

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 22 May 2014

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

Bills

CITY OF ADELAIDE (CAPITAL CITY COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (10:31): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the City of Adelaide Act 1998. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Parliament of South Australia established the Capital City Committee under the City of Adelaide Act 1998. That act is recognition that a thriving capital city is critical to the overall success of the state. The act establishes arrangements for the intergovernmental liaison between the state government and the Corporation of the City of Adelaide for the strategic development of the city.

The objective of the act is to recognise, promote and enhance the special social, commercial, cultural and civic role the City of Adelaide plays as the capital city and heart of South Australia. The act allows for three members of the Adelaide City Council and three from government. Since the committee's establishment in 1998 up until 2010, the member for Adelaide had always been a member of government and therefore has had access to all of the information discussed by the committee and the ability to put forward views on behalf of their constituents.

From 1998 to 2002, the Hon. Michael Armitage was the member for Adelaide but was not on the committee. I have been in contact with Michael Armitage and he informed me that there was no need as all initiatives were discussed in the party room where he could freely access information and put forward his views on how it would affect his electorate. From 2002 to 2010, Dr Jane Lomax-Smith was the member for Adelaide and the chair of the Capital City Committee. I believe the current situation of the state member being in opposition was not anticipated when the act was established.

The committee's role is one of facilitation and coordination, with formal decisions referred to the state cabinet and the Adelaide City Council. Within this role the committee had broad functions to enhance and promote the development of the city with the powers to:

(a) identify and promote key strategic requirements for the economic, social, physical and environmental development and growth of the City of Adelaide as the primary focus for the cultural, educational, tourism, retail and commercial activities of South Australia;

(b) to promote and assist in the maximisation of opportunities for the effective coordination of public and private resources to meet the key strategic requirements identified by the committee, and recommend priorities for joint action by the state government and the Adelaide City Council;

(c) monitor the implementation of programs designed to promote the development of the City of Adelaide;

(d) make provision for the publication, as appropriate, of key strategies, goals and commitments relevant to the development and growth of the City of Adelaide that have been agreed upon by the parties who are, or will be, required to undertake responsibility for the implementation or delivery; and

(e) collect, analyse and disseminate information about the economic, social, physical and environmental development of the City of Adelaide with particular emphasis on assessing outcomes and identifying factors that will encourage and facilitate future developments in the City of Adelaide.

These are all issues that are not only of broad concern to South Australians but more importantly they directly relate to and affect the lives of the people living in Adelaide. Inherent in democracy is the role of the member for Adelaide to voice the interests of their electorate. It is not for the government of the day to make decisions about their electorate—especially with regard to heritage buildings, CBD population, shared road use, and CBD development—without consideration of the opinions of the affected constituents. I quote from a speech from the Hon. Ann Bressington on 30 May 2012 from the other place where she said:

Our constituents deserve...that their chosen representative in the House of Assembly, regardless of whether their vote in parliament contributes towards the formation of government, be a member of the Capital City Committee.

For while the City of Adelaide is our state capital, and as such must be governed and planned for the interests of all South Australians, for these constituents it is also their home town, and they must not be forgotten nor their voices silenced in the planning debate.

The reality is that since the Capital City Committee's inception in 1998 the state seat of Adelaide has not been held by a member who is not a member of the governing party.

Removing the politics, the question is simply whether the member for Adelaide on behalf of constituents they represent, and regardless of from which party they hail, should be on the Capital City Committee. Clearly, I believe they should be and the bill has my support.

On 6 September 2012 in the House of Assembly, the Hon. Bob Such said:

I am very surprised that the government would want to deny this opportunity. I am all in favour of democracy and I think this is just an extension of the democratic principle that the people who live in an area should have a say and that it not be left to others, in terms of issues that will be considered by that Capital City Committee. I strongly support this bill. I think it has merit, I think it is reasonable, and I urge government to reconsider if it is planning to oppose it.

In a ministerial statement on 23 November 2011 the Premier, Jay Weatherill, described the Capital City Committee as holding a 'pivotal role in revitalising the city' and 'reaffirmed the committee's commitment to working together on real change agenda to enliven the City of Adelaide'. The people of Adelaide must also, through their elected member, have a pivotal role in the revitalisation of the city, not just the committee. When we say 'working together', working together includes actual people who live in the city and their elected representatives. So it is a bit of a farce to have a committee designed around the future of Adelaide without the elected member for Adelaide being part of the committee. In a further ministerial statement, the Premier stated:

The community expects its government to be open and accountable and should have confidence that decisions its government makes are for the right reasons.

Given this statement, why can't the elected member for Adelaide be part of the committee? If the government is open and accountable, then quite logically the local member should be a part of the committee making decisions for the area.

I give you an example of some of the topics that are discussed by the Capital City Committee, and given that I cannot access their minutes or FOI any information, these come from other sources. I quote once again from the ministerial statement given by the Premier on 23 November 2012 where he said:

We committed to work together on a real change agenda to enliven our city, including activating side streets, laneways and spaces between buildings; finding new uses for vacant buildings, including heritage buildings; reducing red tape so new enterprises can flourish in Adelaide's CBD; having a flexible planning regime for the city centre; promoting shared-use roads; and increasing the population living in the city.

From a radio precis on 21 December 2011:

The Adelaide City Council has referred its plan to introduce lower speed limits in the city centre to a State Government committee...The plan will now be considered by the Capital City committee.

From the Hon. Gail Gago in the other house:

Victoria Square is a project of the Adelaide City Council...The government gave some financial commitment some time ago to assist in advancing the project, and I think the Adelaide Capital City Committee has responsibility for its oversight.

When the member for Ramsay asked a question in the house about planning reforms for the City of Adelaide, the Hon. Deputy Premier said:

Work has continued, and the government and the Adelaide City Council have been discussing what a reformed planning agenda for our capital city needs. I have been meeting with—and I continue to meet regularly with—representatives of the Adelaide City Council, including the Lord Mayor and members of the Capital City Committee, to keep them informed of progress.

All of the topics that are covered are of great concern to myself and the people I represent—for example, things such as the city's safety.

I have personally participated in three night audits of the West End, East End and the Gouger and Grote Street area on behalf of my constituents because safety is of great concern to them. I think that it is fair that not only am I notified of what is happening in these areas, but that I have a voice for my community. I am the person they ring when they have issues, so I am the one who needs to be able to pass on their concerns on their behalf.

The city activation, which is also a function of this committee, is concerned with residential buildings and conversions, public realm interventions and activating Adelaide's buildings. Every time the council or the government puts out a plan, whether it is a local heritage listing or new development plans for the city, it is my office that people call to try to understand and make sense of what is going on. I should be part of this so I can pass on information.

When this bill came up for discussion previously in this house, members made some comments that I would like to address. It has been raised that adding another member would cause an imbalance in the numbers, given that currently there are three from council and three from state government. From my discussions with Michael Harbison, who was a member of this committee for approximately 10 years, I have been able to ascertain that the committee does not actually vote on anything, so an imbalance in numbers would have no effect.

It has been argued that my inclusion on the committee is not warranted as the Adelaide City Council represents the views of their constituents. Whilst I acknowledge the good work of the Lord Mayor and councillors, as we all know, councillors are paid a small allowance to compensate for their time; however, most of them have full-time jobs or other occupations.

I believe Michael Harbison was the first lord mayor who made the job a full-time position and the current mayor has continued this tradition. In saying that, the Town Hall is not like an electorate office with full-time electorate staff who have regular interaction with their local community. Being a state member of parliament is a full-time job that involves being aware of the views of the community they represent.

It is about assisting, informing and advocating for my constituents who are currently denied any representation by my not being part of this committee or having any access to the minutes or information discussed at this committee. As the local member, I receive a diverse amount of information to my office and personally act to represent the views of my constituents. Many decisions have been made by the government which do not truly take into account the effects on those constituents. It is my job to ensure their views are represented and taken into account.

The point has been made that I am not part of government or cabinet and my being on the committee would open up the committee's deliberations to public scrutiny. This is a weak argument. The members from Adelaide City Council are not part of government or cabinet and, as far as I am aware, none of them have signed any confidentiality agreements. Michael Harbison does not recall signing anything during his 10-year tenure. Given this, the deliberations are already at risk of public scrutiny, and so they should be. My involvement in the committee would be for the benefit of the constituents of Adelaide.

I think this is basically a common-sense piece of legislation. It is obvious that the member for Adelaide should be part of a committee formed to produce outcomes that will affect those living in the City of Adelaide. This bill gives the government the opportunity to show that it can transcend party politics and work together for the betterment of the City of Adelaide. I commend this bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

WORKERS REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION (FIREFIGHTERS) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (10:45): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Worker's Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1986. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (10:46): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill is a very simple bill. All it is about is giving people equity. It is a very fair bill. The issue of this bill has been long discussed in this place, and I expect it to pass with the support of all members of this place if they are truly representing their electorate, if they are truly representing what they stand up for, if they are truly listening to their constituents and supporting the 13,500 CFS volunteers in this state.

