETSTONE:** I withdraw.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you very much, member for Chaffey. Supplementary from the leader.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16):** My supplementary is to the Minister for Regional Development. Has he spoken with the former president of the other place, the Hon. John Gazzola, to ascertain the basis of his allegations of corruption against the current President of the other place?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:17):** The Minister for Regional Development I think adequately dealt with this matter in his answer, but I do want to supplement and answer this question by saying that when members of parliament advance their own personal grievances and causes, and appear to be thinking more about themselves rather than what is in the interests of the people of South Australia, naturally there is criticism that comes their way, and it reflects on not just the government but all of us.

So, my advice to any of my colleagues, whether it is in this place or the other place, is to keep firmly in mind their principal responsibilities, which are to represent their electorate and discharge their other functions, especially if they are an office holder of this parliament or indeed of executive government. There is no doubt that this reflects poorly on the government, and we need to accept responsibility for that, and I hope that those who have engaged in this behaviour understand that they have caused that.

But I for my part and I know each of my ministers are firmly focused on the critical issues facing South Australia, including ensuring that we modernise and transform this economy. I was very pleased to be standing with the member for Frome (including the Treasurer) last Friday and taking a very important first step in that regard with the almost half a billion dollar project for the transformation of Nyrstar.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18):** Supplementary: further to the—

**The SPEAKER:** A supplementary for the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Further to the Premier's answer to that question to the Minister for Regional Development, my supplementary question to the Minister for Regional Development is: what action will the minister now take, given that his signed agreement with the Premier stated, 'The Government and the Independent Member agree that there is a justified concern in the community about the standards of parliamentary conduct'?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:19):** Can I say that we will be bringing to this house further public policy reforms which are directed at precisely those questions.

We are working on them as we speak to ensure that we address these very questions. One important issue of parliamentary standards of behaviour, of political parties and of members of parliament, is, of course the way in which some parties at the last state election, namely the Liberal Party of South Australia, chose to ignore the specific directions of the Electoral Commissioner—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** —to publish an apology concerning grossly defamatory material that was published concerning myself. Obviously I have a personal interest in that but I think there is a broader public policy issue.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Stuart.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Standing order 98; I don't believe the Premier's answer has anything to do with the Leader of the Opposition's question.

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition asked what is the government—you may be seated while I give my ruling—what actions the government is going to take.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** No, questions are dealt with collectively by the ministry. The ministry chooses which minister is to answer, and he or she answers the question and on behalf of the government the Premier is giving the answer about what the government proposes to do. So, I don't rule in favour of the point of order—but I thank the member for Stuart for giving me a pause during which I can call the member for Heysen to order and warn her a first time, and call the members for Schubert, Hammond and Morphett, the leader and the deputy leader to order. Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Thank you, sir. In fact, there is an even more direct relationship with the question, and that is that in the very agreement that we reached with the member for Frome there was a commitment to set up a process to review the conduct of elections. Indeed, the Deputy Premier just a few moments ago made a ministerial statement which set out the very arrangements that we seek to put in place, that is, a standing committee of this place to inquire into the conduct of elections.

One of the pieces of conduct was directly relevant, because it was raised by the member for Fisher in our discussions. We were having joint discussions with the member for Frome and the member for Fisher before the member for Fisher became ill, and one of the things that he advanced, and which the member for Frome picked up, was this question of electoral reform. He was very worried about the fact that people were able to engage in conduct during elections, and it could be the subject of adverse findings by the Electoral Commissioner but could actually be ignored by a political party, and there was no obvious remedy for the Electoral Commissioner. That is what happened to me during the election, a shameful and defamatory—

**Ms Redmond:** Shameful?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Well, you apologised—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** Mr Speaker, it was so shameful that the Leader of the Opposition apologised for it. But what he did not do was ensure that his party complied with the direction of the Electoral Commissioner to publish in the same repetition advertisements which essentially withdrew the allegation. In terms of the gravity of the offending conduct, I find it a little difficult to imagine the allegation of somebody lying concerning a question of child sexual abuse—I can't imagine there being a more grave offence than making a false allegation about somebody concerning the question of child sexual abuse. If you're prepared to lie about that, I wonder what are you prepared to stoop to, to actually achieve electoral victory. This is part of the motivation that animated the member for Fisher, and the member for Frome joined him, and it is now reflected in the very decision that the deputy leader announced today, and you'll have an opportunity to agitate all of your petty grievances in that same process.

**The SPEAKER:** Before we go to the next question, the members for Chaffey, Morphett and Unley are warned a first time. The member for Unley offended twice and, therefore, is called to order and warned a first time. The members for Heysen and Hammond are warned a second and final time, and the members for Mount Gambier and Adelaide are called to order.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: I have not been warned once yet, so I am not sure where you got a double-up.

**The SPEAKER:** If you will be seated, I will tell you the reason.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is warned for the second time, and the Treasurer is called to order. The member for Hammond offended twice during the Premier's answer and I was unwilling to interrupt the Premier to call him to order, so there are two offences. Leader.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. In line with his commitment to reassess his support for the minority Labor government if serious maladministration or corruption is uncovered, does he support referring the allegations against the President of the other place to the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mount Gambier is warned a first time for forced laughter. The Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:25):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I didn't realise I had risen in such a humorous fashion, but I will—

**The SPEAKER:** You did this morning.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Thank you; thank you very much. I will attempt to carry on in a similar vein, if I may. First of all, the federal royal commission is something that has been established by the federal government and will proceed according to its own lights. It is not for us to direct the commission, nor, might I add, to impede the commission.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Can I just finish, please? The really good bits are coming—the good bits are coming. Mr Speaker, it is not for us—those of us assembled here today—to be telling the federal royal commission what to do. We are not in a position to direct them, and the government has resolved that in the event that we are able to assist them in any way, we will; we will cooperate with them. We will be entirely cooperative with them, as indeed all other state governments have indicated they will be.

We intend to be no different, Mr Speaker—absolutely no different—and I can tell you that the government has so resolved. So, there won't be any impediment from our point of view, but we do not direct the royal commission. The royal commission conducts itself according to its terms of reference and I expect it will continue to do so.

#### FEDERAL BUDGET

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:27):** Can the Minister for Health inform the house about the potential impact of the recent federal budget cuts on health in regional South Australia?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Health Industries) (14:27):** I thank the member for Giles, who looks after his electorate, and has an assiduous interest in the regional hospitals in his electorate. The government is committed to improving health services in regional areas. That is why we have invested in redevelopments at Port Lincoln and Mount Gambier hospitals, as well as enhancements to the maternity wing at Mount Barker.

We have opened dedicated chemotherapy units in Wallaroo, Clare, Port Augusta, the South Coast, Murray Bridge, Whyalla, Naracoorte, Mount Barker, Gawler, Berri, Ceduna and Kingscote, with further units due to come on line this year. We have opened an integrated mental health inpatient unit at Whyalla, and a unit in the Riverland will be opening in June.

In contrast, some people don't care about health care in regional South Australia. Last week's federal budget slashed more than \$600 million from the health budget over the next four years. In the 2017-18 financial year alone, the state will be \$269 million worse off. This is the equivalent of closing nearly half of all beds in regional hospitals in South Australia. The people of South Australia have a right to expect that those who represent them in this place stand up against their federal counterparts, who want to savage the services available to country residents. They should be standing with this state government, and with the people of South Australia, to reject—

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Health will be seated. He is welcome to apprise the house of what he believes will be the effect of the federal budget on South Australia, but he has no responsibility to the house for what the state opposition should do or not do. Minister.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Sir, if you look at my remarks, I was very careful not to identify Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition in my remarks. I kept my remarks general, so people, particularly those who represent—

**The SPEAKER:** So I was mistaken in identifying the state opposition?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** I think if you check the *Hansard*, sir, you might have inferred that, but I was very careful not to directly say that it was the state opposition. They should be standing with this state government and with the people of South Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** You should be! You should stand up for country South Australians. You can squawk like a mob of galahs, but you should be looking after your constituents rather than being the lapdogs of Tony Abbott and Joe Hockey.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr GARDNER:** Point of order: I think the standing orders and natural justice require action on this.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Health is called to order and warned a first time. Has the Minister for Health finished?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Yes, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** There is a supplementary question from the member for Davenport.

#### HEALTH BUDGET

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:31):** Can the Minister for Health guarantee that no health service will be negatively impacted by the South Australian Labor government's proposed \$1,000 million cuts to the health budget across the forward estimates?

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Health.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Health Industries) (14:31):** I am very happy the member for Davenport should ask this question, because the Hon. Rob Lucas has been going around telling anyone who will listen that the state government has planned \$1 billion worth of cuts to health. He cites evidence given by the chief executive of the Department of Health to the Budget and Finance Committee.

I have checked the relevant *Hansard* from the Budget and Finance Committee, and the chief executive officer of the Department of Health says no such thing. The Hon. Mr Lucas has pulled the figures out of thin air. He has completely made it up—completely made it up—as is his wont. The Hon. Mr Lucas will peddle any nonsense to anyone who will listen. It is complete and utter nonsense, and I am happy to refer members opposite.

The member for Davenport should know better. He has known the Hon. Mr Lucas for a long time. They are friends and colleagues. They were architects of the most recent election campaign. The member for Davenport should know better than to listen to and take the advice of the Hon. Mr Lucas, or believe any word—any word—that comes out of the mouth of the Hon. Mr Lucas.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I grant a supplementary question, I call the members for Stuart and Hartley to order. The member for Stuart's offence was a couple of questions back, in case he was wondering. The member for Mount Gambier is warned a second and final time, and it would not be good to be such a new member and to be removed from the house so soon—unless, of course, that is the reputation he wishes to have. There is a supplementary question from the member for Davenport.

#### REGIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:33):** My question is again to the health minister. Why won't the health minister guarantee that there will be no negative impact to regional health services as a result of South Australian Labor government cuts to the health budget? Why won't you guarantee that?

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Health Industries) (14:33):** I can make no guarantees, because Tony Abbott and Joe Hockey and members opposite—the members squawking like a flock of galahs—

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Health, yes it is true that the opposition is behaving badly, but I ask you to withdraw the reference to them as galahs, because it is always—always—unparliamentary to refer to a member as an animal or bird of any kind.

**The Hon. J.J. SNELLING:** Sir, I will happily withdraw, but members opposite certainly were squawking. Mr Speaker, I can make no guarantees, because of last Tuesday night's decision to tear up the National Health Reform Agreement and to renege on national partnership agreements which have been entered into in good faith by the state of South Australia and the commonwealth government, agreements we expected to be honoured. I can simply make no guarantees about what this will mean for services, not only in country South Australia but in metropolitan South Australia. The member for Davenport can duck and weave, but the simple fact is that we need them to stand up to their counterparts in the commonwealth and to stand up for South Australia and put South Australia first.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Health is now entering forbidden territory.

**Mr Whetstone:** Really?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey is warned a second and final time.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** We've been trying to get you kicked out for years and it's not working!

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Newland is called to order.

**Mr Gardner:** Throw him out, sir.

**The Hon. T.R. Kenyon:** My apologies, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** There seems to be a lot of dobbing on both sides. The leader.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35):** My question is to the Premier: has the allegation by the former president of the other place, the Hon. John Gazzola, that the current President of the other place is 'a parasite' made the President's position untenable?

**The SPEAKER:** I am not sure the Premier is responsible to the house for that, but he looks like he would like to answer it.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:36):** I think I summarised my position in relation to all of these matters as effectively as I could in my earlier answer, which was to say that the extent to which we all seek to ventilate these questions and throw any petrol on this fire

is likely to reflect poorly on all of us. Obviously, it doesn't reflect well on the government, and I acknowledge that. I think all members should focus on the job that they have, which is to represent their constituents and, in the case of office holders, to discharge their offices; that is what should happen.

If those opposite wish to advance their allegations there are the relevant authorities for them to send their allegations to. So if you have some information that you think ought to belong with an authority, you send it there, but be very careful though, because we have seen in the past what has happened when those opposite have advanced baseless allegations. They have had rather the opposite effect than perhaps one might have hoped for.

So, think carefully about your allegations. I think it is disappointing that we have squabbles essentially over positions; I think most people are out there worried about their jobs and they would like us to be in here talking about those things. So, to the extent that we are intruding into that territory, I agree that it reflects poorly on all of us.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Davenport is called to order for an earlier offence.

**Mr Marshall:** Stop it!

**The SPEAKER:** He did. The Treasurer is warned a first time in the midst of further offending, and the member for Morialta is warned for the second and final time.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I think not. The leader.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38):** A supplementary to the Premier, sir: has the Premier spoken with the Hon. John Gazzola, a member of the Premier's caucus, to ascertain the nature of his allegation of corrupt behaviour against the President of the other place?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:38):** I think I have made it clear what my position is. Obviously, the former president is bitterly disappointed about no longer being in that role. I think he has chosen a fairly destructive way of seeking to advance his grievances publicly. I have expressed my concern about it; I don't think it is an acceptable way of advancing the matter. If he has some concerns, he also has his rights to put them to the relevant authority.

**Mr MARSHALL:** Mr Speaker, a further supplementary.

**The SPEAKER:** A further supplementary.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39):** What is the nature of the allegation of corrupt behaviour against the President of the other place?

**The SPEAKER:** I am not sure again that the Premier is responsible.

**Mr Marshall:** He's the leader of the party.

**The SPEAKER:** He may be—could you please be seated. There is an allegation that has been made under parliamentary privilege. It was the subject of a defamation action where the Hon. Russell Wortley succeeded and was paid damages by those who published the allegation some time ago. There are places to go to, such as the Office of Public Integrity and the Anti-Corruption Branch, to make allegations of corruption, and there is a federal royal commission.

I am not sure that it is within the scope of the Premier's responsibility to tell the house what he thinks is the substratum of fact for the allegation. If the Premier wishes to answer, he may, but I would be inclined to say the Premier is simply not responsible to the house. If Mr Gazzola wants to further outline the allegations outside parliamentary privilege, or under parliamentary privilege, he is free to do so. The leader.



**MEMBER FOR FROME, GOVERNMENT AGREEMENT**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Can the minister advise if he was offered a stand-alone department for regional development as part of the deal to form a minority Labor government?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:40):** Thank you to the leader. My agreement with the Premier and the state government to form a minority stable government has been tabled in this house here—

**Mr Marshall:** Part of it has.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** My agreement with the Premier and the state has been tabled in this house previously by the Premier, and I am very happy doing what I am doing as the Minister for Regional Development and also as the Minister for Local Government. I am doing what everybody should be doing, which is going out there, getting out into the regions, understanding what the issues are and bringing them back into the parliament itself. The issues are there. We need to go forward. We cannot continually refer to what happened yesterday or yesteryear. We have great opportunities here but, to the leader, my agreement has been tabled in this house here—

**Mr Marshall:** Not just part of it?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** My agreement has been tabled in this house here in full.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary from the leader.

**MEMBER FOR FROME, GOVERNMENT AGREEMENT**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41):** Supplementary to the Minister for Regional Development: was he aware that the member for Fisher was offered this department, yet the minister wasn't given this offer?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:41):** Thank you very much to the leader. As I mentioned, this agreement I struck with the Premier is known and has already been tabled in this house. The agreement is a great agreement and is a particularly good one not just for the regions but also for all South Australians. It reflects what I want to achieve for the regions and the people of regional South Australia. It provides stable government and certainty over the next four years.

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned a first time.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** This could not be more evident than last Friday. As the Premier has indicated, last Friday we made the announcement for Nyrstar—the half a billion dollar project investment into Port Pirie and the region, and also to the benefit of South Australia. This agreement also provides for ministers to visit regional South Australia on a weekly basis. This has already started and it is being warmly received by commitments and communities out there that I have already visited.

The agreement also provides for three cabinet meetings a year to be held in regional South Australia. I have already travelled to many towns, and many of the members on the other side have seen me out there in those regions, including all the key stakeholders. I have held discussions with many individuals, local councils, RDAs, other community organisations, small businesses and also the local state parliamentary members.

To the best of my knowledge, the initial letters the Premier wrote to myself and the member for Fisher immediately after the election are basically the same; there is no significant difference. I would also remind others that the member for Fisher and I were together in the initial stages of the post-election negotiations with the Premier until the member for Fisher was unable to proceed due to his illness. The member for Fisher's major concerns were a charter for small business and also for electoral reform. These are encompassed in the final agreement that I have reached with the Premier.

I am comfortable with the final outcome of negotiations and am very honoured to hold the position of Minister for Regional Development and also Minister for Local Government. The main

outcome of my agreement with the Premier is the certainty and the stability it provides for all South Australians over the next four years and, if it was not signed, we may not be here today focusing on the future directions of this state.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MARSHALL:** Supplementary, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Before you proceed to the supplementary, I warn the member for Morphett for the second and final time and I warn the member for Hartley for the first time. The leader.

#### **MEMBER FOR FROME, GOVERNMENT AGREEMENT**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44):** I am even more confused about the answer to my original question: were you or were you not offered a department for primary industries by the Premier?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:44):** The Minister for Regional Development made it absolutely clear in his answer. He said the initial letter he received is, very substantially, in similar terms to the one that was published in today's paper and that was sent to Dr Such. It was a preliminary letter that was sent after our first meeting. A series of pieces of information were requested by both gentlemen and I was happy to provide that. Essentially, there is no material difference in the letters that went to both of those gentlemen.