This bill is not about money. This bill is not about advantage. This bill is about equity. This bill is about honesty. This bill is about principles. This bill is about courage. This bill is about conviction. This bill is about saying what you mean and meaning what you say. This bill is about putting people before politics. This is about giving people what they deserve—not just what they want, but what they deserve.

You and I, Mr Speaker, know that the first thing you learn in politics is how to count. I know that 24 beats 22, so without the support of Independents and those people opposite, the members of the Labor Party, this bill will not pass. So, I appeal to them to have the courage of their convictions, to have the courage of what they are saying to me privately in the corridors, to have the courage of what they are saying to the CFS volunteers of this state, and to have the courage to support this bill and give the CFS volunteers equity.

Let me remind this house and the member for Frome what the now Premier said in this place in 2005. This is what the then minister for families and communities said in this house on 16 February 2005:

Democracy is not served by having a representative for whom their electorate will not know where they are to vote on a particular issue.

Well, the electors of Frome clearly understood what the member for Frome was saying in 2013. They understood what he was going to vote for last year. They understood what he was going to vote for on 14 March this year, but what has happened since? Let me remind the member for Frome what he said in this place, because the electors of Frome believed him. They knew what he said, and they hoped he said what he meant. In his maiden speech, the member for Frome said:

I know that every member here will put their constituents and South Australia at the top of their priorities and always place them ahead of politics and self.

Well, where is the member for Frome today on this issue? I ask the member for Frome to have the courage of his convictions and come down here and support the volunteers and do what he told his constituents, back then on 24 September last year, he was going to do. The member for Frome said in the debate on the government's bill last year:

I will not support the bill in its current form. The main reason is the omission of the CFS.

That is what the member for Frome said September last year. That is what his electors thought he meant on March 14 this year. What do we know about what he says now. Let's just listen to what the member for Frome said in his speech about the CFS in the electorate of Frome. He said:

...I also have 18 CFS locations across the electorate of Frome. Those 18 CFS locations do exactly the same as our MFS firefighters. They go out there and they fight fires.

The member for Frome went on to say:

They...go out there and [they] attend road traffic accidents. They attend a lot of stuff there.

The ones from Napperby, Crystal Brook and Port Broughton also assist the MFS people in Port Pirie...If somebody from the MFS or a retained and also a CFS volunteers contract one of these cancers, are we going to leave that CFS person out?

Well, tell us, member for Frome; come down and tell the house what your constituents thought you were going to do if you were elected to be part of this parliament on 15 March, because that is what they thought on 14 March. In his speech on the government bill last year the member for Frome then went on to say:

I urge the government to put just three letters into this bill: CFS.

Where is he on that issue now? He needs to come down here, he needs to stand up, he needs to be counted. As I said, the first thing you learn in politics is how to count: 24 beats 22. I know the member for Fisher—

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett will be seated. It is a convention that all members are always present in this chamber, so the member will not speculate on where a member might be or if he or she needs to come down into the chamber. Member for Morphett.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I was speaking metaphorically about where his mind is on this issue rather than his body—we know we are always in the house—because I do not know where his mind is on this issue and the electors of Frome do not know where he is on this issue. You have got to have gonads to do this job, Mr Speaker, and I do not believe the member for Frome has got the gonads to stand up to the Premier and say, 'Premier, you're wrong on this. I am going to support the CFS volunteers, I am going to support—

Mrs VLAHOS: Point of order: I think the anatomical language being used in the chamber is highly offensive, and the member should withdraw.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, I will rule on the point of order first. The member for Morphett told the house that one needed gonads to be a member of the house. Now, I imagine that many members of the house disagree with that. I imagine the member for Adelaide disagrees with it, but he is allowed to say it. The member for Morphett.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I digress for a second, Mr Speaker. Gonads do refer to ovaries as well as testicles. Had I said, 'Does the member for Frome have the balls to come down here?', that would have been out of order. I urge the member for Frome to stand up and be counted by his constituents, be counted when the division happens on this bill, because there will be a division on this bill. I guarantee that. Members of parliament will be listed in that division and every elector in Frome will know how the member for Frome voted on this bill. You need to stand up in this place, say what you mean and mean what you say.

Let me tell this house and let me tell the member for Frome that the Labor Party offered me a chair of a committee. When I refused that, they offered me an outer ministry. I do not believe that was without some form of commitment, if I had accepted it. I did not accept it because I am a man of principle. I will not betray the electors of Morphett, I will not betray the Liberal Party, I will not betray the people who voted for me in Morphett. I am on this side of the house with great disappointment, but I am not going to betray my principles.

I think it probably cost me about \$1 million in increased wages in superannuation—\$1 million. It is not about the money: it is about the principles, and that is what you need to have in this place. I ask the member for Frome: where are your principles? Where are you, when you told the people of Frome in your speech in this place 'include the CFS in this'? I will not betray the people of Morphett, I will not betray the CFS volunteers, I will not betray my principles.

I am in here lobbying for the CFS for equity. This is not about money, this is not about anything more than giving the CFS volunteers everything they deserve. Ask the people of Bangor, ask the people of Eden Valley, ask the people of Delamere about how they value volunteers. What do we save this place, what do we save this state in assets, never mind the price of a life? What price a life? This place should be valuing our volunteers, they should be supporting this bill.

Members of the Labor Party have said to me privately, 'Look, we support this bill; we know this is about equity.' I tell them now: one of you might be disendorsed if you come across this side but, if all of you who have spoken to me about this come across en masse, the Premier needs you. He is not going to disendorse you. He is not going to risk the spat or the arguments that are going on in the upper house down here. He is going to make sure that you stick together, because that is what he wants, but show this parliament, the people who elected you and the CFS volunteers that

you have courage, that you have gonads, that you can stand up and do what is right, and support the CFS volunteers.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morphett will be seated. The member for Morphett will address his remarks through the Chair, not taunt members on the government side. The member for Morphett.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I certainly do not want to taunt them. I do plead—

The Hon. P. CAICA: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: A further point of order.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I am not offended by the terminology, but we do have—

Dr McFetridge: Here we go.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Not everyone in this house has external organs.

The SPEAKER: We have already, alas, been through this.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: I will then sit down, sir.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I will explain the facts of life to the member for Colton later. As a former firefighter, the member for Colton more than anybody in this place understands the dangers that firefighters face. My father was in the MFS for 30 years and I have been in the CFS for 25-plus years. I have trained with MFS firefighters and been out with them, and I know the member for Colton has put his life on the line. He is one of the heroes out there on the front line. When the bells drop, you do not know what you are going to. Others are running away and firefighters are running to the job, and the member for Colton is one of those who has done that. Actually, I should mention the members in this place who are in the CFS: the members for Stuart, Finniss, Chaffey, Hammond, MacKillop—

Mr Pengilly: Forty-six years.

The Hon. P. Caica: The member for Wright.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Forty-six years for the member for Finniss. I am not so sure that the member for Wright is a member of the CFS anymore. I understand that the member for Wright has resigned from the CFS. I do acknowledge her role and former premier Rann's role in the CFS. It would give me no displeasure in any way to see the member for Wright cross the floor and support the CFS, which she has been a member of. Let's see her be disendorsed if she does that. Let's do that. This is about equity, it is not about money. This is about valuing volunteers. This is about making sure that South Australians stand up for what is right.

I will be on the stage of the Festival Centre in a couple of weeks' time addressing volunteers. Hopefully, Peter Goers will be the compere again—always great fun. The Premier will be there. The Minister for Volunteers will be there, and I congratulate her on her appointment. I heard the Minister for Volunteers say last week during National Volunteer Week that volunteers put \$5 billion in in-kind support to this state. The CFS put a huge amount of that in through their volunteering. As I said, never mind the assets they save, the lives they save and the people who can now go about their business because of the quick action of the CFS, in many cases in conjunction with the MFS—that is what this is about.

I make no apologies for speaking with passion and wearing my heart on my sleeve with this issue, because it means a lot to me. I know it means a lot to everybody in this place. So, when the vote comes, let it be like when the bells drop: let's all run over to support this bill. Let's not walk away from this confrontation, this conflagration, as it has become politically. It should never be that. It should be a straightforward issue, giving volunteers equity and what they deserve. Support this bill.

The SPEAKER: I thank the member for Morphett for correcting me and the house on what the term 'gonads' embraces. He is, of course, correct. Nevertheless, I think the suggestion that, unless one has a working reproductive system, one should not be a member of this parliament is perhaps going too far.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Digance.

Motions

JONES, MR HENRY

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:01): I move:

That this house expresses its deep regret at the death of Mr Henry Jones and places on record its appreciation of his long and tireless commitment to the River Murray and the Murray-Darling Basin.

Henry Jones was a quietly-spoken Clayton Bay fisherman who raised his voice against decades of abuse of the Murray-Darling system. In my opinion there was no greater champion of the Murray-Darling than Henry, and the Murray-Darling Basin Plan would not have proceeded without his efforts and determination.

Sadly, Henry passed away on 15 April 2014, aged 72. I was fortunate to attend the celebration of his life with my wife Sally and colleagues, the member for Bragg and the member for Finnis on 19 April 2014. Henry was a true gentleman, always respectful and conveyed an integrity and dignity which impacted on everyone he met. When Henry spoke people listened.

Henry was the face of *The Advertiser*'s I Love Murray campaign but he never sought that sort of attention but pursued it because he knew it was right. There are many great anecdotes about Henry but one that I love is about the time he took a tinny to Canberra and cooked fresh mulloway from the Coorong on a barbecue outside Parliament House so that every member of parliament knew his story and his fight.

Ian Doyle, a friend of Henry's, reminisced at his funeral and said that Henry was, above all things, a fisherman and whose story 'is about a quintessential Aussie bloke who shared it for a lifetime with his high school sweetheart'. Throughout his campaign Gloria, who joins us here today with their daughter Christine, was always by Henry's side. It was a partnership, and I thank Gloria for her attendance today.

Henry's great loves, the Murray aside, were his wife Gloria, who he met at Mount Barker High School in 1955, daughters Christine, Julie and Susan, and his five granddaughters and one grandson. I am told that Henry and Gloria's story is one for the romantics. Henry says it was love at first sight.

My wife Sally and I were privileged to attend Henry and Gloria's 50th wedding anniversary, a day we fondly remember as we were embraced into the Jones family fold. Henry first moved to Clayton and started his own commercial fishing operation in 1961. Clayton in 1961 had no roads, no electricity and a population of four when Henry turned up. The early days in Clayton were nothing short of pioneering and Henry and Gloria went on to achieve much for Clayton at little or no cost to the community. For that he also deserves to be remembered.

Ian Doyle, who gave a terrific eulogy, retold stories of Henry's three neighbours. One was Claude Dent who was a knowledgeable man who had given up on civilisation and lived in a cave. According to Henry, Claude enjoyed the company of about 30 cats that were full of fleas and, as Henry remembered, this made having a conversation with him in the cave an interesting visit.

The other two family residents were Mr and Mrs Greenbottle. Henry never found out whether Greenbottle was their real name. There was a rumour that the massive pile of green bottles behind the ambulance where they lived may have had something to do with their surname. Said ambulance was in the middle of a rabbit warren, with a white ferret as a pet—and, yes, the pet was used to provide fresh meat from the warren below. Henry built a very small residence in Clayton, on lot 22, at a cost of £50; to this day, it remains the family home, or 'the love shack'.

When the Postmaster-General's Department was not interested in providing a telephone line to one permanent resident and a couple of shacks at Clayton, Henry decided to build it himself. Henry and Gloria also ran the local store and oversaw the vision, financing and construction of a \$180,000 Clayton community hall.

The hall committee, of which Henry was president and the foreman for the build, saw its fair share of dramas, including a visit from union officials, who Henry politely chased up Clayton Hill, stating, 'If you bastards come around here and try to close us down, I'll use you for yabby bait.' One

of those 'bastards' was Norm Gallagher. The community hall was opened in 1985 and is one of the many community-based developments and projects in which Henry and Gloria played pivotal roles.

The Yabby City story is one for the ages. Through processing, retailing and cooking fish and yabbies Gloria and Henry had caught, Yabby City became a hotspot to dine out and a trailblazer in South Australia as a tourist venture. Celebrities, politicians and many high-profile people came from far and wide to try Henry's yabbies. According to Ian Doyle, to get in for Saturday night or Sunday lunch, you had to book three months in advance.

Henry established the Country Fire Service in Clayton, and was captain there for 20 years. Gloria drove the school bus for some 30-plus years, and Henry played for and coached the Milang Football Club. Their devotion to the Clayton and Lower Lakes communities is nothing short of amazing.

The early days in Clayton were the reason that in future years Henry fought so hard for the Murray-Darling system. Clayton was pristine, and anytime Henry hopped into his boat and pushed away from the shore, he travelled into a wilderness of birds, fish, animals and a healthy aquatic system. Henry was not going to allow future generations to grow up accepting that dying ecosystems were the norm.

As a commercial fisherman operating in the Lower Lakes and the lower Murray system for more than half a century, Henry witnessed first-hand the declining health of the environment and river systems. When drought closed the Murray Mouth for the first time in 1981, Henry decided enough was enough and that it was time to act. According to Henry:

Our problems started long before the drought, but the drought made it bigger and really brought it into focus. While the drought was on...the people were walking around with their shoulders down, and the kids were the same. No laughter...all they talked about was water and when are we going to get water. The floods brought the water back, and all of a sudden the shoulders were back, the arms were swinging and eyes were wide open. It just proved to me beyond a shadow of doubt that you need a healthy environment and healthy rivers to have a healthy community.

Henry fought tirelessly over more than three decades for river and Lower Lakes reform, and he took his dedicated campaigning to prime ministers, premiers, state and federal ministers and anyone else he thought was blocking the reform necessary to save the Murray.

Henry spent those over 30 years lobbying, debating, encouraging, addressing, being threatened and abused, trips to Canberra and the Murray Mouth and thousands of meetings. He faced strong challenges from the powerful irrigator groups, but people started to listen.

As described earlier, Henry has often been described as a man of few words, yet when he did speak he used his words wisely and people listened. His experience and knowledge of the region, his fishery and the river made you want to listen.

Henry was a man who gave freely of his time in his cause and for his community and our great river system. Henry joined a number of committees, all of which benefited greatly from his contribution. Henry was a longstanding representative on many Murray-Darling Basin Commission committees, and later Murray-Darling Basin Authority committees, the Murray-Darling Basin Community Reference Group, the Murray-Darling Basin Authority Native Fish Advisory Panel, the River Murray Advisory Committee, the Living Murray Community Reference Group, and the Basin Community Committee. Henry was also a spokesman for the River, Lakes and Coorong Action Group and a member of the Lower Murray Drought Reference Group—I don't know when he had time to fish, quite frankly.

In Henry's opinion, the Murray-Darling Basin Authority's draft basin plan did not allocate enough water to South Australia. Towards the end of the fight for the River Murray, Henry copped a lot of abuse from people upstream. Meetings were so hostile in places like Griffith and Leeton they were like a war zone. Ian Doyle recalled at Henry's funeral:

At one of these meetings, a big redheaded bloke confronted him with a scarlet face and steam coming out of his nostrils, and was firmly pushing his right shoulder. 'Henry,' he said, 'you are in a room full of friends, but none of them are yours.'

Henry Jones should be remembered as the man who saved the Murray. The culmination of his 31-year campaign happened in 2012 in Canberra when Henry stood by former minister for water Tony Burke's side to see the bill passed and the plan implemented. Such was Henry's involvement

in the Murray-Darling Basin plan, former minister Burke travelled to Clayton to deliver Henry and Gloria a copy of the basin plan, in which he wrote:

Dear Henry, more than a century in the making, but we got there. This is one of the most important tasks I'll ever be given, but it never could have happened without you. Generations of the future will always owe a debt to Henry Jones. With kind regards, Tony Burke 20.2.13.

I first met Henry and Gloria soon after getting elected in 2006, and I soon learned of their vital contribution in all things in the Lower Murray and Lakes, especially when the system was beginning to be gripped by drought. One of my proudest moments as the member for Hammond, and at the time shadow minister for the River Murray, includes launching the Jones Lookout at Clayton Bay, in honour of Henry, Gloria and their family in September 2009.

Henry was a lifelong volunteer and deserves every piece of recognition he received and will continue to receive. His hard work and determination was recognised in 2008 when he received the Pride of Australia Medal. Henry was a finalist in the South Australia Senior Australian of the Year Award in 2014 for his work in water conservation, and was given a lifetime contribution at Alexandrina Council's Year of the Farmer celebrations in 2012.

In 2013, he received the River Murray Medal, awarded by the Murray-Darling Basin Authority, for his services devoted to protecting the health of the River Murray. I understand this was the first time this particular award had been given to a community member in 160 years since it was first established in 1853.

I was fortunate enough to attend a number of his and Gloria's Hall of Fame fishing industry awards recently, where they were both recognised at a state and national level. Henry played pivotal roles in numerous advances and changes in the fishing industry, and it was great to see him recognised. He led the way and others followed.

While president of the Southern Fisherman's Association he, along with others and with the help of Gloria, developed the world's first environmental management plan for a whole of fishery in the Lakes and Coorong, as well as receiving the Marine Stewardship Certification for his multi-species fishery. Henry was also awarded life membership of the Lakes and Coorong Fishery.

I was privileged to call Henry a friend, and it was an honour to work with him on issues impacting his beloved Lower Lakes and Coorong fishery and the River Murray. His passion, his dedication and his enthusiasm for the River Murray and Lower Lakes and Coorong fishing industry were second to none, and he will be greatly missed by many. Luckily, his work will continue, with his L21 fishing licence remaining in the family, with daughter Christine and grandson Justin taking over. Remarkably, that will be six generations of fishers, something of which Henry was enormously proud.

I met with Henry before he passed away and, even in those final months, he was still instructing me on the work that was needed to protect the river system and keep the Lower Lakes a freshwater system, and looking to the future. Henry was always optimistic that water to be delivered as part of the basin plan would improve the environment in the Lower Murray. Henry said:

I can see a rosy future for the river. It's never going to be pristine, it's a working river, there's still going to be irrigation, there's still going to be things grown because there has to be. But at least there's a cap on it now, and there's water set aside to look after the environment, and there's a chance that we'll have something to pass on that we're proud of.