#### **MEMBER FOR FROME, GOVERNMENT AGREEMENT**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:45):** Supplementary, sir. Given that the Premier has now confirmed that, indeed, the Premier offered to have a stand-alone department for regional development, I ask the member for Frome why he turned down that very generous offer.

**The SPEAKER:** You would ask him in his capacity as the Minister for Regional Development. Premier.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:45):** I am happy to answer on behalf of the government. We reached an agreement that was based on what both the member for Frome and representatives of the Labor Party believed was in the best interests of the future of the state. I think the member for Frome has secured an upgraded set of arrangements for the governance of regional development in South Australia—which was just settled upon, in fact, at the cabinet meeting on Monday. Substantial additional resources have now been applied to that part of the governance of the state that concerns regional development, and it was necessary to supply substantial resources to do that.

Of course, the minister at all times, and this is to his credit, has always been trying to balance the idea of making sure that he has the right bureaucratic support with also making sure that he maximises the dollars that he can put out on the ground in the regions. That is one of the reasons why I offered, and we thought it might be appropriate for him to have, some substantial upgrade in his office at Port Pirie, and he told me he could not justify the extra tens of thousands of dollars that would be necessary to make those changes in his office. He preferred to take that money and actually spend it on the ground.

I am sure he would have got three cheers if people saw a much bigger office in Port Pirie to reflect his additional ministerial responsibilities but he said, 'No, I don't want that. I will try to live within my existing office envelope and use the money that we save on that and spend it in the regions.' I think that is to his credit. The fact that he has not accepted some massive piece of additional bureaucracy but, rather, wanted to plough that back into regions reflects the sort of person that the member for Frome is. I think that's why he is being incredibly well received around this state and is, I think, well accepted as a great part of our team.

**The SPEAKER:** Would the leader please be seated? The member for Adelaide is warned for the first time and the member for Stuart is warned for the first time. This would be a fourth supplementary, by my reckoning. Could we just make it another question?

**MEMBER FOR FROME, GOVERNMENT AGREEMENT**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:47):** Certainly. Given that the Premier has just informed the house that the offer to the member for Fisher was substantially the same as the offer to the member for Frome, can the Minister for Regional Development offer an explanation to the house why he did not take up the government's offer for a parliamentary committee for rural and regional affairs as part of the deal to form a minority Labor government?

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (14:48):** As the Premier has just indicated, I have been in this position for probably about eight weeks. There have been some opportunities to look at putting an office for regional development in my office at Port Pirie. In discussions looking forward, the agreement is not set in concrete. It was very clear—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** We have moved along and, as the Premier has just indicated, there is a committee which has been approved by the cabinet last week which will be exactly what was in the news release the other day.

**Mr Marshall:** It is another agreement.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** It is not another agreement. It is moving on. It is looking at the best opportunity to represent all of regional South Australia. Mr Speaker, I would ask the leader—it is similar to what the opposition leader—

*Mr Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** —wanted for the member for Hammond as the chair of that committee. This is a similar committee, but it has a wide range of portfolios and will be reporting directly to the cabinet. I will be chairing that committee and working very closely with members on the other side. I have made it quite clear in my discussions and visits out to the regions that we have to work together.

This parliament is starting to work against each other. We have great issues out there, we have great challenges, we have great opportunities, and I am calling on all members of this house to work for the betterment of South Australia. We have lots of issues, and I am going to make certain we try to get the best outcomes for the people of South Australia, not for political parties.

**The SPEAKER:** A supplementary, leader.

**MEMBER FOR FROME, GOVERNMENT AGREEMENT**

**Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:50):** Just for clarity, are you announcing to the house today—

**The SPEAKER:** No, is the minister announcing—

**Mr MARSHALL:** Is the minister announcing to the house today that, indeed, the government is going to set up a parliamentary committee for rural and regional affairs, and will we require legislation to effect that change? Can the minister provide greater detail, because it's certainly not encompassed in part of the agreement? We were only informed minutes earlier that this was the total agreement.

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:50):** What the minister said, if the member had listened carefully, is that there is a cabinet committee in relation to regional affairs that has been established that will be led by the minister.

**Mr Marshall:** Not a parliamentary committee?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL:** No, not a parliamentary committee: a cabinet committee. There are a number of parliamentary committees that deal with questions which touch on rural and regional affairs, including the Natural Resources Committee, including the Environment, Resources and Development Committee, including the Aboriginal lands committee and, indeed, any committee of this parliament. Whether it be the Economic and Finance Committee, the Public Works Committee

or the Social Development Committee, they can, from time to time, as part of their remit, take on board rural and regional issues.

Indeed, I have requested—I made this request at our caucus meeting on Tuesday morning—that each of those committees give consideration to holding at least some of their deliberations in rural and regional areas. That was a request I made of all of the members and chairs of the committees, to the extent that we can influence those decisions. So, I think there are ample governance arrangements within the parliamentary process; that's obviously the conclusion that the member for Frome arrived at as we went through the process of negotiation concerning what should comprise the nature of our agreement.

#### FEDERAL BUDGET

**The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister inform the house about the recent meeting of education leaders that the minister convened to discuss the impact of the federal budget?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:52):** Last Friday, I convened a meeting here at Parliament House with the state's education leaders to give them the most up-to-date information we had available in relation to the federal budget. With \$5.5 billion to be ripped from the state's health and education budget over the next 10 years, the impact will be nothing short of catastrophic. This was not lost—

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order from the member for MacKillop.

**Mr WILLIAMS:** Standing order 98, I think: the fact that the minister uses the expression 'ripped from' indicates that she is debating the answer.

**The SPEAKER:** I think that's an entirely bogus point of order, and I call the member for MacKillop to order. Minister.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** The import of this was not lost on the many organisations that were represented at this meeting. Well-respected groups like the South Australian primary and secondary principals' associations, the Association of Independent Schools, Catholic Education and the South Australian Association of State School Organisations attended at very short notice.

We had principal associations, preschool and childcare associations, children's disability organisations, as well as union representatives and parent groups. Their mood was sombre on arrival. Once briefed, their reaction was that the situation they—we—now face is appalling. President of the Association of Independent Schools, Ms Carolyn Grantskalns, is a fierce but fair advocate for her schools, and she labelled these federal budget cuts as 'deplorable'.

We know the Coalition government plans to erase \$320 million in Gonski payments in 2018-19 to South Australian schools and, as I outlined yesterday, the future of universal access to preschools remains uncertain, potentially impacting on something like 20,000 families here in South Australia.

We know it's difficult to attract early childhood education teachers to some disadvantaged and regional areas. It's particularly difficult in remote and Indigenous communities. A \$12.4 million national HECS-HELP program, which helped attract early childhood teachers willing to teach in these areas, will be scrapped next financial year. Moneys for childcare learning inclusion projects and professional support programs, the childcare accessibility fund and several more programs amounting to \$39.3 million nationally have been taken away. The National Partnership Agreement on TAFE fees for childcare qualifications will close at the end of the year. That is \$68 million nationally over four years.

The removal of these funding programs will hit regional and remote areas the hardest. They send the strong message that this Abbott-led government has no understanding of the importance of the early years of a child's development. I heard the federal Treasurer say today the most important task his government faces is to get the economy back on track. Well, you can't do that if you're not investing in your most valuable resource—and that's our children. Whispers from Canberra that this is just the beginning grow louder by the day, and members opposite should take note that the temperature is rising rapidly. Six thousand people protesting—

*Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members opposite don't need to do anything. I would ask the minister not to refer to members opposite, because they are not really relevant to the answer.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Thank you, sir—and that has been the hallmark, unfortunately, of the opposition: a small target strategy which costs them dearly.

**The SPEAKER:** I call the minister to order for defying my ruling.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Thank you, sir. Our education and children's service leaders are extremely concerned about these devastating cuts. They want more information, we want more information, but not surprisingly the federal government appears reluctant to come clean with the detail of their plans.

#### EDUCATION BUDGET

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:56):** Supplementary: considering the minister was so eloquent in her details of the impact of the federal government cuts to the education budget, is she able to detail the impact of her own department's \$230 million of education cuts, as outlined in the Budget and Finance Committee *Hansard* of 18 November last year?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:57):** I am surprised even that the shadow spokesperson would ask a question like this, being that they clearly have a view that their policies, or their leader, were certainly not in politics for social issues. But let me point out the education—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will be seated. The point of order.

**Mr PISONI:** She is once again defying your ruling.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order on the basis that the minister appears to be imputing improper motives to the opposition in asking the question. Minister.

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** Sir, the education budget over the next five years is likely to grow by something like \$1.9 billion. I can guarantee we won't be sacking 25,000 public servants—25,000 public servants—

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** He let the cat out of the bag.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is warned for the second and final time. The member for Unley.

#### ANDREWS, MS JAN

**Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Does the minister stand by her ministerial statement to this house, on 26 September 2013, that former education department employee Ms Jan Andrews was sacked for disciplinary reasons as a result of that Debelle inquiry?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:59):** Sir, I don't recall ever saying that.

*Mr Pisoni interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** I don't recall ever saying it, but I will be checking the *Hansard* to make sure I'm not being misrepresented, which I have to point out, the member for Unley has got a history in.

**The SPEAKER:** What is the name of the person? I didn't quite catch the name.

**Mr PISONI:** Sir, Jan Andrews; *Hansard* of 26 September 2013, to make it easy for the minister.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes; does the minister want to add anything?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE:** No.

**The SPEAKER:** No, okay. The member for Unley. The member for Unley has the call; would he like it?

**Mr PISONI:** No.

**The SPEAKER:** Okay. The member for Florey.

#### HOMELESS FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. Can the minister inform the house of recent changes to funding arrangements that will affect homeless people in South Australia?

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:00):** In 2012-13 alone, an estimated 23,832 people received support from the social housing sector here in South Australia. Housing SA is charged with providing funding assistance to this important sector, which comes in part from the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness. This money contributes to the provision of about 76 specialist homelessness support services across 97 sites throughout South Australia.

Many of these services provide meals, showers, laundry, access to nurses and GPs, access to assisted accommodation and referrals to Housing SA services and boarding house accommodation. For example, the Hutt Street Centre alone provided around 50,000 meals (about 1,000 each week) for approximately 1,500 individual clients in 2012-13. In general, we have had a very positive, bipartisan approach to this social issue, and I make note that I think earlier in the year both the Premier and the leader were there supporting the Hutt Street Centre.

Only a few weeks ago at the Angel for a Day launch, the deputy leader, the member for Kurna and the federal member for Hindmarsh were there supporting people who need our support the most. I am advised that more than three-quarters of the centre's clients are between 25 and 54 years of age, and about 70 per cent of people presenting as homeless have a mental health issue. These clients are some of the most marginalised and vulnerable people in South Australia. They are real people, real members of our community, who need as much care and assistance as we can provide them.

When the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness was originally signed in December 2008, approximately \$82 million in combined funding was agreed for the original three-year term. While I am pleased that the funding of the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness has been confirmed for 2014-15, at the same time I am extremely disheartened that the commitment will only be for one more year. This will have a long-lasting impact on the viability of the social housing sector, particularly in light of the savage welfare cuts flagged in last week's federal budget.

You don't need to be an economics wizard to work out that, by cutting funding to existing services provided by the social housing sector, you will increase demand for these very services. To cut even further, recent proposed changes to the Newstart allowance will prevent jobseekers from receiving government payments within a six-month period. Six months with no government support—this will leave more people under the age of 30 without the option of obtaining secure housing due to not having a stable income.

As the minister and in conjunction and partnership with the sector we will now be required to begin the process of redesigning our existing social housing sector. This has been a very successful sector which has had contributable focus from this Labor government and has seen more than a 40 per cent reduction in the number of homeless people who experience rough sleeping across the state since 2006. I am very disappointed that our federal government would cut services to the most vulnerable members of our society.

#### FAMILIES SA ADVERSE EVENTS REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:04):** My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister now provide to the house the answer to a question she took on notice on 8 May, and that is: has Families SA received any

recommendations from the Adverse Events Review Committee in respect of any case as yet and, for each accepted recommendation, what action has been taken?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:04):** I can confirm, obviously, that the Adverse Events Committee that has been in operation, I think since about 2004, of course has made recommendations to the department, but it has been operating for many years—10 years now—so I don't have the detail still of all of the recommendations. As I said, I will be checking as to whether this is a reasonable ask for the department to go through all of the recommendations that may have been made over the last 10 years and provide a report to the parliament. If it is possible within a reasonable time frame I will do it. If it's an unreasonable diversion of resources, I won't be doing it.

#### **FAMILIES SA ADVERSE EVENTS REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:05):** Supplementary, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Supplementary, deputy leader.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Minister, have you made the inquiry of your department as to whether this is a reasonable or unreasonable ask and, if so, what is their response?

**The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:05):** I have put the request and am awaiting advice.

#### **COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:05):** My question is to the Premier. Prior to 7 April this year, did the Premier have any discussion with the Minister for the Public Sector about a proposal that Ms Erma Ranieri be appointed the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:05):** I thank the honourable member for his question. To answer that question it is probably worth understanding the context in which this decision needs to be made about the future role of the Commissioner for Public Employment. During the election campaign we made a commitment to bring two parts of government together, which are essentially the Commissioner for Public Employment's role and the Public Sector Renewal Unit aspect of government. The public sector renewal element of government is headed up by Ms Erma Ranieri and she is doing a fine job in it, implementing the Public Sector Renewal Program.

The most obvious public feature of those has been the 90-day projects which have been incredibly important in driving renewal and culture change in the public sector, so she is doing a great job in that role. We are bringing together these two roles, and so we are going through a process at the moment of filling the Commissioner for Public Employment role. Obviously Ms Ranieri, because she is an incumbent in one—if you like—half of the two roles that we are bringing together, is a likely choice, but there is a range of due diligence and process that needs to occur before we are in a position to make that appointment. So I have raised the possibility of Ms Erma Ranieri being in that role, but there are certain processes before we can make a final decision about those matters.

#### **COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:07):** To the Premier again, did the Minister for the Public Sector take a submission to cabinet on 7 April this year which indicated that she would be proposing in a future cabinet submission that Ms Erma Ranieri be appointed as the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:07):** Obviously we don't answer questions about what matters go to cabinet and what are the deliberations of cabinet, so I am certainly not going to be answering that question. One only needs to reflect on my earlier answer to understand that, in bringing together two parts of government—one of them has an incumbent, the other one has a vacancy—obviously considerations would be given to the person who is the incumbent and continuing to pool the merged roles, and that is the process that we are presently considering.

#### **COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT**

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:08):** Further supplementary.

**The SPEAKER:** Further supplementary, member for Davenport.

**The Hon. I.F. EVANS:** Given the Premier's first answer indicated that he had had discussions with the Minister for the Public Sector about this appointment, can you confirm that any of those discussions occurred before the 7 April this year?

**The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:08):** I don't know when they occurred but I will take that on notice and bring back an answer.

#### GILLMAN LAND SALE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:08):** My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. During the last sitting week the Deputy Premier gave an undertaking to the house that he would find out whether the member for Lee had met with representatives of Adelaide Capital Partners while working as the deputy chief of staff to the Premier. Can the Deputy Premier now confirm whether the member for Lee met with representatives of Adelaide Capital Partners?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:09):** I can't confirm that, and on reflection it seems to me that in my capacity as minister I cannot possibly be accountable to the house for the actions of people who at the relevant time were not even members of the parliament and, so, I have come to the opinion I am not able to assist the honourable member in relation to that matter.

#### GILLMAN LAND SALE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:09):** Supplementary, sir: given the minister's answer, I will now address my supplementary to the Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Will the minister assisting tell us whether indeed he has attended any meetings—as I had asked him last sitting time—with Adelaide Capital Partners in respect of the Gillman option to sell?

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier.

**Ms Chapman:** He said he can't answer!

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:10):** No, I said that I cannot assist you in relation to the matter, and I continue to not be able to assist you in relation to the matter, and I will continue to not be able to assist you with the matter, and I will continue to get up and answer it.

#### GILLMAN LAND SALE

**Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:10):** Further supplementary: will the Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development advise the house whether he has attended any meetings with Mr Stephen Gerlach or other boards of directors of Adelaide Capital Partners?

**The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:11):** Again, look, these—

**Ms Chapman:** He's the minister assisting!

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Yes, he is many things—

**Ms Chapman:** And he can answer the question well enough.

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is warned a second and final time.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** The question that was asked is an open-ended question in relation to periods of time during which the minister assisting was not even a member of the parliament, let alone a minister of the Crown. The position is that there is nothing that can be offered by way of assistance in respect of those particular questions.



Can I also add this: there are matters floating around at the present time, of which I am sure the honourable member is aware, in our court system. In fact, one of them was lodged, I believe, within the last 24 hours, relating to certain matters. In respect of those matters, there are a great many issues which touch upon things like privilege and various other things.

I do not consider it to be appropriate, in the context of those proceedings, for me—and, can I say, other members—to be answering questions about this particular matter, which is now actively being litigated by people, some of whom I understand are associated or have in the past been associated with senior members of the opposition.

So, let us just bear in mind what is going on; let those proceedings roll out as they will. Let the activities that are being agitated in other places roll out as they will. When all of that has been completed, if there are matters still to be explored, then well and good.

**Ms CHAPMAN:** Supplementary.

**The SPEAKER:** No, I am going to call the member for Kaurna. I give notice to the member for Unley that I would like him to read out the quote from *Hansard* on which he relied for his question that Jan Andrews was sacked for disciplinary reasons. So, I will just give him notice to obtain that quote and share the complete quote with the house. The member for Kaurna.

#### TOUR DOWN UNDER

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:14):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister inform the house about the economic benefits of the 2014 Tour Down Under?

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:14):** I thank the member for Kaurna for his question. Of course, his electorate is showcased across the world—the wonderful beaches of Silver Sands, Port Willunga and Aldinga—as the second-to-last stage of the Tour Down Under each year goes through the seat of Kaurna.

Fantastic news just in in terms of the economic impact of this year's Santos Tour Down Under: \$45.9 million was pumped into the South Australian economy. We saw a total of 762,266 spectators attend the event, and 36,000 interstate and overseas visitors came to South Australia specifically for the 2014 Santos Tour Down Under. The event generated 26,092 media items, resulting in a calculated public relations value of \$167 million.

There were 26 hours of the 2014 event, including 17½ hours live and 8½ hours of highlights telecast on the Nine Network and GEM. The race itself was spectacular, with just one second separating the eventual winner, Simon Gerrans, and the Australian champion, Cadel Evans. Simon Gerrans became the first person to ever win the Santos Tour Down Under three times.

One of the highlights of this year's race was actually at the Legends dinner, when Phil Liggett, the voice of world cycling, declared that the best way for South Australia to retain the Santos Tour Down Under was to re-elect the current government in March. He told me that he had just got down off the stage when he was confronted by Joan Hall, who came up with David Ridgway, who was the opposition tourism spokesperson. She said, 'Phil, next year David is going to be the minister for tourism, so you are going to have to deal with him.' Phil was a little bit taken aback by that.

Christian Prudhomme, the head of the Tour de France, was out here. He had a great time, and loved the event. He described the Santos Tour Down Under as the 'Tour de France in January'. Brian Cookson was also here, the new head of the UCI, the international cycling body. It was his first trip to see the Santos Tour Down Under. He was blown away by it; he loved the event. The Premier and I spent a lot of time with him to make sure that the future of the Santos Tour Down Under is as safe as it possibly can be. This is the sort of thing you need to do. You need to have good relationships with the people who run world sport.

A couple of weeks after they went back, I rang Brian and Christian, and I asked them whether the opposition had caught up with them while they were here to work on keeping the Santos Tour Down Under in South Australia. They both said that they had not been approached for any briefings or discussions by the opposition. Particularly, Christian Prudhomme, the man who runs the Tour de France, said that was very interesting, because in France when there is an election on, the opposition

parties will always come and sit down and have a meeting with him about the future of the Tour de France.

They thought that it was a little unusual that while they were here there were no discussions. It is particularly unusual given that Joan Hall raced up to Phil Liggett and said that David Ridgway was going to be the new tourism minister for the 2015 race. They obviously thought that they were going to win in March, even though Phil Liggett, the voice of cycling, had advised people in the room that night—

**Ms Redmond:** Phil. You haven't even got the name right.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** I said Phil.

**Ms Redmond:** You didn't; you said Bill.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL:** You should just give it up, I tell you. You're just so negative. Here we had someone who thought he was going to get in and did not even take the time to sit down with the bosses of world cycling.

#### *Grievance Debate*

### **CLIMATE CHANGE**

**Ms REDMOND (Heysen) (15:18):** I rise today to talk about the issue of climate change and what I see as the problem with it. I am sure that is getting everyone excited. I did want to get everyone's attention, but no, I am not a climate change denier, or even a sceptic. Indeed, I look at it like this. I am not a scientist. Apart from the science I learnt at high school and the bits and pieces of knowledge I have picked up along the way since then, I am not at all educated about matters in the realm of science generally. I know some basic physics, chemistry, biology, geology and so on, but I am certainly not equipped to assess the validity or otherwise of arguments put with regard to scientific matters, just as I am not equipped to assess matters of medicine.

When I go to my doctor, I put my trust in him as someone who has studied the relevant literature, who can understand and assess it. I rely on him and the vast bulk of those involved in Western medicine to be able to assess—for me and for others—the likely diagnosis and best options for treatment. I know that in many parts of our community there are people who reject Western medicine, some just gently looking for other, more natural responses to the body's aches and pains, but some with a passionate zeal that borders on hysteria.

Some of those people, for instance, will try to bombard you with so-called scientific evidence that immunisation is a terrible thing, or that fluoridisation of water is poisoning our population. This is despite the fact that immunisation has saved literally millions of lives worldwide, that the risks of an adverse reaction are microscopically low, and that fluoride—a natural substance found in rocks, air, soil, plants and water—has been overwhelmingly shown to protect teeth against decay. The scientific evidence shows a huge population benefit from the addition of very small amounts of fluoride to the water.

These zealots often proffer literature on the topic as proof of their fervent beliefs, but as I already noted, I have neither the time nor the inclination to develop the necessary level of knowledge—of the subject matter or of the scientific method and its assessment—which would allow me to make any rational assessment of these proffered arguments for or against the particular topic. Instead, I choose to rely on my doctor and on all the other doctors who have devoted their lives to studying, understanding and working with Western medicine because the overwhelming balance of the evidence and the outcomes supports their hundreds of years of work.

The same reasoning applies to my attitude to climate change. There are many people out there who are wanting me to read their proffered articles about why climate change is a hoax. I have neither the time nor, more importantly, the expertise, to dispute whatever assertions they put to me. But I do know that the overwhelming preponderance of opinion in what one could generally describe as the scientific community says that our climate is changing, and that it is at least in part due to human activity.

So, without the benefit of any detailed study, knowledge or understanding, it seems to me that the safest bet is to go with what is clearly the vast majority of opinion. There are, I think, two other reasons to lean in favour of climate change. Before that term was even in regular use, I had

formed the view that we owed it to our children and grandchildren to try to leave this earth a little better than we found it, rather than depleted and ravaged, and also—even if it did turn out to be wrong—surely we are better off taking the precautionary approach.

After saying all of that, what is the problem with climate change? It is simply this: I do not like being told what I have to think. Those of you who know me even slightly may know that I do not like being told what to think, and that is where in my view the climate change advocates (for want of a better term) have made their fundamental mistake.

They insist that I accept climate change and that I do not question it in any way. If I do, I will be labelled as some sort of heretic, and there is something in my nature that makes me suspicious of any organisation, creed, doctrine—whatever you want to call it—that will not let me question; that says, 'If you so much as raise an eyebrow, you will be pilloried, ostracised, criticised, and made a pariah.'

Instead of letting the preponderance of opinion speak for itself, the so-called 'debate' has been hijacked to the point where anyone even trying to bring things back to a rational discussion, as I am today, is likely to be seen as some sort of radical.

**The SPEAKER:** I will call the Treasurer, but I find it remarkable that the Treasurer would enter a grievance debate. I thought grievances were about the redress of grievances and that ministers were supposed to listen to them. But since the Treasurer seems to have a grievance, I will give him 5 minutes.

#### STATE ELECTION CAMPAIGN

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Automotive Transformation) (15:22):** Without wanting to correct you, Mr Speaker, in your resplendent attire today—wearing the House of Commons brocade—it is not your five minutes to give: it is the parliament's, and the parliament allows it sir.

In my grievance I rise to speak of the most recent state election campaign and to thank those people who ensured that we are sitting again in the parliament on this side of the chamber. Firstly, I thank my wife and my family. We had a new baby girl who was born on 2 January, so I did not get to spend much time at home in those early days when I should have been home being Dad. So I want to thank Anthea and little Tia for being so patient with me for leaving home every morning at about 4.30 or 5 o'clock and getting home very late.

I also want to thank my electorate staff: Betty Livaditis and Zoi for their commitment to getting me re-elected in West Torrens. I want to thank the political candidates who stood in the seat of West Torrens: Serge Ambrose and Tim White. I think they ran their campaigns exceptionally honourably which means they did not do anything to upset me, which was very good.

I also want to thank the Premier and his entire office. I thank my office, and I want to thank Reggie Martin. I thank everyone in the ALP head office who worked so hard to get so many people elected. They are the people who do so much for us working behind the scenes. They work day and night, away from their families and do not get the public recognition that we all do in this parliament for winning our seats; for winning a campaign.

My ministerial office, headed by my chief of staff, Robert Malinauskas, right through to my personal assistant, Vicky—all of my advisers, not during government time but in their own time, gave up their labour for a cause, because people in our party are part of a movement larger than themselves, and that movement is healthy.

I believe that this government's victory is the beginning of something greater for this country. We are the one force that will stand up to those people who deny climate change, who think they can make cuts to health and education and who think that Australia should be somehow more Americanised and less Australian.

Former premier Dunstan used to say that the lights have gone out across Australia, but a light flickered in South Australia. I think that is a true statement of what has occurred here in this state. Darkness has descended across the country, with Coalition governments all across the country, but a light flickers here: a voice of reason, a voice of progressive politics, to stand up to—

**An honourable member:** A voice of modesty.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes—a voice to stand up to the excesses of members opposite and their ilk, a voice to stand up to the excesses and brutality that they would impose on those most vulnerable. I am privileged to hold the position of Treasurer of South Australia and, indeed, to hold the title of Labor Treasurer in this country. I will take that title into this budget process and be proud of it, to make sure that we can implement a Labor agenda. I also want to thank a few other people who played a very big part in the re-election of this government, and they are Steven Marshall, Rob Lucas and Graham Greene.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sorry, sir, the leader of—

**The SPEAKER:** The Treasurer will withdraw that and refer to them by their position or electorate name.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I wish to thank the member for Dunstan for the role he played. Our campaign tactic was very clear: we wanted to define him and he let us. After we had defined him, he played his part beautifully. I also want to thank the Hon. Rob Lucas. He has been advising the Liberal Party now for 40 years on how to run campaigns. Long may he continue. He is a man who I think should be held in the highest regard and I am pleased to note that he was re-elected for another eight-year term. This man is a genius and I hope that he continues in his position.

I also want to thank the hard-working Liberal Party state director, Graham Greene. I understand he had a very great—

**Mr Gardner:** Jeff.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Geoff Greene. I am sorry, Geoff Greene, for the work he did. I understand he did great things in Queensland and he has brought that great work and that great tactic to South Australia. That is a bit unkind on him, because he only has so much to work with. I think it is fair to say that the Liberal Party beat us in one thing and one thing only: money. On every other aspect of their campaign they were outsmarted, outfoxed, out-tacticked, out-worked and out-campaigned. We ran a grassroots campaign that is the envy of the nation. When I went to my first Treasurer's conference they all asked this one question: why did they run a first-term MP as their leader? I hope they do it again.

Time expired.

**The SPEAKER:** Graham Greene wrote *The Quiet American* and was a Nobel Prize winning novelist.

### OAKLANDS PARK RAIL CROSSING

**Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:28):** I rise today to talk about the ongoing saga that is the Oaklands Park train crossing, which is where Diagonal Road and Morphett Road dissect the train line at the northern end of the Mitchell electorate on the boundary I share with Elder. I was interested to hear the member for Elder talk about public transport just the other day in the house, and she stressed that she wanted to be positive. The member for Elder spoke about the Tonsley train line being up and running, but I was flabbergasted that at no time did she mention the number one transport issue in her electorate: the burning issue that is the Oaklands Park train crossing. I am positive that the people of Mitchell and Elder and the surrounds are very frustrated with the Oaklands Park crossing.

The member for Elder and I have been together at community forums, listening to and speaking with constituents on the issue, and I know that it would have been one of the key items for her, as it was for me, during the election campaign. This is also not a new issue. Having grown up in Oaklands Park, I have watched the debate rage around this intersection for a number of years now. It has been a source of aggravation for commuters in and around Mitchell and Elder, and beyond, for more than a decade. In fact, some say that it has been brewing for way longer, but I know in the last 10 years it has reached boiling point and next to nothing has been done.

Before my time here a petition was collected by the City of Marion council. It had more than 5,000 signatures and I am told was distributed to the members of this house. Interestingly, the signatures were from people as far south as Seaford and Morphett Vale and as far north as

Torrensville. This is a clear indication to me that, while this is an issue that centres around Mitchell and Elder, it has implications far beyond these districts.

When I worked at Westfield Shopping Town back in the late 1980s and early 1990s, the centre was lauded as being one of the biggest in the Southern Hemisphere. Since then, the precinct has grown fourfold, and potentially more. It has gone from being a shopping centre to a South Australian entertainment, health, public service and sporting hub. There has been the addition of the state aquatic facility on the corner of Diagonal and Morphett roads, and the GP Plus, Centrelink and the Marion Cultural Centre have been established. A new Service SA office has been added. In general, the precinct has flourished but nothing has been done to alleviate the congestion of the notorious Oaklands intersection.

In the past few months, as the new electric trains have slowly begun running, the new schedule has had more trains moving through the intersection and increasing the bottleneck. Unfortunately for residents who combat the crossing, they have been teased over time. They sit in their cars in clogged traffic. In 2008, the state Labor government spent \$6.8 million overhauling the train station and moving it closer to the intersection. Then they recalled a promised upgrade of the Diagonal Road, Prunus Street and Morphett Road precinct which is valued at \$12.6 million.

This promise was scrapped in the 2011 state budget when the state Labor government realised it had overspent and it did not have the funds to complete the project. Instead, the key players opposite decided to spend \$2 million on a study into how to ease traffic congestion. The value of that \$2 million study could be well questioned by all those sitting in their cars stuck in traffic again at the Oaklands intersection today, this week and beyond.

For the \$2 million study, we received some pretty pictures of an overpass and we are told that it was the most cost-effective solution to fix the traffic congestion at Oaklands Park. Those pictures were presented to the public in September 2012, nearly two years ago. Since then, nothing has been done. My grave concern is that the cost of the project was estimated at the time by the transport minister's office to be in the vicinity (and, as I say, the figures are very rubbery) of beyond \$100 million. No-one really knows, and I worry that the government does not know at this point in time.

Perhaps it will be explained at some time soon when we meet with the transport minister. My deputy leader has organised a meeting with the transport minister for herself and me in the not too distant future. She asked for that back on 1 April and we are still waiting for a response. Almost two years ago, the pictures and diagrams came out but nothing more has been done.

I know that the state Labor government has watched as the state debt has risen above \$14 billion. I can only presume that is the reason they have not gone ahead. That is one option: the state debt has risen to \$14 billion and they cannot fund the project. The plans have been put in place two years ago and, as I said, nothing has been done.

The only other explanation, if it is not mismanagement of the budget and there are not funds to complete the project, is that the state Labor government does not care about the people of Mitchell or the people of Elder. They are the only two options: they do not have the funds because they have mismanaged the economy or they do not care about the people of Mitchell and the people of Elder. I can see why the member for Elder did not want to talk about the crossing at Oaklands. It is a big issue, but I call on the Premier to get the job done.

#### **DENNIS, RETIRED LIEUTENANT COLONEL MICHAEL**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:33):** Today, I inform the house of the death of Lieutenant Colonel Michael Dennis MBE (Retired). South Australia lost one of its finest and most respected with the passing of Mike 'The Fox' Dennis after a long and courageous battle with cancer on 3 May 2014. It was an honour to be present at his funeral service, attended by so many family and friends at the Heysen Chapel on 9 May, and I am indebted to Mike's son, Simon, and Bill Denny, Director of Veterans SA, for the following information, which I have combined to give a fuller picture in Mike's memory.

Mike had a long and distinguished career as an infantry soldier and officer over 28 years. He enlisted as a private in the regular Army in 1967 after two years in the Papua New Guinea Volunteer Rifles (CMF) and, after initial and corps training, was posted to 9 Battalion, Royal Australian Regiment. He was quickly promoted to Section Commander but suffered an injury during training

which prevented him deploying with the battalion to Vietnam in 1968. However, he applied, and was accepted, to attend the Officer Cadet School at Portsea in 1968.

On graduating in 1969 into the infantry, he was posted to the 1<sup>st</sup> Battalion, Pacific Islands Regiment, where he served as a platoon commander until 1972, when he was posted to 2 Battalion, RAR, as Pioneer Platoon Commander. He was promoted to captain and, in 1973-74, he was posted as adjutant of the Monash University Regiment and the Adelaide University Regiment, as training officer serving in South-East Asia. From 1975 to 1978, he served in South Australia in Headquarters 4<sup>th</sup> Military District and then as a company second-in-command with 3 Battalion, RAR. From Adelaide, he was sent to the Land Warfare Centre, Canungra, as an instructor on battle wing—a very much sought-after posting.

In 1982, Mike returned to Papua New Guinea as the major operations officer of the 1<sup>st</sup> Battalion of the Pacific Islands Regiment. During this posting, he was appointed a member of the Order of the British Empire by the Papua New Guinea government in recognition of his outstanding service, primarily for the planning and conduct of border operations on the PNG-Indonesian border.

This was followed by a posting as officer commanding 3 Brigade Headquarters ADF. Mike undertook extensive special forces training and was a Navy diving instructor, demolition instructor, foreign weapons instructor, small craft instructor, unconventional warfare instructor, a linguist and an expert marksman.

A major change of direction occurred when in 1986, after a brief posting to Townsville, he was appointed a senior desk officer at the Defence Intelligence Organisation, Canberra. Then followed a series of intelligence/diplomatic appointments centred around PNG and the Pacific Islands. These culminated in an appointment as defence attaché, South Pacific, covering Fiji, Tonga, Western Samoa, Kiribati and Tuvalu.