He was a truly great man and it is a truly great family. It is a real privilege to have known Henry. As I reflect on one of those meetings at Langhorne Creek one day, when Henry was speaking to a group of Eastern States irrigators (Victorian and New South Wales irrigators), I was left in absolutely no doubt and they were not left in any doubt—and that is probably why he had no friends up there—on Henry's views about the River Murray that it should have a freshwater recovery. He did his utmost and he won on that scale, because I believe in the future and that what Henry did will keep that freshwater recovery. Long may we remember and may we never forget. I commend the motion.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (11:16): I rise in support of the motion moved by the member for Hammond that this chamber expresses its deep regret and sadness at the death of Mr Henry Jones and places on record its appreciation of his long and tireless commitment to the River Murray and the Murray-Darling Basin.

I acknowledge Gloria and Christine here today and other friends of the Jones family who are here. It gives me great pleasure to speak—and 'pleasure' might not be the right word because how

can it possibly be a pleasure when such a great person has passed away? I am very pleased to be able to rise in support of the motion.

I will give a few recollections of Henry. I first met Henry when I was the agriculture minister and had cause to travel down to the lake system down there in particular. I guess we should put in context that this was 2009. We had had four or five years of the most unprecedented drought in anyone's living memory. As the member for Hammond mentioned, what we saw at that time through that drought was the exacerbation of the problem from many years before that, and Henry noted and knew that—that we had been taking too much water out of the system. The drought was unprecedented, but most certainly it was exacerbated by over 100 years of extraction of water from that particular system.

It was not a very pleasant time at all. You could see the fractures occurring within the community with respect to the lack of water, the building of what we called bunds at that time, blockages within the river, and there was great debate about whether that was the right thing to do. They were extraordinary times, and extraordinary times needed extraordinary actions. We can debate whether they were right or wrong at that particular point in time, but the simple fact is that it required not just a whole-of-government approach but a whole-of-parliament approach, a whole-of-community approach and a whole-of-state approach, and that is where Henry was absolutely instrumental. He was the heart and soul not only of the Clayton region but also that entire area down there.

He was a fifth generation fisherman. I have an affinity with all people who fish, contrary to some popular beliefs around the place, whether they be commercial or recreational fishers. We had that rapport from the first instant because I love to talk about fishing. The first thing I said to Christine today was, 'Who is catching today while you are here?' My relationship with Henry grew a lot stronger when I had the privilege to become the state's water minister. It was not such a good time to be the water minister because, as you would realise, there was not that water around. Water had not fallen in the catchment area for an extended period of time, and we were seeing things no-one ever thought they would see with respect to the impact it was having on the environment of the river system.

We worked very closely with Henry and groups. I would not have had to fundraise at this last election if I had a dollar for every time I travelled the river system to meet with communities and speak with people about the circumstances and how, as a collective, we could go about it.

The member for Hammond also said—and it might seem to be quite correct, given the meeting that occurred upstream where, to paraphrase, 'There are lots of friends here Henry, but you ain't one of them'—that through his work with the Community Reference Group he had lots of friends along the length and breadth of the river. He knew that for us and for his future, for future generations, for the future of all the communities along the river (and he is right, it is and will continue to be a working river), things needed to change. He had lots of friends along the length and breadth of the river who also realised that there needed to be changes made.

Henry was at the forefront of understanding that it was not an upstream versus downstream debate. It was not an irrigators versus environmentalists debate; it was a debate about a system, an interconnected system, and the health of that system is only as good as the health of the sum of its parts. So, it was just as important to do work upstream as it was to make sure that the work being done downstream was able to cater for the additional water that was required.

The member for Hammond also said that the Murray-Darling Basin Plan would not have proceeded without Henry Jones—it would have, it is just that we would not have the plan we have today if it was not for Henry Jones. I do recall, too—and I think this might be the right word—some of the anguish Henry felt when the Murray-Darling Basin Plan first came out and science proved and showed that there was not going to be enough water. It would have been so easy for Henry to say, 'Look, in the past we had no water coming down and this is going to give us 2,600, 2,750 gigitalitres or whatever it is; that's better than what we could ever have imagined'.

But he was understanding enough and intelligent enough to realise that the science that was produced by the Murray-Darling Basin Plan was still only going to return parts of that river to a moderate to fair health—not the level of health that was required to make sure that this system would be able to sustain future populations for many years to come. So we would have got a Murray-Darling Basin Plan without Henry Jones. The point is that we would not have got the plan we have today; we would not have got as good a plan as we have today.

Many people have spoken about Henry in that time, and he did share a very good relationship with Tony Burke and I agree with Tony's views that Henry was absolutely instrumental in the development and enshrinement of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan as law. I have had a look at some of the things Henry did and I do agree—and I do not always agree with the member for Hammond; he knows that, but I like the man—that it is a wonder with all the things that he did that he was actually able to go and catch fish.

The one that really took my attention was that he was coach of the Milang Football Club. I judge football clubs—and I visit a lot of games—by how good their barbecues are and not so much by how good their football team is. I can tell you where the best hotdog or hamburger is at any amateur league game here. But the Milang Football Club must have had a good barbecue because if its coach and its chairman was a fisherman, I could imagine those pieces of fish in between bread at those particular football matches, and I would have loved to have been there.

When you have a look at all the things that Henry did—a member of the Community Reference Group, the Native Fish Strategy Group; the Murray Advisory Group, Dean Brown's Drought Relief Group, which I worked with for an extended period of time as well—it is just amazing the work that he was able to achieve in a single lifetime, and many people or a group of people would never achieve as much over many, many lifetimes.

It was very sad that Henry passed away, but one thing that he has done is left an indelible stamp, and the people of South Australia can be thankful for the role Henry played because we here today and future generations will benefit from the legacy of the work undertaken by Henry Jones.

I also acknowledge the role he played as the face of the Save the River Murray campaign. It was an outstanding role and, as the member for Hammond said, he never sought that type of exposure but he did it because it was necessary and it was important and there was no more appropriate person to be that ambassador, if you like, for the face of the Save the River Murray campaign. He worked tirelessly for that cause with the Premier, with me while I was the minister and others to make sure that we were able to send the very important message that this is a fight that we cannot afford to lose and, as a consequence of the involvement of Henry Jones, we did not lose that fight.

He also said too—as I think the member for Hammond said—that we need to be not only mindful but diligent in making sure that we continue to in turn ensure that the amount of water comes down, that we do have an operating system, that that system is healthy and that Australia as a whole benefits from having that healthy river system. I just want to finish off by saying to Gloria and Christine, who are here today, to the entire family, I am very sorry for your loss. You lost a husband, a father, a grandfather, a friend of so many and South Australia lost a giant of a man. Vale, Henry Jones.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:26): I would also like to acknowledge the presence of Mrs Gloria Jones and Christine in the gallery. I pass on my best wishes to them on the loss of Henry. However I, along with the member for Hammond and the member for Bragg, were fortunate enough to be able to attend Henry's celebration of life service at Clayton Bay on Easter Saturday. The member for Hammond has passed on many of the recollections from that day. However, on that day, the numbers were up to some conjecture, but somewhere between 600 and 800 people attended Henry's farewell. It was a good fishing day.

I just found it an amazing experience, along with Sally Pederick and my wife, Jan, as well. We were lucky that we were able to go. We were warned at the start that the number of eulogies would exceed the numbers in a cricket side, and I suspect if we had all got up and spoken as we would have liked to, we probably would still be going, because it was one of those days when people just wanted to express their thoughts.

Ian Doyle did a sensational job in his eulogy, along with Henry's family, of course, but to me, it typified the Jones family of Clayton Bay and it typified Henry's contribution that so many people wanted to be there and perhaps that was no better expressed than at the conclusion in the hall where we lined the road. Some 600 to 800 people lined each side of the road as Henry left for the last time on his way to do a lap around Milang Oval, I understand. That was probably one of Henry's weak points, that he was a Port supporter, I might add, but much of that has been discussed before.

I had quite a bit to do with Henry and Gloria in the last few years particularly, but my recollection of Henry was that he was imposing. From his lifetime of hard physical work, he had arms and hands on him with the strength of a bullock, quite frankly. He was a massively powerful man and the work he did leads to that, and if you do hard physical work, that is how you end up. Henry was naturally strong, but he was not only strong physically, he was strong mentally, and that was the great thing about Henry.

Henry and Gloria made a pretty unique partnership, quite frankly. I would have thought that there would be some consideration to renaming Clayton Jonesville or something like that because really they made Clayton. They built Clayton and made it what it is and that can never be taken away. As long as people are settled in Clayton, the Jones family will be around and will be well known.

Henry was a man who had integrity. He had knowledge, he had passion, he had devotion, and through all of that he was quietly spoken, but if you talked with Henry, or if you listened to Henry, more to the point, rather than talk, you knew exactly where he was coming from. People up and down the river got that, including the ones that the member for Hammond spoke about.