Following involvement in the 1987 Fiji coup and Operation Morris Dance, he was promoted to lieutenant colonel and posted as a defence adviser to PNG and the Solomon Islands in 1988. This position was primarily an intelligence collection role, and he served on Bougainville in 1989 and 1990, in the early stages of the Bougainville war, in a plainclothes role. He was awarded a Chief of Army Commendation and an Australia Day Award for actions on Bougainville. Posted back to DIO in 1990 with the PNG/SWP section, he was then selected to be the defence attaché South Pacific accredited to the islands I have mentioned previously.

Mike resigned from the Army in 1995 on completion of his postings to Fiji and entered the commercial world. His subsequent appointments included general manager of Suncorp Stadium Brisbane, Clean Event Australia and vice president of Clean Event International, and during his time with this organisation he undertook the restructuring of the US-based arm of the company. He was also involved in the planning and conduct of the Sydney Olympics, the Salt Lake City Winter Olympics, the Manchester Commonwealth Games and the Athens Olympics.

Mike's other sporting interests included being the manager of the Australian national rugby league team, the Kangaroos, and manager and coach of the PNG and Fiji national rugby league teams. The large number of South Pacific nations represented at his funeral demonstrated the high esteem in which Mike was held, and a beautiful traditional song was sung in his honour.

On his retirement to Adelaide, Mike became honorary consul to Fiji in South Australia. His leisure activities included a love of golf, serving for a time as president of the Lower Murray and Hills Veterans Golfers Association. He became heavily involved in veterans' issues, working with the Department of Veterans' Affairs and the RSL at sub-branch and state councillor level, and the RAR Association, serving for a term as president.

He was also appointed to the Minister for Veterans' Affairs National Committee on Emerging Issues in the Australian Defence Force. He was a strong advocate for a range of veterans' issues, especially those which he believed deprived veterans and their families of justice and their rights. He will be sadly missed by many, and particularly by the veterans community here in South Australia. Lest we forget.

#### **MUSTER, MRS ROBYN**

**Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:38):** I rise to acknowledge one of the great women upon whose hard work the success of her local community has thrived—that is, one Mrs Robyn Muster. Robyn

was born in July 1955 at the Freeling and District Hospital. Whilst she travelled on occasions far away from Freeling, it was her home for most of her life, and she was homesick whenever she left Freeling for too long.

After attending the local primary school, which had only 25 students, she studied at Immanuel College—a school which had 500 in the city in 1969. She was the first woman to study agriculture at Immanuel and worked in the industry following year 12. This would be followed by many 'first woman' achievements throughout her life. Women in agriculture was a constant theme for Robyn, building upon the beliefs and the strong encouragement of her parents, Colin and Joy Lienert, who were very well-known and well-awarded Berkshire pork breeders in the region. Following school, she worked at the wheat research/plant breeding program at Roseworthy College. She was promoted and worked as a technical officer for 15 years—one of the very few women on campus, let alone in such a role.

She married Barry Muster in 1981, whom she had met at a Freeling Rosedale parish youth meeting, and they moved in together in the Muster homestead which they renamed 'Schoenfeld Manor'. Robyn and Barry had two children, Travis and Kelly, and were involved as a family in the local sporting scene in Freeling: Kelly in hockey and tennis and Travis with his football.

Robyn's hard work in the agriculture sector is one of her greatest contributions to the community and to South Australia at large, especially in advocating for women in farming and agriculture. In 1997, Robyn was the first female to be elected as a councillor of the Royal Adelaide Show society, which celebrates its 175<sup>th</sup> anniversary this year, representing the grain and fodder section. Robyn would represent the grain and fodder section for 17 years, and was again the first female elected onto the Royal Adelaide Show society's executive committee for five years.

In 2002, Robyn won a scholarship to attend the 3<sup>rd</sup> World Rural Women's Congress in Madrid, Spain. She also attended the fourth world congress in 2006 in Durban. As is usually the case in rural communities across the state, Robyn was a good 'joiner of things' and volunteered at the local op shop for over 15 years, the school council of the Freeling Primary School for over 10 years, and on the Faith Lutheran College council for eight years. Robyn's dedication to her local community was duly recognised when she was awarded the Light Regional Council Citizen of the Year Award in 2003.

Robyn's contribution to her community was clearly much larger than being a member of the Liberal Party, which is how I first came to know her. Being a party member and holding various positions within the Freeling branch, including as president for many years, she was a stalwart of the Liberal Party. She was very active at election time and, indeed, held a fundraiser for me only four weeks before her death. Even once bedridden, she continued to worry about the Freeling booth being manned on election day.

Robyn was taken by the scourge of cancer, but she and her family refused to let her illness, which was present for such a short time at the end of her life, determine her legacy to the community that she held so dear. The agricultural world is poorer for losing Robyn, but her achievements and firsts, of which there are many, will only serve to help future generations of rural families, and especially rural women, realise their potential with as much passion and zeal as Robyn expressed, and for that we in the rural communities are richer for having known her.

Her funeral, which was held in Freeling, was attended by around 600 people, which is not bad for a town the size of Freeling. My thoughts are with Robyn's husband Barry, her son Travis and his new wife Kendall, her daughter Kelly, and her parents Colin and Joy and Barry's mother, Ruth. Having said all that, what impressed me most about Robyn was her no-nonsense approach to getting things done. She cared for others in her community and always held true to her Lutheran values. She confirms very much the saying that is often said: that it is often the good ones who are taken too soon, and Robyn is definitely one of those.

I will never forget Robyn and the way she approached life. She was one of the best examples of local community spirit, and she has inspired many others to continue her work in the local community. She is someone I look up to and someone I am going to miss deeply. She exemplifies for me everything that is right about our rural communities and how they work together to look after each other. I will make sure that I try to live up to her example over my time in this place.

### FEDERAL BUDGET

**Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:43):** I do not normally raise negative things when I use my grievances. I prefer, as do some of the members on the other side, to use them for positive things and to talk about my community and to give voice to people in this place that often are not spoken about. But today, after the recent federal budget, I have no alternative but to use the time to raise concerns that I have for my electors in the area of Taylor, who I represent.

The recent federal budget has been a nightmare. In fact, many people have raised their concerns and rung my office, and there are many anxious and frightened people in the northern suburbs, particularly in the area of Taylor. Only last year we had the announcement of the closure of the Holden plant. Many people in my area are affected by that: husbands and wives in the same house, extended families, children. There is already a great deal of uncertainty in the north, yet the federal government in Canberra has announced many changes which will profoundly affect the lives of people I represent, and over the next couple of days I intend to highlight some of these.

It is no wonder that our doctors, nurses and health professionals are deeply concerned about the cuts during these times. The recent federal budget has cut more than \$600 million from South Australia's health budget over the next four years if everything goes to plan as the Abbott Liberal government would like. The federal government has reneged on its national health reform agreement and reduced its fair share of funding for South Australia's hospitals. It has walked away from the National Partnership Agreement about our health system and the agreements that we needed to do to pick up our health reform pace.

At the end of the forward estimates in 2017-18, South Australia is expected to be \$269 million worse off in that year alone. I believe this is the equivalent of closing nearly 600 hospital beds, or all of the beds at the Lyell McEwen Hospital in the northern suburbs and the Women's and Children's Hospital for a year. It gets worse: with the new \$7 co-payment for standard general practitioner consultations and out-of-hospital pathology and diagnostic imaging services, these costs will drive more people to our public hospital emergency departments and this will put enormous strain on EDs and increase waiting times.

One of the things that perhaps did not get highlighted last week that particularly concerns me as a mother of young children is the fact that there will be a huge blow to the vaccination programs in our nation. This is quite baffling in that it makes no sense for young families who want to keep their kids in child care and go out and earn an income. If their children are sick and not vaccinated, that is going to be a huge problem.

Effectively, as the AMA has confirmed, the childhood vaccinations that were previously free under the bulk billing system will now incur a \$7 Medicare co-payment, along with all other bulk bill services. In fact, there will be no exemptions for low-income families, and as one of the researchers in this area (Jessica Kaufman, who wrote an article in *The Drum*) highlights, it is just a huge knock-on effect in the vaccination area.

The current vaccination schedule requires six separate GP visits to receive vaccines for the first 18 months of a child's life. Let's imagine a fairly typical scenario. A family of young children have a bad week: the power bill is due, the car breaks down, one child has an ear infection and the baby is due for vaccination. If there is not enough money to go through all of these expenses, what do you think will be dropped and postponed? A vaccination schedule is designed to make sure children develop long-lasting immunities by delivering vaccines with a specific amount of time between doses. When children are late for a dose, they are considered to be under-vaccinated and they may be susceptible to diseases.

Even for parents who will not struggle with the co-payment, there is a disincentive for the contribution to keep going. New South Wales has also brought in a policy of 'no jab, no play' this year, and in fact it is a very sensible policy. Rather than throwing up hurdles to timely and appropriate vaccination, the government should be encouraging it. Vaccines protect all of us, and they protect herd immunity. Most people in the population are vaccinated; if we are actively making it harder for low-income families or children to maintain our vaccination rates at a national level, we are actually affecting our economy in how parents contribute and how those people react later on in their lives if they are ill.



So, that is one little way that it is affecting us. There are also the proposed cuts to the dental system, as well, which will again be another knock-on to people in my electorate. Health experts are saying that cuts to dental funding in the federal government will mean more people will be languishing on public dental waiting lists. I will continue at another time.

Time expired.

*Address in Reply*

#### **ADDRESS IN REPLY**

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

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:48):** Thank you, Deputy Speaker, and I thank you for this opportunity as part of the Address in Reply. Firstly, I would like to acknowledge that we live, work and learn on the traditional lands of the Kaurna people. Deputy Speaker, I congratulate you on your election to your office, and I have no doubt that you will do the role justice. I would like to commence my Address in Reply by thanking and congratulating the Governor, Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce, for his speech in opening the first session of the 53<sup>rd</sup> parliament.

As usual, the Governor spoke with great eloquence about issues that are at the heart of responsible government. The Governor covered a broad range of issues in his speech and it was very heartening that at the centre of the matters he raised was the importance of ensuring that we continue to aim to be a prosperous, fair and just society where every person can live in dignity and be treated with dignity.

The Address in Reply gives new members in this place an opportunity to establish who they are, and what they seek to achieve during their time in parliament through their first speeches. I would like to congratulate the new members for Elder, Kaurna, Reynell, Torrens, Napier and Lee and look forward to working alongside them to serve our community. I would also like to acknowledge the enormous contributions made by the former members for Hartley, Bright, Elder, Kaurna, Reynell, Torrens, Napier and Lee.

Congratulations also go to the Hon. Tung Ngo, in the other place, and I acknowledge the contribution made by the Hon. Carmel Zollo who is the first Italian-born minister in this parliament. Finally, I would like to acknowledge the new members for Schubert, Bright, Mitchell, Hartley and Mount Gambier, and the Hon. Andrew McLachlan in the other place. I wish the new ministers, namely the members for Lee, Port Adelaide, Ramsay and Frome, great success in their new roles. Additionally, I look forward to developing a constructive working relationship with my two shadows, the members for Stuart and Morphett. Last, but certainly not least, I would like to wish the member for Fisher a speedy recovery.

For returning members, the Address in Reply gives us the opportunity to reflect upon our experiences to date and, in particular, what we have learnt, what we would do differently if we had our time again, and, more importantly, where we would go from here.

Firstly, I would like to thank the people of Light who have bestowed upon me the privilege and honour to represent them for a third time in this parliament. Given where I started my life, this honour cannot be overstated. I am sure that as my parents nursed me on the *Roma* as we sailed to Australia from Italy in 1963, they would not have dreamt that their son would not only be a member of parliament but also a minister in the state government of South Australia.

My success in life is a testament to the courage and hard work of my parents Raffaele and Maria Piccolo. It is with a great sense of personal sadness that my dad was not alive to see me firstly elected as mayor of my town in 2000, and then to this place in 2006.

I would like to thank my colleagues in the caucus for again nominating me to the ministry. My election to this place is a result of the combined efforts of many people and organisations who believed I was worthy of their support. I would like to take a few moments to thank the people who made my election possible.

I would firstly like to thank my campaign committee ably led by Mr Ben Rillo, who worked extremely hard to ensure that we ran a credible campaign so that the electorate was aware of the

government's achievements, values and vision for the future. The campaign team was supported by an army of volunteers who made phone calls, knocked on doors, stuffed envelopes, handed out how-to-vote cards, put up corflutes and took them down again, amongst many other tasks.

These volunteers did a magnificent job in supporting the campaign. While all my volunteers were important to the success of the campaign, I would like to particularly acknowledge those who had no connection with either the ALP or the trade union movement. Their involvement made it a truly community-based effort. For the first time I had a number of young people who volunteered in my campaign, and I would like to thank them and hope they continue to be involved in local community action. I will certainly be happy to work with them to address the issues of concern to them and their peers.

I would also like to acknowledge the significant contribution made by many community members who publicly endorsed me for re-election, especially those who generally have Liberal political leanings. I would also like to thank my staff both in my electorate and ministerial offices who volunteered all their private time to work on my campaign. Their efforts cannot be overstated as they had to do their day-to-day work and then work on my campaign after hours and on numerous weekends.

I would also like to thank those people who donated to the party. Whether it was five dollars or more, their contribution made it possible to produce the products which helped us inform the community about the Labor government's good record in Light and the vision for the future.

I would also like to acknowledge the support I received from a broad range of trade unions, in particular the Transport Workers Union, the SDA and the CEPU. At the state level, SA Unions pitched in to make sure the interests of working people were at the front and centre of the campaign.

I would like to acknowledge the contribution to the campaign by local members of the ANMF, ASU, United Voice, RTBU, SDA, TWU, amongst many others. The Light electorate as it is currently constituted, would ordinarily be a seat the Liberal Party could count on as one of theirs. It is because the Labor Party has been able to garner support from across the community that it is now for the third time in Labor hands.

I would like to acknowledge the support I have received from local farmers, small business owners and those involved in the broad range of community-based organisations. Campaigning can sometimes be a daunting affair so I would like to pay tribute to the other candidates and their campaigns in the Light electorate.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the unqualified love and support I continue to receive from my family, and in particular my two sons, Raffaele and Stefan. Their counsel helps me stay true to my beliefs and values, and close to my community's aspirations.

Members on this side are here today not only because we have a proud record and vision for the future but also because we ran a superior campaign that was extremely well executed. For our overall success, I would like to acknowledge the significant contribution made by the Premier (the member for Cheltenham) and the state Labor campaign team led by State Secretary Reggie Martin. The Premier can be very proud of the result we achieved given the political environment in which the campaign was fought. His decision to release our broad policies and vision early in the campaign was the right one, as it provided a sound foundation upon which to fight the rest of the campaign.

I now wish to make some comments about the issues which I believe are important to my community and which I will seek to address in this term. I will continue to lobby to have the South-Eastern link road built—a key element of the Gawler East development—as part of the answer to addressing traffic management issues within the core parts of the Town of Gawler. It is unfortunate this road and infrastructure issue would have been treated differently under the policies now adopted by the state government when dealing with urban development. This new approach ensures that infrastructure issues are addressed prior to any DPA being authorised.

These policies are helping to inform the implementation of the 30-year plan. The 30-year plan is based on some key principles: it identifies areas that could be investigated for urban development should they be required. The plan has attempted to stop the continuous speculation by developers to promote development in areas of benefit to them rather than the community at large. The plan sets out some clear targets of where development should occur. At least 70 per cent should

be infill, and no more than 30 per cent should be greenfields or fringe development, and to allow some township growth where the critical mass is an issue.

This is a clear and responsible policy, as infill comes at a lower cost to the taxpayer over time, and protects valuable farmland needed for food production. It is with these principles in mind that I have supported the rezoning of the Angle Vale township and the areas of Munno Para West and Downs. The signing of infrastructure agreements between the many small landowners, the City of Playford and the state government will ensure that sustainable communities are developed, and in many cases, the new developments will help create opportunities to resolve any existing problems within the locality, like stormwater management in the Angle Vale township.

Equally, it is for these same reasons that I have supported a modest expansion of the Roseworthy township, and not the 100,000-person mega city promoted by the Liberal Party and some developers who have been identified in the media.

I am encouraged by the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure's recent comments that he will focus on the electrification of the Gawler Line now that the other electrification projects have been completed. While the initial project will only extend to Salisbury, I have no doubt that only a Labor government has the commitment and capacity to deliver it to Gawler, given the federal Liberal's policy not to fund public transport.

During this term, additional public transport services will be extended to Angle Vale, and I will continue to monitor the Gawler metro service to explore how patronage can be improved. Improving traffic flows around the core parts of the town of Gawler involves three key strategies; improving the flow of existing roads and the ongoing implementation of the Main North Road Management Plan developed by DPTI is certainly achieving this.

Secondly, the construction of new roads in the right localities and alignment will also move traffic more quickly around the town, and the South-East link road is certainly a key project. Thirdly, but not necessarily last, improving public transport, including cycling and other opportunities. The introduction of buses to Gawler, and linking them to key railways stations, will assist in moving both around the town and to other areas via rail, and will also help curb the growth of vehicular traffic.

Doorknocking can be a very instructive process. Walking the streets of your electorate gives you the opportunity to gain valuable insights into your company. You can tell those communities that have a strong spirit and those who, for whatever reason, are socially isolated. One of the biggest challenges in new large urban developments is the fostering of a sense of belonging or community spirit. Regrettably, I found this challenge in some parts of my electorate, and in one case, a resident who attended one of my street corner meetings raised the very issue with me. I intend to continue to work with civic-minded community people, local councils and other community institutions to develop strategies to help foster community spirit in various communities.

This loss of community is an important issue which we as a society need to address, as it has important implications for maintaining a civil society—that is, a fair and just community. I wish to elaborate upon this a little bit later.

As Minister for Disabilities, I look forward to continue working with my department and the disability sector to improve the quality of life for those living with a disability, their families and carers. Increasing work opportunities, access to justice, and protecting from harm and abuse those living with a disability are key priorities for me, as is the full rollout of the NDIS, as originally planned and agreed to between the states and the federal Labor government.

In my other portfolios, generally grouped under the community safety banner, namely the police, correctional services, emergency services and road safety, I look forward to working with my new agencies and non-government stakeholders to deliver the best possible programs that we as a community can afford to keep our community safe.

Both paid and volunteer workers do a great job in keeping our community safe, but like all aspects of service delivery in the government sector, we need to be bold and be prepared to explore new and innovative ways to deliver services in a difficult budgetary environment, which has been made significantly more difficult with the recent federal Liberal government budget.

I look forward to working towards this challenge alongside the community safety sector. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the staff in the Department of Communities and Social

Inclusion, whom I had the pleasure of working with in my first term as minister. I learnt a great deal as minister for social housing, communities and social inclusion, youth and volunteers.

I would also like to thank those individuals, members of peak organisations and community groups whom I had the privilege of working with. Collectively, they and the various government agencies undertake very important work in ensuring that all members of our communities get a fair go.

A little earlier I stated that the Address in Reply gives returning members the opportunity to reflect upon our experiences to date, in particular what we have learnt and what we would do differently if we had the time again, and, more importantly, where we go from here. In addition, I identify the loss of community as an important issue which we as a society need to address, as it has important implications for maintaining a civil society. In my Australia Day address to my local community, I stated in part the following:

The relationship of community is suffering from the lack of attention and neglect. While individual social rights are important, they cannot be at the expense of community. While individual economic rights are the foundation of our economy, they cannot be allowed to undermine community. Communities thrive when we all make a contribution to them. Humans are social beings, so individuals thrive when we have healthy communities. Children thrive in healthy families and families thrive in healthy communities. Community flourishes in an economic and socially inclusive and just society—so we must find ways to ensure that all Australians feel that they belong, and can derive benefits from, and meet contribution to, community.

...[W]hile we enjoy the fruits of our rights and freedoms, let us also remember our responsibilities towards our communities. For those values we share and hold dear as Australians are nurtured by that relationship called community.

It is because I believe in these things that I am a member of the Australian Labor Party. It is because of these core values that I hold that I believe in the importance of electing Labor governments. I support moves by the national Labor leader, Bill Shorten, to reposition the party so it can continue to form a majority government. While the reforms he is proposing are helpful, I do not believe they will encourage sufficient members of the Labor diaspora to return to the fold.

The recent results in the WA Senate elections sound an ominous warning that a serious rethink is required if Labor is to continue to be a major player at the national level. The biggest challenge facing the ALP nationally, I believe, is not a change to the rules but the need for a coherent ideology or philosophy that reflects our social democratic history.

The increasing influence of social liberalism and neoliberalism within the Labor Party is sending an unclear and mixed message to the electorate and is alienating both traditional working class supporters who identify as part of the trade union movement and those in the community who simply see Labor as protecting the interests of those less powerful in our society, whether they be farmers, small business people, independent tradespeople, pensioners or the young.

At a Gawler ANZAC Day football game, I had the opportunity to talk with a local retired businessperson who has been in the building trade most of his life. Through this discussion he told me that he was once the president of the Gawler sub-branch of the Labor Party, but he is no longer a member. At an AFL match at the recently rebuilt Adelaide Oval, a Hewett resident came up to speak with me. He was what we once called a blue-collar worker, proud to be a member of the relevant union and supporter of the Labor Party—but no more.

The first Labor member for Light and the federal seat of Wakefield was a farmer, and I was good friends with a former member of my local branch, where both she and her husband were poultry farmers. This serves to illustrate that we were a geographically and demographically broadly based political party.

National Labor leader Bill Shorten is right when he says that the party needs to reconnect to small business and regional Australia. I am proud to call myself a social democrat. If I wanted to be a social liberal I would have joined the Greens and if neo-liberalism was my thing, I would have joined the Liberal Party.

I disagree strongly with those in the ALP who believe that we need to be a social liberal party if we wish to survive. Those sentiments certainly do not reflect the views expressed by ordinary people in my community. While I appreciate that, like Christianity, social democracy has many traditions, I believe a stronger emphasis on 'communitarian values' should be at the centre of a renewed Labor philosophy.

It is somewhat ironic that the ideology that underpins most of the so-called progressive policy today is the same as that used by supporters who seek to weaken the anti-discrimination laws in this country in the name of freedom of speech. Both are based on liberal ideology and support the primacy of the individual over the needs of the community or the common good.

Communitarians seek to achieve a balance between the needs of individuals and the needs of the community or the common good. The community can be either family, a church, a trade union, or a town. Communitarianism promotes the responsibilities that individuals have towards their community because the individual can only realise their full potential through their relationship with the community.

Many past Labor reforms have been for the common good. In fact, many trade unions in the early days established various societies and programs to support the common interest of their members and families. They were the forerunners of the non-government community sector.

Liberalism's focus on the rights of the individual can give rise to identity politics in the Australian political discourse. Identity politics is based on the premise that those who identify with a particular identity group experience the same level of hardship and discrimination and that their identity comes from their association with that group rather than the broader community. Clearly, no group is economically and socially homogenous, and very few individuals identify with only one group in our society.

Identity politics reinforces our differences rather than what we have in common, and can weaken social cohesion in our community. Paradoxically, those who support social liberalism fail to appreciate how it undermines social cohesion in our community which is necessary if we are to benefit from our diversity. Our culturally and religiously diverse community can only thrive when not only do we have mutual respect for our differences, but we also strongly acknowledge and affirm what we have in common.

It is somewhat ironic that self-styled social liberals are the first to reject the rights of those with religious views to enter the public space when dealing with political issues. A secular society does not mean that people cannot express a religious view in the public domain, but rather no religious view is sanctioned as the official state view. A moral compass guided by religious values is no less important than those based on humanist principles. For example, in addressing the needs of a multi-faith society, there is no need to diminish the presence of Christianity in our society, but rather we need to explore ways of acknowledging the role of new faiths and beliefs in our community. It is, however, regrettable that some churches fail to enter economic debates as often as they do with social issues.

The recent federal Liberal budget, while it was a statement about the nation's economy, is premised on a neo-liberal foundation highlighting the primacy of the individual over the common good. It has a moral aspect and should be worthy of comment by the faith-based organisations.

A number of social issues will be debated in this place over the next four years. The outcomes of those debates will be enhanced by the thoughtful and respectful expression of different views reflecting a range of values. It is my hope that genuine debate is not shut down or curtailed by language which is designed to exclude or diminish the views of others.

Values that underpin our actions are important because they influence public policy. The negative impact of social liberalism can be observed in our communities every day. People asserting or exercising their rights at the expense of others affects the public domain and the lives of ordinary people and undermines the cohesion required for stronger and healthy communities. Having said that, advancing the rights of people is important and can be achieved through a communitarian framework.

Many social and economic changes have advanced our community, but we must ensure that in delivering reforms—whether economic or social—we do not leave people behind. For my part, in promoting an economically and socially inclusive society, I will not be forgetting the poor or those who are less powerful in our society.

*Ministerial Statement***PREMIER'S CLIMATE CHANGE COUNCIL**

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (16:09):** I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to climate change policy, made earlier today in another place by the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I draw your attention to the state of the house, Madam Deputy Speaker.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I call on the member for Stuart.

*Address in Reply***ADDRESS IN REPLY**

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption resumed.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (16:12):** Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to give my Address in Reply, and I am pleased to see you in the Deputy Speaker's chair. I can tell that you are enjoying the role, and I wish you very well in it. Of course, I am pleased for Speaker Atkinson to be re-elected as well because, while we are not always happy with every single thing he does, I think most people in this chamber would accept that he is doing a good job. So, congratulations to him as well.

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** You are his pet; he loves you.

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Sorry, I missed that, member for Ashford.

**The Hon. S.W. Key:** I said, 'You are his pet; he loves you.'

**Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I didn't hear that, I can tell you. I also, of course, congratulate the Governor on his speech opening parliament. I am not really one for the pomp and ceremony, as probably most people here know, but there is no doubt that he does an excellent job as Governor.

As well as congratulating him on his job in opening parliament, and reading the speech on behalf of the Premier and the government, I would also like to congratulate him on his nearly seven years as Governor. He has done an outstanding job. I wish him and Liz Scarce well in their life after their current role, which I think ends in August this year. They both do a tremendous job, and I am particularly grateful for the time they spend in regional South Australia.

In regard to the election, I will start by congratulating Steven Marshall. To be really blunt, regardless of what side of the chamber you sit on or what political affiliation you might have, I do not think there is anybody who does not admire the enormous work, skill and contribution he has made to this place and to this state since becoming leader as a first-term member of parliament. Every single person here can imagine very well how hard it would be and what a gigantic job it would be. I do not think he could have done it any better and I do not think anybody else could have done it any better. Congratulations to him.

I would also like to say thank you to all the Liberal candidates who stood at the election, whether they were successful or unsuccessful. We really did have an outstanding group of candidates representing us at this election, some of whom were not successful but who would have made very good members of parliament, and I thank them enormously for their contribution to the Liberal Party and also to democracy in South Australia.

I would like to welcome all new members on both sides of the house. No doubt you will all bring talents, capacities and abilities. It will not surprise anybody to know that I think that the new members on this side will bring slightly more talent, capacity and ability, but I do genuinely and warmly welcome all of you here today. It was only four years ago that I was in your situation, and I have not forgotten exactly what a big step it is and I congratulate you on being elected. I think you have each achieved enormously by being elected.

I would also like to congratulate the new ministers as well. To be quite frank, that is not to say that I am going to agree with everything they say or everything they do but, again, that is something to be proud of. If you become a minister in parliament, you deserve to be congratulated. So, well done to those people for that.

In regard to the electorate of Stuart and the election, the candidates against whom I competed were Josh Vines from the Labor Party, Brendan Fitzgerald from The Greens, and Sylvia Holland from Family First. I am not aware of any dirty tricks and I am not aware of any skulduggery or of anything underhand that happened in our electorate, by them or me, and I thank them for the spirit in which they went about competing in that election.

I would also like to thank, enormously, the people who supported our Liberal campaign in the electorate of Stuart. I would like to highlight for this house that the vast majority of them were not Liberal members. Liberal members were certainly there, front and centre, as they have been year in and year out, and I thank them from the bottom of my heart. Some of the people have been members of the Liberal Party much longer than I have, which is really not a lot more than four years. I joined the Liberal Party shortly before putting my hand up as a candidate. I had always been a Liberal voter.

People who have been committed to the Liberal cause much longer than I have been supported our effort in Stuart, but an enormous number of people who were not Liberal members did as well, and I thank them all very deeply for that. I am grateful to the electors in Stuart. I cannot pretend that I am not happy with the swing that we achieved. A 13 per cent swing is fantastic. I will not be churlish or shy about it. We worked incredibly hard, and within our electorate we achieved a very good result. I thank everybody who contributed to that.

At the top of the list are my staff members and my wife. Chris Hanna, my longest serving staff member, started with me immediately after being elected in 2010; and Sandra Spaeth, my next longest serving staff member, is an absolutely outstanding part-time staff member and really knows the electorate very well. Tracey Freeman is our senior leader within the group and came along perhaps two years and four months ago. She leads and contributes to our team within the electorate offices exceptionally well. Anyone would be glad to have her as their office manager/staff leader for all the things that I am not directly involved in.

Stacey Davidson, who works in our Kapunda office, is a recent arrival and, I have to say, has done an outstanding job with no experience in this sort of work but a lot of experience in a range of different areas throughout the electorate, and she really does an outstanding job.

And Paige Bowshire, our outstanding trainee, will come to the end of her 12-month term in June this year I think. She has faced and overcome an enormous number of challenges in her life, and that is clearly evident in the way she goes about her work and tackles the tasks that are given to her, and I am sure she has a big future in whatever she chooses to go on to when we are finished.

So, thank you to that core team of people and, of course, thank you to my wife, Rebecca. I would never have been preselected if it were not for her support. I would never have been elected and I would never have been re-elected without her support. One of the most wonderful things about Rebecca with regard to my work is that she is actually not very interested in politics.

To be quite frank, she is interested in the world, she is interested in where we live, she is interested in communities and she is interested in our home. She is interested in all of the things that are at the foundation of what we should all work towards, but she is not actually very interested in politics. That means that she supports me gigantically, but our relationship is not dragged down, if you like, by talking about the nitty-gritty of work and the sorts of things that we do in this chamber all the time, so I thank her very, very sincerely as well.

The electorate of Stuart is a pretty big place. If you look at a map of South Australia and imagine Oodnadatta to Innamincka to Cockburn to Truro, that is a big part of the state, so there are a lot of different issues. There are approximately 30 different towns, 42 schools and nine hospitals. Nine different council areas overlap with Stuart, including the Outback Communities Authority.

There is a gigantic range of issues. The issues that affect people in the Riverland part of Stuart are different to those that affect people in Port Augusta, are different to those in the Flinders Ranges or the outback, are different to those in the Mid North and are different to those at the edge of the Barossa, even.

Stuart starts 75 kilometres away from Parliament House and finishes at the Northern Territory/Queensland/New South Wales borders, so it is a large electorate. It is hard to get around, but I think the best way to go about your work, whether you have a small electorate like Morphett or a large one like Stuart or Giles, is just to be incredibly genuine about what you do. Just get out there and do everything that you possibly can to help people.

I can say that, occasionally, I feel a little bit embarrassed that I do not know all of the political history that has gone on in this place or with the different political parties. People talk about things or people that I do not really know much about. Occasionally, there are terms and phrases I do not understand. The member for Light, a few minutes ago, was talking about neoliberalism and natural socialism and a whole range of different things.

To be quite honest, I have got a bit of an idea, but I do not know exactly where the borders start and stop. To be honest, I do not actually care too much about that stuff. What I care about is doing the very best I can for my electorate. Whether people vote for me or do not vote for me, whether they are going to be Greens voters for the rest of their life or they are rusted on Liberal voters, they get the very best that I and my staff can possibly do for them.

I think that that is probably one of the reasons why we have had such a good swing, because we largely take the politics out of the work that we do in the electorate of Stuart. We certainly cannot take it out of the work that we do in this chamber, we cannot take it out of all of the media that we do but, when it comes to actually helping people, there is not a lot politics in what we do in Stuart, and I would recommend that approach to any colleagues here.

Turning to the outcome of the election, much has been said about that. I am disappointed we did not win. Flat out, there is no reason to say it any other way. I am disappointed that we did not win the election. It could actually be said that, really, no-one won. No party won the election. There was not a good enough outcome either way, so the government that was here before is still here, and that is largely because of the good work of many incumbent members who, I think, do the sorts of things that I was talking about just a few minutes ago.

For example, we had an excellent candidate in the electorate of Ashford. Terina Monteagle would make a wonderful member of parliament, but the current member of Ashford did not give up, works hard, has a foundation in the electorate and was, on this occasion, not able to be beaten.

I think that is the sort of thing that has actually created the outcome of the election. We can go through all of what both teams would have considered to be the marginal seats and, by and large, it actually came down to the local members who really did the work and had been working hard throughout the whole term.

There are, of course, some other things that led to the outcome. I will not dwell on the electoral boundaries issue or the need for electoral reform. Many of my colleagues have spoken about that, and I agree with what they say. I will not go back over all of that, but you cannot have a situation where 53 per cent of the vote is won by one party but they do not form government. At the same time, 54 per cent of the vote was won federally at the last election and that was considered a landslide. That in itself says that something needs to be done. I will not go over all of that, but I do encourage people to consider what the member for MacKillop and the member for Davenport have put forward in their contributions, because they have done a lot of homework, seen a lot of things, and I think they have a lot to offer.

I would like to touch on something that the Deputy Premier, the member for Enfield, said in his contribution earlier this morning, which I think included some mistakes. He made the point: why would the Liberal Party put any effort into supporting the member for Flinders when he is, according to the Deputy Premier, a laydown misère? Well, I can tell you, the member for Flinders works his guts out; he absolutely works his guts out. That is why he has been so successful. Sure, it is traditionally a good, strong Liberal voting area, but it was once a National seat. It is not a place that he takes for granted.

For the Deputy Premier to ask why the Liberal Party would waste money in that seat I think is misguided too. I do not know what the Flinders election budget was but I will bet you it was absolutely minimum. The member for Flinders increased his margin in an extremely safe seat because of all of the work that he has done over the last four years. The Deputy Premier also spoke



about his own seat of Enfield which would be considered a very safe Labor seat. He said: why would you waste any time, why would you spend any money attacking him in that seat?

I think what he does not understand is that Scott Roberts worked his guts out, was an excellent candidate, but he raised that money almost exclusively of his own back. He rallied supporters, he brought people together, he did everything that was necessary to encourage people to contribute to his campaign. It was not as if some central fund just said, 'Oh well, take X dollars out of the bank and we'll just throw it away in Enfield.' It was nothing like that whatsoever, and to try and paint it that way is very, very misguided. Scott Roberts threw absolutely everything he possibly could at that campaign, and he did the legwork and he did the grunt work to do the fund raising.