There is no doubt that across the broad spectrum of government, whether it be state or federal, ministers, prime ministers, the whole gambit, knew exactly where they should be going after they had a session with Henry. That was the type of fellow he was, and that was his integrity. He knew what had to be done, he knew what needed to be done and he worked quietly towards getting that done.

I suspect, and I am not being poetic or anything else, but if Henry had been in another generation and had fought in World War I or World War II, he would have won the VC. He should have got the VC or something similar for what he did for the River Murray and the lakes. That was the character of the man. He was a unique, iconic Australian, and that lives on through his family. He was an incredible man. I am very privileged to have had the honour of knowing Henry and Gloria. I regard it as a great honour.

Equally, can I just say that there were no greater friends to Gloria and Henry than Dean and Rosslyn Brown. They are great friends, and unfortunately the Browns were overseas on the day of Henry's service. I am sure that if Dean had been there and spoken, we would have gone on for another three hours. However, they are great friends and they will continue to be great friends, and I think that is an enduring friendship that will never go away.

The Jones family are very generous of spirit. I attended numerous barbeques and fundraisers, particularly in the Hindmarsh Valley Hall, where the first people to turn up were Henry and Gloria, and they would unload an esky of mullet and start cooking. That was Henry and Gloria's contribution and that is what they liked to do. They could do it and they did it—they were just fantastic. They just got on with it, quite frankly. That was the way they operated.

I do not want to go on too long because I know there are others to speak, and I want to give them the opportunity so we can get through, but Henry Jones was a doer, not a talker. He was a doer. If he had to speak, he spoke because he knew what had to be done. It was a question of getting on with what had to be done, not waffling around, not having 55 committees, and not going back for inquiries. Henry said, 'Well, this is what you've got to do. This is what needs to be done. Get on with it.'

I know that Australia was so fortunate to have Henry during the 10-year drought, and I think the member for Colton alluded to that in his remarks. They were so lucky, but we were so lucky to have him. At the time of the drought, part of my electorate was in Goolwa and the river, and I know that the member for Hammond and others were heavily involved in the river, but I will always, always, always remember Henry Jones. He made a profound impact on me, and I say: vale Henry.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (11:33): I rise in support of the motion moved by the member for Hammond that this house expresses its deep regret and sadness at the death of Mr Henry Jones and places on record its appreciation of his long and tireless commitment to the River Murray and Murray-Darling Basin, and I do so at a number of different levels.

At a personal level, I do wish to pass on my condolences to Henry's wife Gloria and his family. I was privileged to make their acquaintance in that very long but ultimately successful campaign to restore the River Murray to health. I think anyone who met Henry was struck by his silent and quiet sense of dignity but incredible sense of power, so he was like the river in a way—a very great man, but not an overbearing man. You just had this enormous sense of the power of his presence. It is hard to imagine him gone, and it must be an enormous hole that he has placed in your lives.

Henry's legacy will have a lasting impact on this state as well as the local community. I think many of you have recounted that he was the first permanent resident at Clayton. His dedication, alongside Gloria, in fighting to retain the health of his beloved river, the Lakes and Coorong will benefit generations of South Australians. As we know, Henry was a commercial fisherman for most of his adult life. This is a story he told eloquently in the advertising and public communication material that we produced for the purposes of campaigning for healthy river. It is worth going back and looking at that material because these are beautifully produced ads and they hopefully give you a lovely memory of Henry.

He had a deep connection and understanding of a unique and iconic part of Australia. He regularly guided officials and dignitaries around the site, sharing his knowledge with his legendary generosity of spirit. As a result of Henry's passion, he, of course, was a tireless campaigner for the health and prosperity of this region. I know on all sides of politics we can appreciate how important this fight was and still is because there is always an ever present risk of reversal when you are at the end of the river and people are making decisions about what goes on upstream.

Henry tirelessly urged all sides of politics to take our environment and health of the river and Coorong and Lower Lakes seriously and was central to everything we have achieved to secure the health of this important area. He understood the balance between agriculture, irrigation, fishing, environment and river communities, and he was truly a voice for the region. In a way, in one man, he reflected everything that the member for Colton and myself were trying to achieve when we were trying to unify the whole of the state in this campaign. We knew we had to bring together irrigators and conservationists, we knew we had to bring together the city and the country, we knew we had to bring together the whole of the state because we are a relatively small voice in a large nation and there were powerful interests that were lined up against us.

Henry cared deeply for his community and his river. I think this does demonstrate how one person can make such a substantial difference. It is no accident that the attitude of the federal government changed after the federal environment minister met with Henry Jones. Indeed, the federal environment minister, after he met with Henry, started referring to the things that Henry had said during the meeting. I am told that Henry once said:

It's our obligation to protect 60 million years of evolution.

The river is more than a sewer, it is more than a pipe that provides water, and it's more than a playground.

It's a wonderful living ecosystem that provides habitat to many living things.

It's our obligation to pass it on.

Henry and his family have ensured, through their tireless dedication and passion, that these sentiments will not be forgotten. He will be deeply missed by family, friends and community members from all sides of politics.

When we got to the end of this very important campaign in trying to lift the amount of water that was going to come down stream from 2,750 gegalitres to 3,200 gegalitres, it was a massive additional contribution. If you look at the result that has been achieved in the legislative instruments, you can see where we were and you can see Henry Jones and the campaign's contribution, because it is in black and white.

You can see the bit that has been strapped onto what was proposed to be the plan and what now is the plan. That difference, if you want to turn it into dollar terms, has got a value in the order of about \$3 billion. An enormous amount of that accrued for the benefit of South Australia. So, Henry Jones and those that campaigned with him are the \$3 billion men and women. They were the ones that secured that, and that is a massive amount of resource to be able to secure from the federation in South Australia's interests.

When we got to the end of that process, as there inevitably is with any campaign of this sort, there were people who were saying, 'Perhaps we could have got more. Perhaps it's not enough: we needed to have secured more water, more commitments or a better deal.' I can remember that debate occurring and, I must say, I was fearful about whether some of the more extreme elements would say, 'This deal wasn't enough,' and it might unravel and the community might not understand what an historic deal was done.

However, the daily paper interviewed Henry Jones and asked what Henry Jones thought of the deal, and he said it was a good deal. Once Henry had spoken, all of the criticism ceased, and that is because he was trusted. His judgement was a judgement that people respected. Like any agreement, when you are negotiating between governments in a contested area, there are compromises that had to be made and I am sure it is not perfect. We have to continue to be vigilant to ensure that it delivers everything that it promised, but Henry Jones warranted it and that is certainly good enough for me, and I think it was good enough for many people in South Australia.

The member for Colton and I made many deep and enduring friendships as a consequence of that campaign, not necessarily always on our side of politics. Indeed, I can remember often going to the Riverland and many people saying, 'Look, you're doing a great job on the river. I'm not going to vote for you, but you're doing a great job on the river.' There is no doubt it was tiger country, but that was not our role. Our role was to advocate for South Australians and I think it was a tremendous result, and Henry was front and centre in achieving those things for our state.

Once again, I pass on my condolences to the family and thank this great South Australian for the contribution he made on what is one of the most important public policy issues that has faced our state in many a long decade.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:42): I, too, rise to acknowledge the passing of Mr Henry Jones and his unrivalled passion and commitment to the River Murray and its Lower Lakes system. I also acknowledge Gloria and family members in the gallery today. On reflection, I met Henry in Canberra in about the late 90s. It was very much a learning curve for me as an advocate for the river, and it was all about river reform. For myself, back in my earlier days as a representative for the River Murray, its communities and its irrigators, I learned very quickly that Henry's passion was about the sustainability of the River. As members have said, it was not just about the environment, it was about the working river and how it needed to be cared for—how it had to be a working river from the top to the bottom.

In saying that, obviously as an advocate for the reform of the river, I used to use some of the older members of river communities as sounding boards or sounding drums, and Henry was one of those people. He was there for the benefit particularly of his patch in the earlier days. It was about what was going on down at the tell-tale end of the river system, and that was the lakes, the Coorong and the lower end of the river. There was also a very knowledgeable advocate for the river in Jack 'Salty' Seekamp, may he rest in peace. He was also one of the most knowledgeable people I had ever come across with regard to the river. Sadly, we have lost another good man to the river, as we did with Jack Seekamp, and it is something I continue to treat with sincere passion, because the river is so important not only to this state but also to the people of Australia.

Henry Jones dedicated his life, almost, to advocating for the health and sustainability of the Murray-Darling Basin, but in doing that he became a champion of the river. He became the voice of the river here in South Australia.

I have heard others say that he was met with hostility when he travelled the length of the river, but he soon gained respect because it was not about him being a South Australian looking for more water; he was a South Australian looking for a fair deal to benefit all river users, not just those in South Australia.

His advocacy for the river was underpinned by being a commercial fisherman in the Lower Lakes and Lower Murray. He lived and breathed the industry. As I described him, he was a walking barometer for the river system and its ecosystem. As a fisherman, he could see what was going on: he could see the workings of the river, the water quality and the rising and dropping of water levels. He always had an opinion that was based on the facts he saw on a daily basis in combination with 50 years within the industry. He also travelled to the Riverland to visit family and to holiday, and it also gave him a greater knowledge of the river system.