It is not the Liberal way to say to somebody, 'You don't have a chance', or 'Just go easy,' or 'Don't try hard'. Scott Roberts was an excellent candidate who made a significant dent, who did have a real chance, and he gave it everything he had. So I think that the Deputy Premier has missed the point when it comes to where we put our resources. It is not as if we have spent oodles of money to make safe seats safer, and it is not as if we wasted money. We did actually fight very hard in a very genuine and concerted way in those marginal seats. Some we won and some we did not win, and it really is as simple as that. Of course, I wish we had won more, but to attack the party and say it is a waste of resources, time, effort or strategy is incorrect.

What really happened, what really made the difference, of course, was what happened with the two Independents. I will not dwell on this issue particularly because I know that for everybody in this house it is a fairly emotional issue. Dr Bob Such's illness is something that everyone here is incredibly unhappy about. Everybody is very sad, and everybody, myself included, wish him well and a speedy and healthy recovery and the best possible outcome that anybody could ever have with the illness that he faces.

Of course, once that was known, it fell onto the shoulders of the member for Frome to decide what he wanted to do. I consider the member for Frome to be a friend. We knew each other before we were in politics. He is a good and decent person with genuine morals. He decided to support the government. I say very clearly, and I have said it to him, 'I think you made a mistake.' I am disappointed in his decision. We remain friends, we work well together.

He said, when he found himself unexpectedly in the position of having to make difficult choices, that he would do what was best for his electorate, what the majority of second preferences said (did most of the people who voted for him choose Liberal or Labor second?), what was best for regional South Australia and what his counsels thought was the best thing to do. By any of those standards, he has made the wrong decision.

I do understand that he felt he was in a predicament with regard to numbers in the house. I do understand that he felt that, with the member for Fisher being on leave due to illness, he had to go the only way that would give an immediate answer for the people of South Australia. But I do think he jumped to that decision far too quickly; I think he jumped to it before even knowing what was actually really wrong with the member for Fisher. I think he jumped to that because the Premier and the Labor Party led him to believe that that would give stability for our state. Unfortunately, we know in the very short life of this returned government that that is not the case. We know that there is no stability within the government in South Australia at the moment.

We also know that, if you wanted to bring the discussion just down to pure dollars, the member for Frome managed to get \$116 million over four years through negotiation with the government, which is \$29 million per year specifically for regional South Australia. The Liberal Party's election commitment before negotiating anything extra was \$139 million over three years, so \$46 million per year dedicated to regional South Australia compared to \$29 million per year dedicated to regional South Australia. He had to actually drag the Premier kicking and screaming for the \$29 million; the \$46 million was already on the table for us. I think he really did jump too soon, but as I said, he has made his decision and we will do everything that we possibly can to work with him.

I think that it was probably a bit akin to a shotgun wedding, that he really felt he had no choice, but I think, as is often the case, a lot of other people looking in from the outside thought actually that he did have a choice. So, that is what we have got, and that is what we will work with. He has made his decision, and I will do everything that I possibly can to work with him to advantage regional South Australia. The electorate of Stuart and all of the rest of regional South Australia

deserve to see very quick benefits from his decision which must outweigh the benefits they would have got if he had decided to join the Liberals.

With regard to the portfolios that I represent as a shadow minister—police, corrections, emergency services, road safety, recreation and sport, and racing—I am privileged to represent people who work in those areas and people who depend upon those areas for the services that they provide. I think most people here would know that I am very happy to work collaboratively with the government when that is possible, when that is appropriate and when the government is on the right track, but when they are not I will certainly say so, as well. If you give credit where credit is due, when you have a different opinion, it is far more likely that people are going to listen to you.

There are certainly issues with regard to all of those portfolios where the government needs to lift its game significantly. With regard to police, less than 50 per cent of the government's 2010 election promises—less than half—were fulfilled by 2014, and that is a pretty poor track record. With regard to corrections, our prisons are bursting at the seams. The Minister for Correctional Services told ABC regional radio in the South-East that, yes, our prisons are operating over capacity. Good on him for having the courage to say it. The former minister and the Attorney-General have certainly never admitted to that before, but good on the current minister for saying: it is a fact. He agrees with the opposition that they are bursting at the seams and they are operating over capacity. I also do not think the government gives nearly enough focus or credence to the people who work in the community corrections side of the Department for Correctional Services.

With emergency services, it might interest you to know that, while funding over the last decade or so has increased to the emergency services sector, it has increased less quickly than the additional costs that the government has put onto the emergency services sector, so the money that the emergency services workers—whether they be professionals or volunteers—get to access to do their job has actually decreased under this government.

Regarding road safety, two weeks ago we had a pretty significant debate in this place about quotas and benchmarks. It is a fact, and police officers tell people, myself included, that they have quotas and benchmarks. The police commissioner said to the Budget and Finance Committee last year that, yes, nothing has changed, the policy is the same, we have benchmarks. The government can continue to try to publicly deny it, but the public knows better. What is so wrong about that is that it takes the focus off genuine road safety where police want it to be, and puts it onto revenue raising.

It is a great shame to see that the government has reduced funding in recreation and sport, and it is interesting to see the article in today's *Advertiser* about, very sadly, reduced levels of fitness among our youth. Recreation and sport are vitally important for many reasons but, if nothing else, because they contribute to the future health of our community through the current health and fitness of our younger generation.

Regarding racing, and this is quite curious, the government shamelessly contributes nothing to the racing industry and does not even pretend to do otherwise—and it never, ever even looks like it is trying to pretend that it does otherwise, and I think that is a great shame. The racing industry is second only to Australian Rules football with regard to spectator numbers in our state—an incredibly popular industry.

It is a gigantic employer, and it is something that people can enjoy—whether they are seriously interested in racing, whether that be in thoroughbreds, harness racing or greyhounds or whether they would just like to have a good social occasion, whether they want to bet, do not want to bet, they are old or young, they get dressed up, do not get dressed up, want to drink alcohol, do not want to drink alcohol, male, female, Aboriginal, non-Aboriginal—anybody can enjoy the racing industry, and that creates employment, so I think the government should contribute to it and should make a very significant contribution to that industry.

Much has been said this week about the federal budget, and there are things in the federal budget which the state opposition finds difficult because they are not moving forward in the way we would like. We would all love to see extra spending everywhere, but the reality is that the federal government has had to make some exceptionally hard decisions, and it would not matter where they made those decisions; it would be difficult, it would be unpopular, and the government would try to say that all Liberals are terrible because that is what they have done.

But the state government understands, and the Labor Party, state and federal, understands that the federal government had no choice. Ten years ago our national income through all sources was much higher than it is today. The national income—the revenue to the federal government—has dropped significantly, but the spending of the federal government under Labor did not drop significantly. It has to be corrected, and the current federal Liberal government are the ones having to make the hard decisions.

What I really want to say on that issue is that we refuse as state Liberals, and we refuse as the South Australian opposition to allow the state government to use the federal budget as an excuse for its own problems. Before the federal government handed down its budget, the state government had already announced that it was going to take a billion dollars out of health spending, had already announced that it was going to take \$230 million out of education spending, had already announced that it was going to take \$150 million out of police spending, and there were many other cuts. So, when we come around to our state budget in June, it will not be true for the government to say that the difficult decisions they have made at a state level are all the federal Liberal government's fault. It will just not be true.

The things the state government was going to do are well and truly on the record; the public will not buy it, and the media will not buy it. Everybody knows the position of the South Australian state budget and it cannot be blamed on the federal government. They will not fool anybody if they try to do that. Those problems already existed in South Australia after 12 years of Labor government.

After 12 years of Labor government, we are dealing with rising unemployment, rising cost of living, and deterioration of our state's finances and economy. We are dealing with more and more red tape—the highest taxed state in the nation. We are dealing with an interstate drift of people which takes knowledge, money, opportunity and many other strengths out of our state and into other states.

What the government does not understand is that it is vitally important to support small business to turn our state around. Big government departments and big Labor bureaucracy will not be the trick that turns our state around. Small and medium-sized business is the largest employer in our state and our nation by miles, and we support policies that support small and medium business to be successful—not because we want those business owners to be rich fat cats, or any crazy idea like that. It is nothing like that whatsoever; that is ridiculous. If they are successful in business and they earn well, good luck to them—that is fine and there is nothing wrong with that. We support small business first and foremost because small business and medium-sized businesses employ people.

We want people to have secure employment. You do not have secure employment if you work for a marginally successful business; you have secure employment if you work for a genuinely successful business. We want businesses to be successful. We want businesses to grow so that they can employ more people, so that regular mums and dads, married, unmarried, younger and older people can have secure income and secure employment so that they can pay their mortgages, so that they can pay their car loans, and so that they can get ahead in life.

We need businesses to succeed so that average, everyday South Australians can have successful, meaningful, productive lives, and that is the stark contrast between the state Liberal opposition and the state Labor government.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (16:42):** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Congratulations on your election to Deputy Speaker and Chair of Committees. It is well deserved and comes not a moment too soon. I would also like to—

**Mr Gardner:** Try and keep a straight face, Tom.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** It is very straight. I am very happy for her, and that is why I am smiling; I am very pleased to see her there. Ma'am, I have no doubt whatsoever that you will be an excellent fill-in for the Speaker at the appropriate times.

I also take this opportunity to congratulate the Speaker on his election and continuation in the office of Speaker after coming into that position last term. I very much enjoy his mix of good humour, knowledge of standing orders, and determination to see the house function, and function effectively, especially during the ritual battle that we go through every sitting day that is question time. It is a very great pleasure to see him there. He has certainly been a good friend to me over a long period of time, so it is well deserved, I think, for him to have been there after his service to this parliament and to the state for a very long period of time.

I would also like to congratulate the Premier on his continuation in that role. It is not an easy job being Premier—that is my observation. I obviously cannot talk from experience, but my observation, having worked with a couple of premiers of the last few years, is that the demands on them are quite high, and the level of public scrutiny and media scrutiny is very, very hard. It takes a toll on members, and on the Premier in particular, that is not seen by a lot of people. In the lead-up to an election that is particularly true.

What I admire about the Premier is the way he just continued to believe in himself and in the government and campaigned unstintingly over a long period of time for re-election. I think he was rewarded appropriately. I certainly would thank him for his contribution to my retaining my seat of Newland. He never once shirked anything I asked of him. If I needed him to come out and doorknock with me, he did. If I needed him to come out and make phone calls with me, he did. If I wanted him to visit a school, he would do that. He never once turned down an opportunity to campaign in Newland, and I am very grateful for that.

We have a number of new members in the parliament. I would like to congratulate them. If you go into the members' lounge and look around the walls at the photos of various members of parliament over the history of this place, at the moment there are almost exactly 700, and I think about another eight new members will have their photos up there in very short order.

For every one of those members of parliament who have their photo in that lounge, there are perhaps four, maybe five, candidates who stood over that period of time. That represents 708 people over more than 100 years of the parliament in South Australia. Just for the ease of calculation, say that 2,800 people in the history of South Australia have stood as a candidate in the lower house and only 700-odd people have been selected by the people of South Australia to come and stand in here, it is a rare honour to be a member of this place.

I am particularly impressed by the quality of the new members we have on both sides—particularly on our side, I do not think anyone will be surprised to hear me say. We have a number of really outstanding members of parliament who have come into this place, and their electorates and the state will be better for it. Congratulations to them. I really look forward to working with them over the course of the next four years.

I would also like to take this opportunity to congratulate my chief rival candidate, though of course there were three other candidates apart from me in my seat of Newland. Chief amongst them was Mr Glenn Docherty, who is the Mayor of the City of Playford but who was the Liberal Party candidate. I have to say Glenn worked hard—very hard.

Members might have noted that after the election there was some suggestion that I was the hardest working candidate in the Labor Party; I will leave it to others to judge. I certainly will not suggest that to the Deputy Speaker; that would be asking for an argument. However, there was some suggestion that I worked very hard in the last election, and I did.

I certainly did work very hard, and the reason I had to work so hard was that the Liberal Party candidate, Mr Docherty, was working particularly hard in my electorate. I think he gave himself every chance and did all the right things that you could do as a candidate. In that case, he was relying on the larger, broader statewide campaign to get him over the line.

It is not easy to come up against an incumbent member, especially one who is relatively well dug in, and he certainly gave himself every opportunity and he is to be congratulated for that, not just for working hard. I think people who just stand should be congratulated for giving voters a choice and for participating in our democracy in a more fulsome way. I think he should be congratulated for the effort he put in.

I would like to congratulate also the state secretary of the Labor Party, Reggie Martin, who I think made some really brave decisions from quite an early moment in the campaign. They paid off, but I suspect he was under quite a bit of pressure about some of those decisions for a long period of time. He was resolute in his determination on how to run the campaign, and that proved ultimately successful.

When I was researching my maiden speech, I read a number of maiden speeches, and someone said in theirs (I wish I could remember who it was), 'No-one gets here alone.' That was true for my first election, it was true for my second election, and it was more true of my third election than for any of the others.

The team of people who contributed to my re-election was large and they put in an enormous amount of effort. I would particularly like to single out a few people—and I am going to miss some, because you always do—but Michael Iammarrone and Matthew Marozzi are two of the best campaigners in the country, not just because of their incredible capacity for hard work—you do not have a successful campaign without hard work—but more than that: you need to be smart about how you go about doing that.

These guys are top-shelf campaigners and incredibly motivated; they are very smart campaigners as well who not only used some of the latest techniques, but actually developed some of the latest campaign techniques which will be used by the Labor Party right across the country and they should be commended for that. They are also incredibly committed people and I cannot thank them enough for the work that they did in Newland.

I thank my office staff as well: Michael Bombardieri and a trainee, Sharee, who put in an enormous amount of hours and were mostly around on their own time—in fact, they came in a lot after hours. There are a number of volunteers from my sub-branch who I would also like to thank: Jordan Bahr, Rob Close, David Binns, Lucas Jones, Sam Runnel, Hannah Russell, Daniella Ratteni, and a number of volunteers who came from interstate.

It is one of the great traditions of the Labor Party that you volunteer to go to interstate campaigns. Last time around we had some people from Victoria come and help and one from Western Australia. This time around we had some people from New South Wales who basically came and camped at someone's house and volunteered their time over a number of weeks to assist in my campaign, and I am very grateful that they would choose to do that.

I would also take this opportunity to thank my family: my sister Ruth and her husband Doug, and my father and his wife Janine for a lot of babysitting, particularly once I became a minister—they really stepped up and assisted with that. I should also thank my wife Tina for her patience and assistance, who for the three years that I was a minister, made that possible and continues to provide a serious amount of support, and I really appreciate that.

I would also like to thank my former ministerial staff: Brigid, Michael, Richard, Corey, Melissa and Rosa, as well as the innumerable public servants with whom I worked whilst I was a minister. The commitment of public servants in this state is very strong and there are a number of really outstanding public servants, and I had the great privilege of working with some of them to further the interests of this state. I thank them for their commitment and for their assistance. When you come into a new ministry there is an enormous amount to take on board, to learn and to try and get your head around, and their patience in training up a new minister is very much appreciated by me.

When you are a minister especially in a marginal seat, you essentially have two jobs: you have your job as a local member of parliament, and then you have your job as a minister serving the entire state and that can be a very demanding thing. So, having stepped back from being a minister I am able to spend more time in my electorate in Newland and that is something I am really looking forward to—being able to spend more time in Newland with a bunch of people who are good fun to be around—wonderful people and who, if the truth be told, probably teach me more than I could ever hope to teach them or anything like that.

It seems a perverse way to say it but it is a privilege to serve them and I certainly get more from them than they get from me. I think that the individuals you get to meet as a local member of parliament and the people that you assist, is a really personally rewarding opportunity and I really thank them for that. I thank them for their trust and confidence as a result of the election, and I guarantee them—as I did after my first election—that I will work as hard for them every day as I possibly can until they decide they don't want me to do that anymore.

Some comments have been made about the electoral system and there will be some discussion about it in the near future, I suspect, and the Attorney-General today talked about a standing committee. However, I will point out some interesting numbers and we can go through them. There are 47 seats in the House of Assembly. All things being equal, each seat would represent about 2.1 per cent of the vote, or each seat represents 2.1 per cent of the seats is probably a more accurate way of putting it. To win 24 seats, the majority in your own right, you need 51.1 per cent of the total vote then.

**Mr Gardner:** Based on what?

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** Well, 2.1 per cent of the vote, allocating one vote, one value. It is a rough and ready calculation, but if you say that each of the 47 seats represents 2.1 per cent of the entire state vote, allocated one vote, one value, 51.1 per cent is—

**Ms Sanderson:** You only got 23 seats.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** That is why we are in minority government, because we needed the Independent to help us to get to that. It is just not possible for a party—any one particular party, us or the Liberal Party—to win 50 per cent plus one of the vote and win government. You just cannot do it. It happens, but what happens is that natural variation that you get between seats. Every party in this parliament and every member in this parliament knows that you need to win your seat, and every member knows that that means you need to campaign and allocate your resources on an as-needs basis: those seats that are more marginal you allocate more resources to.

The ALP's vote across the state is affected by running, very rationally, or not running, as the case may be, very strong campaigns at all, or spending very much in the way of resources at all, in Liberal Party seats in country areas, because we know that the best result we could possibly get is maybe 35 or 40 per cent of the 2PP vote. Does that affect the number of seats that we hold? No. Some may say that we would be better off running campaigns in those seats just to boost our 2PP vote, but that is not the point. The very rational decision made by the Labor Party is that we will allocate our resources to those seats that can deliver us government. The Liberal Party may not choose to do that.

I was speaking to voters in the member for Flinders' electorate and they were surprised by the amount of money that was spent in that electorate. They were surprised by the number of brochures they got. They were surprised by the number of posters that went up around the place. One rough calculation—and who knows? I do not reside over there and I cannot say I was concentrating much on any other seat other than Newland in the lead-up to the election. I was not travelling widely, but one voter over in Flinders suggested to me that somewhere in the order of \$80,000 had been spent—

**Mr Picton:** \$80,000.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** \$80,000.

**Mr Gardner:** Stop making things up.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** No, that was suggested to me. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of their figures but, to be honest, anything more than \$1,000 or whatever the nomination fee is—

**Mr Gardner:** \$2,000.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** Okay. So, anything more than \$2,000—

**Mrs Vlahos:** \$3,000.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** —or \$3,000, which is your nomination fee, I think is an overallocation of resources by the Liberal Party in that seat of Flinders.

**Mr Gardner:** It would have been.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** It would have been. Spending any money at all—

**Mr Whetstone:** How much did you spend in Adelaide? How much did you spend in Newland?

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** Adelaide is a seat in play and Newland is a seat in play.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Newland.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** Newland was a seat in play. That is a seat you do spend money in because it is a seat in play. However—

**Mr Whetstone:** There were four candidates in Flinders.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** You see, this is why I am a good marginal seat campaigner and you are in a safe seat. The Liberal Party may choose to go and review their campaign and their

allocation of resources, but they may not. Quite frankly, if they do not choose to review their campaign I will be quite happy, and I think most members on this side of the house would be very happy with that result, if they choose not to review their campaign. A number of members opposite have brought up the example of Don Dunstan and how the Liberal Party was magnanimous and came in here and changed the laws, which they did, and that has to be acknowledged.

However, let us remember that, at that point, there was a genuine malapportionment—not a gerrymander, because they are separate. A malapportionment and a gerrymander are two separate things. There was a genuine malapportionment, and my memory of the situation—I may be wrong—is that the Labor Party was, in fact, winning a majority of the primary vote and still not winning government.

**Mr Treloar:** So, what's happening now?

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** You are winning a majority of the two-party preferred vote. The primary vote is different. You are winning more than 50 per cent of the primary vote and not winning government. There is no point coming in here and whingeing about it and pretending that there needs to be some sort of magnanimity. There needs to be some sort of review of the Liberal Party campaign because, quite frankly, they ran a poor campaign. In fact, personally, I think they ran a rerun of the 2010 election campaign, which was, as we all know, not an entirely successful campaign.

There is no point in whingeing, there is no point in complaining about the rules, and there is no point getting upset because things are not working or because the Electoral Commission did not rig the result enough. The right result is to go and review the campaign and come back and have another crack, which they have got four years to do.

If you look at the Liberal Party in the last few weeks, all we have seen is a repeat of the previous four years, which is outlining in great detail the faults of the government. There is no doubt that the role of the opposition is to point out the faults of the government and hold it to account—I agree with that—but, when you attempt to seek the leadership of the state (which is what we do when we seek government), it is leadership by concession. The people agree to give you the leadership of the state, which means you need to convince them about why you should do that.

That means involving yourself in a policy debate, more than just complaint. It means providing solutions to well-known problems. Step one, outline the problem. Step two, outline a solution. Step three, take that solution to the people and campaign on it. We never got past step one from the Liberal Party, which was outlining the faults of the government—supposed faults of the government, in some cases.

**Mr Gardner:** Sixty-six per cent of South Australians didn't vote for you.

**The Hon. T.R. KENYON:** How come you are so successful, then? Seriously. You can pull out any statistic that you like, but the fact is the opposition did not win enough seats and they remain in opposition. Any amount of complaining about statistics or the primary vote or the two-party preferred vote cannot hide that fact when we have a one-vote, one-value system and where the number of electors in each electorate is roughly equal, give or take.

I think the margin of error is 10 per cent on each one, but that is 22,000 or 24,000 people. These are words of wisdom and I do not want to give them too much detail because they have to find out these things for themselves, but I think the interests of the state are not served by an opposition questioning the ground rules of the game instead of undertaking a serious self-examination about their campaigning in particular.

In my maiden speech, I quoted Jack Lang, who gave the following advice to Paul Keating. He said, 'When you get into parliament, don't think you've got a lot of time, because you don't.' I think that is very good advice, and it is certainly advice that I have taken to heart and continue to take to heart, and I will always be conscious of the fact that I do not have a lot of time. I am in a marginal seat and I remain in a marginal seat.

I do not expect it to ever be a safe seat, although that would not be such a bad result but, given that there is a limited lifetime to my political career, I intend, very definitely, to use that time to the benefit of my electors (my constituents) and also the people of South Australia, and I am looking forward to continuing that work and working exceedingly hard on behalf of my electors and the people

of South Australia, and I am looking forward to working with all members of this house to further the interests of this wonderful state that we live in.

**Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:04):** I may well be the last up to acknowledge the address from the Governor, so I thank him very much for taking the opportunity to address the joint sitting of the parliament and acknowledge his significant contribution to South Australia over a number of years, along with that of his wife Liz. When I was the shadow minister for disabilities and families and communities, not too many weeks went by without my attending a number of events also attended by the Governor and his wife. Between them, they are patrons of hundreds of significant charities, welfare providers and other services in South Australia.

I think they have undertaken those roles with distinction for the people of South Australia and for the communities that they have served. They have carried out the job, as I say, with distinction. I look forward to the Governor continuing to undertake that role for the remainder of his term and wish them well as, I know, a number of other members of the opposition have done.

I acknowledge the election of the Speaker and Deputy Speaker and congratulate them on those roles. The opposition, as I have said previously, will endeavour to work with them for the maintenance of good order in this house. We seek little more than fair treatment and, preferably, an answer or two from the government when we ask a question, and I look forward to a day when maybe that will happen at some stage.

I acknowledge the Leader of Government Business continuing in that role and look forward to continuing to work with him. I thank his staff for taking our calls when we have questions about the government's program and hope that the person in that role, along with the Leader of Government Business and the Government Whip, will continue playing a cooperative role for the good functioning of the house.

I note that, having spent the last couple of weeks trying to work with the Government Whip and the Leader of Government Business on how we can manage to get the Supply Bill through in good time—in time for it to go to the other place before the end of the financial year so that, indeed, the business of government does not shut down on 30 June—it seems that the Premier has put something else on our agenda. So, we have attempted to work with the government to get Address in Reply speeches done quickly. The Governor, who I know reads all of these, will note that some opposition members have been briefer than in previous years.

We will, of course, work with the Government Whip to try to get the Supply Bill through in good time as well but, much as we might be happy to let the government have the Supply Bill introduced one day and debate commence the next, and much as our other members are attempting to assist the government in getting it through in time, I should note that, if the usual practices of any bill were applied to the Supply Bill—that is, that it be introduced and laid on the table for a week, then transmitted to another place upon passing and laid on the table for a week—the government, having introduced the bill only yesterday, would have no chance of getting that bill through before the end of June.

The government actually depends upon the goodwill and a good working relationship with the opposition. When it is going to pull stunts that use the time of the house in a way such as appears to be taking place tomorrow, then it tests us. We shall see how much time the Premier wants to take up with other matters that are not related to the Supply Bill tomorrow.

I acknowledge the service of those former members who either retired or were unsuccessful in holding their seats at the election. On the Liberal side, of course, that is Mr Ivan Venning—as I can call him in this chamber now—the former member for Schubert. I acknowledge the service of those former Labor members who retired or were unsuccessful in holding their seats as well.

I think, for the most part certainly, people run for parliament with an idea of doing service for their communities and their state and, when the majority of the people in their electorates choose not to continue supporting them, it can sometimes reflect on the political philosophies they take into it. Which party the electorate chooses would be preferable to form government does not necessarily reflect poorly on the character of those who no longer serve in this place. I thank them for their service and, along with other members, I am very hopeful that the member for Fisher will be rejoining us in this house again soon. We wish him all the best for a full recovery.



I thank the leader of the Liberal Party, the member for Dunstan, for the fantastic job he did during the campaign. He has a monumental work ethic. I think one other member earlier described him as the hardest working person they have ever met. He served the party well. He continues to serve the party well as Leader of the Opposition. I look forward to the day, as do 53 per cent of the South Australian people, when he is able to serve as Premier of this state in this place. He will do a tremendous job then. He has the right ideas to get South Australia back on track, and the people of South Australia yearn for such an occasion. I give thanks to my constituents in Morialta for returning me. When I was first chosen as a candidate in the seat—

**The Hon. M.J. Atkinson:** With a 7 per cent swing.

**Mr GARDNER:** Thank you, sir. The Speaker identifies a 7 per cent swing. Yes, that is true. When I was first the candidate for Morialta I was in fact facing a seat that was 42 per cent Liberal. We now have 60 per cent of the people of Morialta voting for the Liberal Party, which I think is a significant vote of confidence for the Liberal Party. I acknowledge that the extraordinary resources devoted by the Australian Labor Party in the seats of Adelaide and Dunstan were not present in Morialta, and I think that that determines probably the difference in the margin between Morialta, Adelaide and Dunstan as of 15 March.

Nevertheless, I am very appreciative of the vote of confidence; it was significant. I think that this is the first time that I have been able to track down, since 1993, that the Liberal Party was successful in winning all booths in the seat of Morialta, and booths such as Newton and Paradise, where at some stage fewer than 30 per cent of electors had chosen the Liberal Party over the Labor Party, are now majority Liberal. It is reassuring. These are communities with whom I have worked so hard to become friends, and to hear their issues and to bring them to this place is very reassuring and I am grateful to those communities for their continued vote of support.

As the member for Newland just identified—and he read it in a maiden speech, and I think we have probably heard it in a few maiden speeches—none of us gets here by ourselves. I particularly want to pay tribute to my wife, Chelsey Gardner, who I met through the Liberal Party. She got engaged to me when I was a candidate. I was an unemployed candidate for the Liberal Party at the time, with questionable prospects if I was to be unsuccessful, perhaps. Nevertheless, she was willing to marry me. Then, as a member of parliament, with the significant effects that can have on family life, she was willing to say yes at the end of the altar, and that was the most wonderful thing she could have done to make my life better. I hope that she understands the gratitude I have for her, and I know that I would not do as well without the support she gives me.

I thank my campaign manager Scott Kennedy, my SEC President Howard Jacob, and my SEC secretary Richard Harvey, all of whom have more than full-time jobs, knowing them all, and who contributed an immense number of hours of their own time in volunteering on the campaign executive to help us retain Morialta. I thank my booth captains, George Hallwood, Kelly Ansell, Samantha Mitchell, Priya Pavri, Richard Harvey, Michael Potter, Scott Kennedy, Callum di Sario, Giuseppe Canala and Kahlia Smith. I thank my parents and all the other members of my family, members of the SEC committee and the many supporters and friends who assisted in so many ways.

I would also like to acknowledge the efforts of the Labor candidate, Clare Scriven. Clare and her family spent a great deal of time getting involved in the Morialta community in the months leading up to the election. Although they may not have achieved the result they sought, as I said at the declaration of the polls, Clare's delightful children can be very proud of their mother's campaign to which they contributed so very much. I trust that she may have another chance when her local seat of Cheltenham becomes vacant in due course, hopefully sooner rather than later, and I wish her well in that preselection for the good of South Australia. May there be a reason for such a preselection at the earliest possible opportunity.

I also pay tribute to the efforts of the Greens' candidate and the Family First candidate, Sue Neal. The Greens' candidate, Scott Andrews, was also the Greens' candidate at the 2010 election. Sue and Scott are terrific members of the local community and they did their parties proud. I note that Scott comes to some of my events and forums. He is a significant supporter of the local community. I know that Sue is very highly regarded by her church and by all who come into contact with her. I thank them for offering their service to our local community.

I offer my congratulations to the new Liberal members of parliament. The member for Schubert I have known for a number of years, and he is indeed, as I am, a former president of the

South Australian Young Liberal Movement. The member for Mitchell, I have to say, pulled one out of the fire. He was not expected by many in the commentariat (certainly I think by those in the Labor Party I spoke to) to win the seat of Mitchell, and yet he never gave up. He just kept working and kept focusing on getting to know his constituents, a community he was already a part of and became even more a part of, and he offered them an alternative that they grasped and enjoyed. I have every confidence that the member for Mitchell will serve in this place for many years to come, and we look forward to that service.

The member for Bright in his second week in the parliament got a question from question time on the TV news demonstrating the failures of the Labor government in his community, and that is a tribute to him as a new member. I know that he also will be here for a long time to come, and we thank him for offering himself to the Liberal Party, and he will do very well indeed. The member for Mount Gambier, who I am hoping has a chance to speak on the Supply Bill tonight because, in the brief time I have known him (I did not have a chance to go down to Mount Gambier during the campaign, I am afraid), has impressed me as somebody who will serve that community extremely well. I enjoyed his maiden speech, and I enjoy the contributions he makes to our party room; he will do a great job.

The member for Hartley, finally, I have spent a lot of time with over the last couple of years. The constituencies of Morialta and Hartley are conjoining. They are the two electorates that take in the Campbelltown City Council, and so consequently the former member for Hartley and the new member for Hartley and I spent a lot of time together over the last couple of years, and I am very pleased that the member for Hartley is joining us. He has grown up in our area; he was a school captain and dux at Rostrevor College. He has been a terrific young lawyer, and he has a huge amount to offer to this house, his electorate and the people of South Australia and I see big things in his future.

I acknowledge the candidates for the Liberal Party who were unsuccessful in some of the marginal seats. I think the member for Newland also articulated quite well that those who put themselves forward for seats are to be commended. You are not thanked very often, so I will thank in particular those I had something to do with and worked with: Michael Manetta, the candidate for Torrens; Lyn Petrie, the candidate for Wright; Terina Monteagle, the candidate for Ashford; Carolyn Habib, the candidate for Elder; Glenn Docherty, the candidate for Newland; Damian Wyld in Florey; and Nicola Centofanti and Louise Mathwin in the Legislative Council. I pay tribute to all the other Liberal candidates, but in particular those I spent some time helping, giving advice to or whatever else it might have been. I know that, given other opportunities in the future, they are all significant people of merit with a great deal to offer.

In relation to some of the Labor Party contributions to this debate, a number of people have suggested that the Liberal Party wasted energy, resources and time in safe seats. I know that the Labor Party tends to have a lot of candidates who are enthusiastic but preselected late, maybe not of the communities they seek to serve, and that is fine. I particularly pay tribute to those Liberal candidates, people like Michael Santagata and Scott Roberts (I will not go into any others because I am sure I will leave somebody out), who were seeking to serve their local communities and who did a great job during the campaign when they were perhaps not given much chance. I commend them for putting themselves forward and the efforts they made, and I hope that they will find other outlets to serve their communities in the future, either in this place or through some other means.

Can I say a couple of words about Senator Don Farrell. Senator Don Farrell was elected to the federal parliament on 1 July 2008, he was unsuccessful at the 2013 federal election, and he is due to conclude his term on 30 June this year. I think everybody recognises that Senator Farrell has played a significant role in the formation of current and former Labor caucuses as demonstrated by the significant gratitude for his support acknowledged in so many Labor members' maiden speeches.

Many recent former members, people such as Lindsay Simmons, the former member for Morialta, Chloe Fox in Bright, Vini Ciccarello, the former member for Norwood, the Hon. Carmel Zollo, the Hon. Lynn Breuer, Alan Sibbons, former member for Mitchell and the Hon. Bernard Finnegan MLC, as a former member of the Labor Party who is still a member in the parliament, acknowledged Senator Farrell's help in getting them elected.

The Hon. Michael O'Brien's regard for Senator Farrell is a matter of obvious record. The Minister for Health, the Treasurer, the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, all acknowledged Senator Farrell's contribution and help in getting elected to this place and, of course,

there were particularly strong endorsements for Senator Farrell in their maiden speeches by a couple of ongoing members, the members for Little Para and Taylor, and the Government Whip. In the Government Whip's maiden speech, I had cause to look up earlier today—

*The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:*

**Mr GARDNER:** You don't need to make a personal explanation; I can help out the house. The Government Whip identified:

Also, I thank Don Farrell who has shown a lot of faith in me, sometimes more than I have in myself. Don has provided me with numerous opportunities; I hope that I have used them as he has expected I would. Certainly, I have enjoyed and appreciated them.

Very gracious words, sir. The member for Taylor on 11 May 2010 identified:

Big thanks go to Senator Don Farrell for his steady support over time; his judgement of people and politics is truly inspiring.

It did not just used to be the Government Whip and the member for Taylor who were happy to be so forthright in standing up for Senator Farrell, but I note that they have been consistent supporters and, in recent times, defenders of Senator Farrell. When the Premier decided to publicly savage Senator Farrell and diminish his reputation in the most humiliating manner that he could in January, it appears that the whip and the member for Taylor—who at the time were a senior minister and a rising star—were left high and dry, and one can only imagine they were seen as being too close to Senator Farrell.