These are the foundations upon which Henry expanded his knowledge of the vast area of the river here in the Murray-Darling Basin. Henry witnessed firsthand the degradation of the river down at the lower end because that was where there were the tell-tale signs of the river's health. In some regard, the Lower Lakes area was treated as a sewer; the Lower Lakes area was treated as a faraway place by many who used the river system. I soon learnt that anyone who wanted to advocate, as the member for Colton and others have, realises that it is not just a river for some: it is a river for all.

As has already been said, along the way in 1981 Henry actively voiced his concerns about the health of the system. He gently moved around, spreading his stories and spreading his concerns and by doing that he brought people with him and people listened. He gave a calm explanation of what was going on while moving around through government departments, communities, the fishing community, the irrigation community and the environmental sector as well. As many have said today, if there was a committee with the word 'Murray' in it, Henry was on it.

In the last 10 years, I had the privilege of attending many hundreds of meetings and workshops with Henry. For me, it was always a task that when I got to meetings I always made sure that I sat next to him so that I could use him as a sounding board for ideas and concerns. I was able to learn quietly, but I was also able to take away a message that Henry had instilled in me during some of those meetings. Henry was a quiet achiever. He always listened to others and he always went about his business as a decent and genuine person. He always put his family first at heart and the river second at heart. One thing he said to me many times was that good leadership and action will put flow into the river; politics and spin were what he feared would slow the progress of reform for the river.

I am pleased that Henry's efforts were recognised by a number of awards—many awards. As the member for Finniss said, if there were a Victoria Cross for presence and advocacy for reform in the Murray-Darling Basin, he would have been awarded it, but for Henry it was not about recognition. He had a role in the South Australian Fishing Industry Council, he was a spokesperson on many groups, particularly the Lower Lakes groups and the Coorong action groups, and he was a consistent attendee at many hundreds, if not into the high hundreds, of meetings.

Henry was always about getting the best outcome for the environment and the river communities. As I said, he understood that it was a working river, and he needed always to present a fair and balanced argument. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Henry for his work, his tireless efforts and his passion. Above all, it is for his passion that he will be remembered. To this house, I vow to continue the advocacy on which the river, the people and the health rely. Henry's work will live on.

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:50): One of the real pleasures we get from being elected to this place is the people we meet as we go about our business. Henry Jones is one of those great South Australians I got to meet, and I am delighted to have met him, to have known him and to have observed him. I am somewhat saddened to be here today supporting this motion.

I first came across Henry and Gloria when I think Dorothy Kotz was the minister for the environment—so it was a fair while ago—and we did a trip down to Clayton. I cannot recall the exact issue at the time, but I do remember that Henry put on a bit of a luncheon for us. One of the dishes he served turned out to be European carp turned into something not only edible but very tasty. That has always remained with me; I have never had that experience anywhere else.

What fascinated me about Henry, and one of the lessons I think we can learn from Henry Jones, is that I do not believe that he was university educated. I do not believe that he would be able to wear the title of a scientist, but I think that he had a greater knowledge and understanding of the river, its needs and its daily moods than anybody.

He achieved this because he did not live in the environment, he lived with his environment. He observed it 24/7 for 365 days a year over a lifetime. He knew every mood and every nuance of the river, and he knew what was important. But over that lifetime, he had obviously observed a decline, and that concerned him and, being the man he was, he became passionate, he became an advocate for that environment he lived with.

The millennium drought did two things for Henry: it fired up his passion and his enthusiasm for that environment even more than it had been previously and it also gave him a platform to engage

with others, and he used that with great skill. I think that there is a lesson for us all to learn from the work Henry did and what he achieved for his backyard, his beloved Lower Lakes and river system, and for all of South Australia and all of Australia.

To Gloria, Christine and your family, please accept my personal condolences and those from the people of MacKillop, whom I represent here. It is with sadness that I say these words, but can I say that it has been a great pleasure of mine to have known Henry and yourselves. Vale, Henry.

Motion carried.

Personal Explanation

STATE ELECTION CAMPAIGN

The SPEAKER (11:53): Yesterday, the Treasurer referred to the Liberal Party's state director, Geoff Greene, as Graham Greene, and I told him that Graham Greene was the author of *The Quiet American* and a Nobel Prize-winning novelist. Well, I am distraught to find this morning that Graham Greene was never made a Nobel Laureate, so I apologise to the house.

Motions

EUTHANASIA

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:54): I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes that—
 - i. the Belgium parliament has recently authorised the direct killing of children through euthanasia;
 - ii. euthanasia or assisted suicide is now routinely performed in Belgium and the Netherlands on persons with no terminal illness but with psychiatric disorders, such as anorexia, or depression or with disabilities, such as blindness;
 - iii. the Belgian Society of Intensive Care Specialists recently advised that they are prepared to conduct involuntary euthanasia—even upon children; and
 - iv. Dr Philip Nitschke during a recent visit to Perth offered instruction in methods of suicide, including how to illegally obtain pentobarbitone, a schedule 8 poison, and how to use nitrogen as an undetectable means of ending life;
- (b) condemns the practice of child euthanasia;
- (c) commends palliative care as an appropriate response to terminal and chronic illness;
- (d) affirms the value of every human life, including those people living with mental illness or disability; and
- (e) endorses suicide prevention as the appropriate response to all those who, for whatever reason, may think life is not worth living.

I raise this motion this morning to talk about the issue of child euthanasia, which has recently been legislated in Belgium on 14 February. I am mindful of the fact that the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child states that 'the child, by reason of his physical and mental immaturity, needs special safeguards and care'.

I think this chamber should be mindful of that when we talk about what the Belgian parliament recently passed on 14 February to enable children to access euthanasia in some circumstances without limitation of age. I would like to draw to the house's attention an article that I got from *ABC Wire* that gives a brief history of the legislation and how it passed:

Belgium has become the first country to allow euthanasia for terminally ill children of any age, after its lower house of parliament passed... 'right-to-die' legislation. The law passed with a... majority of 86-44, with 12 abstaining. Under the extension to the existing euthanasia law, all age restrictions will now be removed on the right to die.

It goes beyond Dutch legislation that set a minimum age of 12 for children to be judged mature enough to end their [own] lives...

Adult euthanasia became legal in the country in 2002.

[Together] Christian, Muslim and Jewish leaders denounced the law ahead of the vote in a rare [declaration of joint affirmation].

'This is not about lethal injections for children, this is about terminally ill children, whose death is imminent and who suffer greatly,' said Carina Van Cauter, from the Flemish Liberal Democrats who back the law...

Children seeking to end their lives must be 'capable of discernment', the law says, and psychologists must test them to confirm they understand what they are doing. Parents must also approve of their child's decision.

Those who oppose the law say it is a slippery slope, which could see terminally ill children pressured into deciding to end their [own] lives...

Adolescents cannot make important decisions on economic and emotional issues in Belgium—and I will touch on that in a moment—but suddenly they have become able to decide whether someone should be allowed to die: themselves. The article continues:

The new law specifies that children seeking euthanasia must be terminally ill rather than just in a state of unbearable suffering, which is the qualification for adults.

Apart from Belgium and the Netherlands, euthanasia is also legal in neighbouring Luxembourg, and France is considering legalising it later this year.

Switzerland allows assisted suicide if the person concerned takes an active role.

In the United States, assisted suicide is legal in Montana, Oregon, Vermont and Washington states.

I will go back to what you can and cannot do in Belgium if you are a child. I would say that this is an important fact, because it is well known that the neurophysiology of a child's brain does not in fact settle, or the wiring become hardened, until most people (particularly males) are in their mid-20s, around the age of 25 or 26.

It is interesting to think that children are unlikely to be cognisant of the gravity of the irreversibility of the decision for euthanasia, especially those who are enduring a terminal illness. By virtue of their age, they are unable to decide to drive, to vote, to marry, or to consume alcohol legally, in recognition of the reality of the maturity of self-determination and that such actions are the result of neurophysiology.

In Belgium, the legal age of drinking beer and wine is 16 and of spirits, 18; the legal age of consuming tobacco is 16; the legal age to go to a PG dance is 16; and to fly a plane is 16. The legal age to drive a car is 18; the legal age to have sex is 16; to prostitute oneself, which is legal in that country, is 18; and the legal age to marry is 18. It is also mandatory that you vote in Belgium, and that is at the age of 18. So, at a time when the Belgian parliament is saying that all those things must be conducted by an adult, it is allowing these children who are terminally ill the right to make a decision that is irreversible at a much, much earlier age.

Children in such circumstances of poor health are particularly vulnerable to suggestion. It cannot be argued in any meaningful way that the discussion with a child in such circumstances could elicit free or informed consent. The very suggestion of euthanasia to a child by a parent or medical personnel is a loaded discussion in every circumstance. The very existence, therefore, of the possibility of euthanasia for children is, ipso facto, an abuse.

I would now like to talk briefly about the role of the medical profession. Recently, the American College of Paediatricians issued a statement condemning the Belgian move, as follows:

Physicians are healers not killers. An individual's future quality of life cannot be predicted by caregivers. The role of the physician is to promote health, cure when possible, and relieve pain and suffering as part of the care they provide. The intentional neglect for, or taking of, a human life is never acceptable, regardless of the health system mandates. The killing of infants and children can never be endorsed by the American College of Pediatrics and should never be endorsed by any other ethical, medical or social entity.

I will also read briefly from the International Children's Palliative Care Network (ICPCN) which held a meeting in Mumbai in February and issued a statement about children's palliative care, calling on the Belgian government to reconsider its recent decision to allow for the euthanasia of children. At the conclusion of the first ICPCN conference in Mumbai, they declared that all children with life limiting conditions should have access to appropriate pain and symptom control and high-quality palliative care to meet their particular needs. The declaration fully reads as follows:

We believe that all children (neonates, children and young people) have the right to the best quality of life. When they have life-limiting conditions they have the right to high quality palliative care to meet their needs. We believe that euthanasia is not part of children's palliative care and is not an alternative to palliative care. It is imperative that we work together to improve access to children's palliative care around the world, including ensuring access to appropriate pain and symptom control. We call on all governments to transform children's life through the development

of children's palliative care, and in particular we urge the Belgian government to reconsider their recent decision to allow euthanasia of children. This includes:

1. Access to children's palliative care within the children's health care system
2. Access to appropriate pain and symptom management (including medications) for all children
3. Supporting children and their families to be able to live their lives to the best of their ability for as long as possible.

Joan Marston, their CEO, went on:

Euthanasia is not and never has been part of palliative care and we believe the answer to a child's suffering is more and better palliative care services, not the ending of a child's life.

I have discovered an interesting piece of work by Drs Arthur Caplan, Andrew Siegel and Dominic A. Sisti who are PhDs that was released recently in the *Journal of the American Medical Association*. All three men argue that children do not have adult capacity for informed consent. Again, I draw attention of the house to some of their reasonings:

'Children and adolescents lack the experiential knowledge and sense of self that adults often invoke—rightly or wrongly—at the end of their lives,' they argue...The Belgian law specifies that euthanasia would be permissible only for 'terminally ill children who are close to death, experience constant and unbearable suffering'. That suffering of such magnitude exists in modern pediatrics is an inexcusable tragedy. But the solution need not and should not be euthanasia. All patients, including children, must have access to adequate palliative care. Although access to adequate comprehensive palliative care is limited in many settings, it ought not be in developed countries such as Belgium...The goal of reducing suffering in children at the end of life is a laudable one. However, the ethical way to achieve this goal should be expanded education and clinical guidance around the provision of aggressive palliative care.

I also draw the house's attention to the issue of how quickly the euthanasia debates have moved over the last decade or so and how they have progressed around the globe and how quickly the slippery slope to death is accelerating in some areas of the world. I ask my colleagues to think deeply on these issues that are nested together. Deaths by euthanasia in Belgium have rapidly increased from 235 in 2003 to 1,432 in 2012. Many of these deaths were not due to terminal illness. In 2012 Ann G. was euthanased for 'unbearable psychological suffering' relating to anorexia and sexual abuse. In December 2012 deaf identical twin boys were euthanased for distress having learned that they were going blind. In September 2013 Nathan Verhelst was euthanased for unhappiness following a sex change operation.

It is the role of every medical profession to deliver care for ailing patients with compassion, always striving to preserve the patient's life, dignity and alleviate pain. Child euthanasia, as legal in Belgium, is not the way forward. This is not an acceptable approach to dealing with the issues related to end of life. Palliative care is the appropriate response to terminal chronic illness and I commend the Minister for Health for his work in this area. Former minister for health Martyn Evans, who is leading a task force in this area, continues to do great work, too, and I will continue to assist them in this area.

It is important that the parliament recognises the value of every human life, including those people who are living with disability or mental illness. Suicide prevention is the appropriate response to all of those who may think life is not worth living and palliative care is the goal that we should be aiming for, for every child in our society. I ask that the chamber support this motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

Personal Explanation

ANDREWS, MS JAN

Mr PISONI (Unley) (12:05): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr PISONI: Yesterday in question time I referred to a ministerial statement by the Minister for Education on 26 September last year in which I suggested that the minister had said that Ms Jan Andrews was sacked. I accept the minister did not say that, and I apologise to the house.

*Motions***DOMESTIC VIOLENCE**

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (12:05): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises Domestic Violence Prevention Month;
- (b) condemns all forms of domestic and family violence; and
- (c) calls on the government to more proactively address the prevention of domestic violence throughout South Australia.

This is a very important topic and I am sure it is one that all members of the house have concerns about, and quite rightly so. May is Domestic Violence Prevention Month which is an annual event aimed to raise community awareness of the social and personal impacts of family violence and the support available to those affected. The key aims of the month are to:

1. raise community awareness of domestic and family violence and its impacts;
2. promote a clear message of no tolerance of domestic and family violence in communities;
3. ensure that those who are experiencing domestic and family violence know how to access help and support; and
4. encourage people who use abuse and/or violence to take responsibility for their abusive behaviour and seek support to change.

All demographics are affected by domestic violence. Unfortunately, there is really no demographic that you can think of that is not affected in one way or the other: all income levels, city and country people, young and old people, all races and both men and women are affected by domestic violence. What is most striking and concerning about this is that overwhelmingly women are the victims of domestic violence—not exclusively, but overwhelmingly that is the case—and that strikes me as especially unfair. It is not fair on anybody, but when you are talking about something that is not only (but very often) physical abuse perpetrated on a person who is not always (but typically) physically disadvantaged that is just a dreadful and disgraceful thing, and I cannot understand how people would think that way.

The federal parliamentary library defines domestic violence as being acts of violence that occur between people who have or who have had an intimate relationship in domestic settings. These acts include physical, sexual, emotional and psychological abuse. It is generally well known that a definition for violence is quite a difficult thing to come up with and a definition for domestic violence is even harder. From the research that I have done, that seems to be the most generally useful and applicable one.

I would like to share some statistics with the house which come from the Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse which is easily accessible on the website. I am not going to read through all of them but I will share some of the very pertinent ones: 15 per cent of Australian women have experienced physical or sexual violence from a previous partner and 2.1 per cent from a current partner since the age of 15. Surveys estimate that 35 per cent of men and women had experienced physical assault since the age of 15, with 10 per cent of men and 4.7 per cent of women experiencing physical violence in the previous 12 months.

However, where men were typically assaulted by a stranger, women most often experienced physical assault in the context of domestic violence. Overall, 31 per cent of women who experienced physical violence in the previous 12 months were assaulted by a current and/or a previous partner.

Over a third of women—34 per cent—who had a current or former intimate partner reported experiencing physical and/or sexual violence since the age of 16. With regard to children, 61 per cent of women who had experienced violence by a previous partner reported that they had children in their care at some time during the relationship. Over a third of women—36 per cent—who had experienced violence by a previous partner said that their children had witnessed the violence.

Fifty-nine per cent of women who had experienced violence by a previous partner since the age of 15 were pregnant at some time during the relationship. Of these women, 36 per cent reported

that violence had occurred during pregnancy. They are very disturbing statistics to read and to know about but they are important and they cannot be ignored.

With regard to reporting, 63.2 per cent of women who experienced physical violence at the hand of a male partner—current or previous—a boyfriend or a date in the previous 12 months had not reported the most recent incident to police. Surveys found that 82 per cent of women who had experienced violence at the hand of a current partner in the previous 12 months did not report that to the police.

There are many more statistics and I am sure that many members in this house are familiar with those types of statistics but they are the ones that I chose to use today to just illustrate what a serious issue this is and how unfair it is for anybody to be the victim of domestic violence, but particularly how unfairly it is usually perpetrated by men upon women. That issue of reporting that I touched on is obviously right at the heart of this issue, because if there is no reporting, there is typically no consequence for the actions. If there is no consequence for the actions of the perpetrator, there is no incentive for the perpetrator to change their actions.

I bring this motion to the house and say quite openly that I do not consider myself to be an expert in this. I have never been a victim of domestic violence. I am a very strong advocate of trying to stop it, though. I have been very fortunate. I am a man, to start with, so that means that statistically I am advantaged. I am relatively strong and relatively healthy, so it is far less likely to happen to me too, and in my upbringing, it was a very important part. 'Don't hit girls' was right up there with don't tell lies and don't use bad words. It was fundamentally instilled in me from a very early age.

Interestingly enough, going back now some 45 years, I did get the odd smack if I did give my sister the odd smack, so it was a different world at the time. It was made really clear to me that you just do not hit girls. That was the message to me as a small boy and, of course, that message seemed pretty straightforward and pretty clear. I did not need to get too many lessons; it just made common sense. I am very fortunate in that regard but I am also very serious about doing whatever I can do to contribute to improving the situation, not because it has affected me but because I believe that is the right thing to do.

People who are victims of domestic violence obviously deserve encouragement, education and support and I think that a degree of peer pressure against perpetrators does not go astray either. I am a very proud ambassador for the White Ribbon Foundation, as is the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Stephen Wade and the Hon. John Dawkins, and it may well be that members on the other side, whom I am not aware of, are as well, so I do not deliberately exclude anybody else. I am just not aware of that.