I note that a number of new members have also paid tribute to Senator Farrell in their maiden speeches—the member for Elder, the member for Lee, the member for Napier and the member for Kurna join the long list who have done so—and, given Senator Farrell's significant contribution to their careers along with so many others before, I can only hope that in the coming years they will not forget their benefactor nor the wrongs done to him. Given the failure of any of these members to publicly defend Senator Farrell's position since the Premier declared him *persona non grata*, and now that Senator Farrell has declared that he will seek no further roles in public life, I would like to acknowledge his significant contribution.

This side of the house may often have disagreed with Senator Farrell as a union leader, as a senator and a minister but we acknowledge that he has sought to serve his party, his state and his nation with honour according to the views that he has genuinely held. Perhaps if more people like Senator Farrell were here on the Labor side or, if, indeed, some who used to consider him a leader in their group were more like him, we would not have had so many displays of arrogant hubris such as we have seen today and in the last couple of weeks.

I will turn briefly (and I will not use up the full time I expect) to the commentary on the election result that has been offered by some during the Address in Reply. There are a number who have taken the opportunity to spend 30 minutes talking about the Liberal campaign being lacking, and I direct them to the member for Newland's address a moment ago, or at least the first half before in the second half he then joined their number.

The nature of our democracy is that people vote for a member not for a political party. As the Deputy Premier said, the two-party preferred vote is a construct, it is not a separate box on the ballot paper that people choose, yet it is significant and the Deputy Premier ignored this. It is significant because our constitution identifies that it is desirable for the Electoral Commission to redraw the boundaries in such a way that the party who won the two-party preferred vote at the previous election is able to form government if, presumably, everyone votes the same way. So, construct it may be, but it is a significant one.

It is desirable that the party that gets the vote of more than 50 per cent of people in an election is able to form government. It should stand for itself. This parliament and the party of government should both be an expression of the will of the majority of the South Australian people.

There are two things to say about this: firstly, 53 per cent of people not getting their party of choice is not an expression of will of the South Australian people; secondly, it does not serve the South Australian people for all of the efforts of the campaign and the policy direction to be focused on the preferences of those dozen marginal seats.

Whichever party forms government, whichever party is able to attain a majority, when all of the efforts of the campaign—as I think the member identified in his contribution, and, indeed, most of the Labor members, decrying the Liberal campaign, have identified—should be directed towards those marginal seats, how does that suit the South Australian people's needs? How does that serve the South Australian people's needs? It cannot be seen to be a good in and of itself.

It has been remarkable—sorry, can I just identify, the member for Newland in fact brought it down to saying the interests of the state are not served by questioning the rules of the game, but that is an extraordinary thing to say. I am not suggesting that the rules of the game have been breached in this way; they are the rules of the game, and we accept that the government has formed government. They have the confidence of 24 members of the house, for the moment, and so they can form government. But it is hardly in the interest of the state (or, as I would prefer to say, in the interest of the South Australian people) to ignore the rules of the game when the rules of the game do not lead to the best outcomes for the South Australian people.

As the member for Davenport said, wouldn't it be better for the vote of somebody in Port Adelaide to be the same as somebody in Kimba, to be the same in Wallaroo, to be the same as somebody as Ardrossan, in determining who forms government? Irrespective of where the boundaries are, would it not be preferable if the needs of everybody, wherever they are located in whichever electorate they live, are going to have the same impact on who forms government, and their desires? It would, as the member for Davenport identified, change way that we campaign, and it would have a positive impact, I think, on the way that we are governed.

The very concept of a specific geographic area having its needs more important to the outcome of government than another geographic area would cease to be important, and so the primary consideration for parties seeking election would necessarily be: 'What is going to convince the majority of the South Australian people that we will make a better job of being in government than the other side?'

There are a number of different ways that this can be identified. I hope that Labor ministers, the Premier, the Deputy Premier, and others who have waxed lyrical on this topic will at least be open enough to consider the fact that going into a discussion about electoral reform is not necessarily a matter of whingeing; it can also be a matter of seeking the best outcome for the people of South Australia. The people of South Australia are not served by the system as it stands, as we would like them to be, and as I think they would like to be.

When 53 per cent vote in a way which does not get their government, when four out of six elections produce an outcome that is not desired by those who framed the constitution in the way that it was, when it was addressed in a way such as to fix this very problem that we are talking about, clearly the current system has not worked, clearly the fix has not worked, so let us address it. Let us talk as a parliament and as a community about how to improve it.

The fact is the government sits with the support and the confidence of 47 per cent of the South Australian people; about a third of South Australians gave them their primary vote. It is not a huge mandate for a forward program based on what they took to the election. In fact, they did not win the election so much as they formed government.

We, as Her Majesty's loyal opposition, will fulfil our duties to the parliament and to the South Australian people. We will seek to achieve the best possible outcomes to the government's legislation, and, where that means supporting the government in expediting debate and where that will assist in the people of South Australia's best interests, then we will do so. The Supply Bill is a case in point: we had hoped, when we said that we would support the speedy passage of the Supply Bill through before 30 June, that the government would take that seriously and treat the parliament in a serious way. It remains to be seen how much time the government will choose to take up with its special new motion tomorrow afternoon, but, otherwise, we will help the government with the Supply Bill.

We will help the government will all of its sensible legislation, we will seek to amend that which needs amending, and we will introduce legislation where the government is clearly lacking, but we will fulfil the duties of the opposition so long a Her Majesty wishes us to. I recommend to the members of the government that they take into account the fact that they actually only got a third of the vote—only 47 per cent of the two-party preferred vote. They do not have the overwhelming

confidence of the people of South Australia, whose needs they should serve, and therefore they should take into account their best interests as their first and primary duty in the years ahead.

Put the hubris to one side, put the arrogance to one side, put the grandstanding and boasting about the election to one side and let's move on and focus on the needs of the South Australian people. With that I commend the Governor on his speech.

Motion carried.

*Bills*

**SUPPLY BILL 2014**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 May 2014.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:30):** Madam Deputy Speaker, I will acknowledge that I am not the lead speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You are not the lead speaker; thank you.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I am one of the masses, but I appreciate the opportunity to lead off in the Liberal response to the Supply Bill 2014. I note that we are authorising the appropriation of \$3,941 million dollars from the consolidated account for the Public Service of the state for the financial year ending on 30 June 2015. Obviously, it is important to have the Supply Bill. We again will be supporting it so that the state can function until the budget is brought down in June, ratified and then gazetted by the Governor.

There has been a lot of comment here lately about budget concerns, both state and federal. I want to talk about some of those concerns, but I also want to talk about some of the good things which are coming to us from the federal budget and which I think need to be recognised. On a state basis, we really have to look at what has been happening in recent times under the Labor government. We have had six deficits in seven years. The debt for this state is blowing out to \$14 billion in 2016. That horrifies me, because our state budget is only around \$16 billion, yet we see the debt at \$14 billion, nearly matching what it takes to run this state. It is a horrifying amount of money, and it is untenable; it is simply untenable.

The debt has been increasing by \$4.1 million a day for eight years; it is out of control. The interest on that debt will be \$1 billion a year in 2017, and that is more than the police budget spend. I am going from memory, but I think the police budget spend is about \$870 million annually, and you can see that the debt level just servicing the debt is more than that spend. If the interest to pay the bills in this state was a department, it would be the fifth largest department in this state. That is a shocking thing to have, money coming from the public—it is public money; it is tax money—paying off the mismanagement of this Labor government.

That brings me to the next point, reflecting on the state taxes, which are the highest in the nation. We have the car park tax, if Labor has its way, coming in, raising hundreds of millions of dollars over time. We have payroll tax crippling business, land tax; so many taxes that are putting people off living and working in South Australia. It has been interesting listening to some of the Address in Reply speeches in this place about new members whose own family members are leaving this state in frustration, because they cannot afford to stay here. That is a real shame.

We have seen that since the 2013 state budget there are 18,000 fewer full-time jobs in South Australia. People are exiting, leaving the state, or they have given up hope of getting a job. We have a higher than national average jobless rate in South Australia; another disgrace that we have to live with under the Weatherill Labor government.

The Murray Bridge area in my own electorate of Hammond (which is the main central business district) has an unemployment rate of 10.2 per cent, which reinforces the need for development and investment. I have recently brought to this place the need for investment in developments like the Gifford Hill racing club development at Murray Bridge so that we can promote jobs in the region.

When we talk about whether there is anything positive about doing business in South Australia, according to the figures from CommSec South Australia is generally 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> on most of the key indicators in Australia. What a shame! South Australia has the worst business confidence on the mainland. You only have to look around—I see it throughout my electorate—and you see the small business closures in regional areas.

There is too much red tape for these people to function. For people who are having a go, who want to employ people, who want to employ South Australians and generate money to keep this state on its feet, it is just too hard. There are barriers put in place for them to establish their businesses; there are barriers put in place to run their businesses; and they are dealing with a government that is just out of touch.

I note the comments made by the tourism minister about the businesses he is having a fair crack at because they will not open for meals around footy time at the Adelaide Oval. They know what it costs to run a business. They know the punitive costs of operating, of all the bills they have to pay. I am not saying that people should not have a fair rate of pay, but penalty rates make people decide not to open their businesses at certain times.

I know plenty of members of the Labor Party eat at Rigoni's; they can talk to the owners there themselves and have that discussion. I know he will tell them what he has told the media—why it is not worth him opening up for breakfast before a Crows or a 'Mighty Power' game who (I must reflect) are on top of the ladder, which is so good to see. May they go on to greater things throughout the season. It is not just the penalty rates: it is just the cost of doing business. There is no point opening their stores if, as the owner of Rigoni's has said, it is going to generate \$300. It is just not worth their while.

As I said, doing business in South Australia is tough. The retail sales in South Australia do not reflect the national increase and the exports continue to decline, yet we see the Weatherill Labor government trying to get on the back of agriculture in this state because their dream of Olympic Dam opening up with the expansion did not happen. Then suddenly Premier Weatherill realised that agriculture existed and the great contribution that it makes to this state.

Farmers and graziers are the great battlers of this state and this nation; they do a great job up against it. I note my interest: I still own my land which is leased out, but I have done plenty of years farming and it is tough. You are up against the seasons, fluctuating input prices and fluctuating returns for what you get. There is no surety of what you will get on the land.

I reflect that, when I was farming, during seeding time you might do anything up to about 100 hours a week, and my staff were getting reasonable rates of pay. My wife said, 'Well, why don't you write yourself a cheque?' I said, 'Well, hang on, there's not enough left for that; we have to keep going.' Sure, you operate the business and that is what you get. The people—not just in farming—put their own blood, sweat and tears on the line so that they can operate and hopefully do something for this state and their family.

I look at the cost of living under 12 years of Labor: consumer price index up, housing rentals up, property charges up, state taxes up, gas bills up, electricity bills up, and water bills up. All these things have gone up considerably over time.

Water is one of the most expensive items for people in this state, and not just domestic users. If you look at agriculture, I have people in my electorate who were hoping that we would get in so that we could get third-party access to the SA Water pipeline. Also, just south of my electorate, in MacKillop down around Meningie, people are putting in private pipelines because they cannot afford the \$3.23 a kilolitre industrial rate for stock water on farms. People are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars, and there are some proposals for several million dollars so that people can put in private lines and pump water directly out of Lake Albert so that they do not have to go through the SA Water network.

I have spoken before in this house about how the emergency pipeline around Meningie was well worth it at the time of the drought, but now everyone who has been hooked up to it keeps telling me, 'We just can't afford to use the water out of it.' For the parliament's interest—and I know I have stated this here before—on my property at Coomandook we have no choice because there is no groundwater. We are on the Keith pipeline off the River Murray water. We just have to pay the bills and make sure that we do not have leaks, which can run into thousands of dollars very quickly.

People are paying not just for water, they are paying more for electricity and gas. It is getting so that it is causing some people to be homeless and that some people just cannot function as a normal family unit.

We have had some negativity from the other side of the house about the federal budget, and that will reflect in our state budget, as our Labor people on the government benches have been telling us. There are a few reasons that there had to be a tough Liberal budget, and none more so than the debt and deficit that Labor federally have run us into. We were heading to a \$667 billion blowout, and that is just out of control. When you think back, not that many years ago John Howard, Peter Costello and their team had to fix a \$100 billion deficit, and they did it, but this is getting out of control, where too much money is not being spent in the right places. It is typical—this is always what happens after Labor governments. Labor is just spend, spend, spend. Liberal governments have to get in and fix the damage. If you do not do that, you run the country into disarray. We do not want to end up like Greece or parts of Europe. It would be absolutely untenable.

In regard to the federal budget, there was a \$50 billion pool for infrastructure in South Australia. We only got \$2 billion out of that, so why did the Premier not fight harder for part of that pool? It would be more than welcome. As part of the federal budget (and this has been in the last couple of budgets), I want to talk about the safety upgrades on the Dukes Highway. We have seen \$100 million—\$80 million of federal money and \$20 million of state money—go into more passing lanes on quite a few kilometres. A 1,200 millimetre separation split was put in the middle of the road; some people have unkindly called it a bike lane in the middle of a highway. We have seen fencing put up along the road to keep cars out of the scrub. Mike Mason has done very well out of that, thank you very much, and I am sure up there at Monash it is helping his bank account quite well.

I can understand the point of the wire rope and the Armco fencing, but many constituents, especially truck drivers, have come to me and said that it does not give them enough area if they have an accident, which is one thing, or a breakdown or a tyre blowout, to pull over and deal with it. I think there are some consequences there. Instead of doing this work—and this has been my position all the time—there should have been more duplication work started on the Dukes Highway. There are 191 kilometres that need to be done to the border, and there are different amounts that people think it will cost; the high end is about \$950 million at \$5 million a kilometre, but that would surely encompass some compulsory acquisition of land.

That is where the money should have gone, I firmly believe, so that over time we get those dual lanes. I believe it is the fourth busiest highway in the nation, and I think it would have been better to spend the money in that way. I do acknowledge, as an interim measure, that more overtaking lanes certainly assist people, and I travel a lot on the Dukes Highway.

In regard to road funding from the federal budget, we welcome extra funding for the Black Spot and Roads to Recovery programs. These programs are far better than taking the easy option, as this state Labor government does, of just reducing speed limits in regional areas. They have hit a lot of roads in my electorate—roads leading up to Mannum on each side of the river and roads from Wellington and Strathalbyn towards Goolwa. It is just ridiculous.

I have mentioned in this place several times before that we will get to the stage, because they do not want to spend any money on the \$400 million backlog of roads, that we will have a man with a red flag walking in front of cars that are capable of doing 200 km/h—not that we do that, of course. This is why we firmly believe that there should be investment into roads so that we do not have to put up with the ridiculousness of reducing speed limits and putting people on the roads for longer in regional areas. That is what causes deaths.

I welcome extra funding from the federal budget, from our Liberal-National Party colleagues, for agricultural research and development. It is \$100 million over four years. We do not hear about that from the other side of this house. R&D is absolutely important in agriculture. I welcome extra funding for biosecurity and quarantine measures. This is an absolute necessity to make sure that all our agricultural areas can grow. I welcome extra funding for regional development, that is, \$1 billion for the National Stronger Regions Fund, and I will be very keen to see how that will be rolled out across regional South Australia and what benefits we get from that money.

I also want to talk about health services, especially in areas like Hammond, and the regional general practice doctors and nurses and the jobs they do. It is fantastic to have their service, but we do need improvements. We need to keep the infrastructure and the equipment so that we attract

health professionals to the country areas. We need to put less pressure on people living in regional areas who need medical assistance. I welcome things like the chemotherapy chairs and the dialysis equipment in Murray Bridge, but then we have the problem of not having enough trained staff to operate it. I acknowledge that it is an improvement, but we have to make sure that the funding also goes through to pay for staff to operate that equipment.

I want to talk, also, about education worries. The Minister for Education comes in here and makes out that the Labor government is doing a great job. I have done some local media in Murray Bridge about the job cuts and program closures at TAFE. Eight jobs have gone with probably six more to go, and the TAFE staff are told to keep it under the radar. There have been very slow response times in regard to issues around the Lameroo school rebuild, which I will acknowledge is now in the member for Chaffey's electorate. A fire happened at that school back in October and the education department and the insurer are still arguing about whether to replace like for like with the four classrooms that were burnt down.

There are budget issues facing the Coomandook Area School which, sadly, my lads do not go to any more because we just got sick of, basically, the dysfunction in how the school operates. They do not have enough money to water the oval. They had to go to Meningie for their inter-house sports carnival this year because the oval was in a state of disrepair. They have a swimming pool that supposedly was repaired over 12 months ago but could not be used this summer because it was still in a state of disrepair. It is out of control. If you want to talk more about education generally in this state, it is a basket case. In terms of NAPLAN, we are below the national average in 19 out of 20 categories.

Obviously, we made some great commitments to regional South Australia as Liberals in this state. We had \$139 million racked up in policy announcements—about \$100 million more than the member for Frome got in his agreement with Labor. I think he could have asked for \$139 million. In fact, I think he could have asked for anything and he would have got it because the Premier did not think he was going to get in, and that is why he went overseas and was away when the Prince and Princess were here from England. He just wasn't here. I do note the initiatives—does that say I'm out of time?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You have five seconds.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I will have to make a further contribution in my grievance—but I do commend the Supply Bill, and I welcome other members' debate.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Speirs.

At 17:51 the house adjourned until Thursday 22 May 2014 at 10:30.