I mention that in terms of peer pressure not because peer pressure is the foundation of the White Ribbon Foundation or that I think it is the single most important tool to be using, but it cannot be ignored. Men need to put pressure on men to stop perpetration of domestic violence, and as the White Ribbon Foundation has focused, typically against women. I was very pleased to hear the member for Torrens talk about the White Ribbon Foundation in her maiden speech. I thought that was fantastic.

In my electorate of Stuart, there are many organisations that work to support people, both with regard to supporting victims and working towards trying to stamp out and reduce domestic and family violence. Specifically in Port Augusta, UnitingCare Wesley has a regional domestic and family violence program. Victim Support Service are prevalent there and they certainly have the Family Safety Framework, Family Violence Action Group and a Social Justice Interagency Group.

Family Violence Legal Service Aboriginal Corporation, which is right around the corner from my office in Port Augusta, does tremendous work, as does the Salvation Army and Centacare Catholic Family Services. That is not an exclusive list, and I apologise to people that I have not mentioned but I do have limited time. I acknowledge that there are many agencies and many people doing tremendously good and important work all across our state, but I did want to particularly mention and thank those in my electorate.

We have had some terrible and publicly known incidents in our state recently, particularly affecting children (but not only), and I do know that the police are doing everything that they possibly can do. It is one of those areas where it is never enough. When there is an incident, whatever you have been doing is clearly not enough to prevent those incidents from happening.

I know that the police take domestic and family violence extremely seriously. I know that Commissioner Burns is a White Ribbon Foundation ambassador, as is Deputy Commissioner Grant Stevens and many other very senior serving police officers in our state, and I commend them for that. I just draw attention to some of the challenges that police face with regard to their work around domestic violence. I quote from a radio interview from 19 May where Deputy Police Commissioner Grant Stevens said:

It's a very difficult situation...we still have this level of acceptance within the community that treating women in a violent or demeaning way is somehow acceptable...if a person has breached an order that has been issued, we will take action. What happens as a result of us taking action often depends on the attitude of the victim in terms of how they feel about the person at that point in time...it's a very challenging situation, it's one that needs to be dealt with with a degree of sensitivity. There's only so much the police can do if a person wants to continue a relationship with a person that they're in a violent relationship with.

That is, as I am sure we all understand, a very difficult situation, and again, not one that I can personally relate to from either side of the coin, but the police are in a dreadfully difficult situation. The police are limited, as Deputy Commissioner Stevens said, with regard to the efforts that they can do, and it really does depend on what a person wants to do with regard to reporting.

As I mentioned in those statistics before, most women who have been unfairly or inappropriately dealt with by a partner within the last 12 months do not report that, and so they need that support to report it. They need encouragement and they need perhaps education. They need perhaps a few more men to exert just a little bit of peer pressure in the community more broadly. I know those are not solutions in their own right, but the people who are victims deserve support, and the people who are perpetrators deserve pressure—there is no doubt about that.

Leading up to the last election, the state Liberals took a very clear plan with regard to dealing with domestic violence. We pledged a plan which involved ongoing support for domestic violence advocacy and education services, an additional \$200,000 of funding for Yarrow Place to provide additional counselling services and to cut waiting times, and legislative reforms, including reforming provocation as a ground to have murder charges downgraded to manslaughter, and greater court involvement in domestic violence orders.

In a very proactive, collaborative and generally bipartisan way, I call on the government to do everything it possibly can to stamp out domestic violence. I call on the government to do more, because, as I said about police, as much as they are trying to do, there is still more that needs to be done. I call on the government to give very serious consideration to implementing the pledges that the state Liberals made in the lead up to the last election.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (12:20): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Insert:

- (d) acknowledge the need to work collaboratively across political persuasions to combat violence against women in our community.

The government supports the motion in its amended form for this house to recognise Domestic Violence Prevention Month and to condemn all forms of domestic violence. However, we would amend the motion to recognise that this government is serious about the prevention of domestic violence. It has been continually proactive in preventing and responding to domestic violence, rape and sexual assault. As part of its commitment to a safer community, the South Australian government believes that we need a strategic and comprehensive approach to violence against women, including domestic violence, rape and sexual assault. Our current approach is proactive in consistently setting the prevention of violence against women as a key priority.

While men may be the victim of domestic and family violence, it is clear that women are most often the victims and men are by far and away most likely to be the perpetrators. The recent Australian Bureau of Statistics Personal Safety, Australia, report, released in 2003, clearly supports this. The ABS found that approximately one in three Australian women have experienced violence since the age of 15. According to the ABS data, many (approximately one in five) Australian women have experienced violence from a current or previous male partner.

In recent years, we have made changes to legislation that have given additional rights and protections to victims of rape and sexual assault and domestic violence. We have also introduced a

target in South Australia's Strategic Plan to have a sustained reduction in violence against women, and we have introduced A Right to Safety, the Next Phase in South Australia's Women's Safety Strategy.

From early intervention work focusing on preventing domestic and family violence and rape and sexual assault through to community education and awareness and a continuing focus on improving service responses to women experiencing violence, A Right to Safety proactively reaffirms our commitment to reducing violence against women that we made in 2005 with the release of the first Women's Safety Strategy.

A fundamental part of this is the Family Safety Framework, an initiative that seeks to ensure that services to families most at risk of violence are dealt with in a structured and systematic way through agencies sharing information about high-risk families and taking responsibility for supporting these families to navigate the service system.

The model has been so successful that it has gone beyond the state borders, with family safety meetings being established in Alice Springs and a similar model proposed for New South Wales. In November 2013, we completed the rollout of the Family Safety Framework and, with a continued focus of A Right to Safety, we are continuing to work to achieve a state free from violence against women, including domestic violence, rape and sexual assault.

We are continuing to take a strong stance on primary prevention. Establishing violence against women collaborations is one of our key strategies. The primary purpose of these collaborations is to build community capacity to prevent and reduce the incidence of violence against women in local regions by creating cultural and attitudinal change within the community, thus addressing one of the key underlying causes of domestic and family violence.

Each collaboration identifies the key issues and priorities in their own regions. For example, Fleurieu Domestic Violence Reference Group negotiated with council for 1800RESPECT stickers to be permitted in public toilets, and Zonta volunteered to physically place stickers across toilets in the Fleurieu. The stickers were also provided to members of the schoolies committee, including representatives from caravan parks and hotels, in time for schoolies week. The stickers list the ways in which victims of domestic violence and sexual assault can contact 1800RESPECT for counselling and support.

Two collaborations which successfully applied for homelessness innovation funding in 2013 are using the funds to develop television advertisements to be played on their local networks. The Limestone Coast collaboration has developed advertisements which focus on local men promoting safe and respectful relationships with women. The Port Augusta collaboration advertisements focus on the diversity of women experiencing homelessness, including women escaping a violent relationship. Both advertisements contain contact numbers for people seeking assistance.

A Right to Safety continues our focus on improving systems through reviewing domestic and family violence related deaths. We established a position in the Coroner's Office in 2011 that works as part of the coronial team and, as at 1 May 2014, has conducted file reviews and investigations on over 100 deaths reported to the Coroner. These reviews have contributed directly to four finalised coronial inquests with a domestic violence context. As a direct result of these coronial inquests, 20 recommendations specific to improving domestic violence responses have been made by the State Coroner and Deputy State Coroner.

New initiatives announced during the election provided an opportunity for South Australia to continue to lead innovations in the areas of women's safety. Currently, women's Domestic Violence and Aboriginal Family Violence services cannot easily identify if an offender is a serial offender. Therefore, the government has committed to funding a database to identify domestic violence serial offenders. The database will enable the identification of domestic violence serial offenders across Domestic Violence and Aboriginal Family Violence services and improve risk management of key services involved in the family safety framework information sharing and risk management process.

This government is also committed to developing new data-keeping systems, which will support evidence-based decision making in policies and programs to reduce violence against women and their children. Capturing this data will assist in identifying the factors which are the most prevalent

in domestic violence-related deaths, which in turn assists in the development of appropriate response models and prevention programs.

This particular initiative arose directly out of a speech that I heard given by Ms Anne Summers at one of the UNIFEM breakfasts, I think, in 2013. Dr Anne Summers AO gave an address on 8 March 2013, and I think the Leader of the Opposition was also present for that address. It was a very powerful address about domestic violence and I want to quote briefly from it, because I think it made some very pertinent observations. In her address she talked about the question of economic self-sufficiency and women being able to control their fertility, and went on to say these things:

For most of my life I have believed that these are the two basic underpinnings of women's equality. If we have these I thought, then we have the preconditions for everything else. Lately I have realised that tragically we need to add another and that is freedom from violence.

She also went on to recommend the very measure that we have implemented or promised to implement in the election campaign—that is, better data keeping in relation to these matters. I am proud to say that we have put that in place.

Generally speaking we do enjoy a bipartisan approach to these issues. I acknowledge, in general terms, the support of all members in this house for this proposition, although we were a little dismayed when the opposition committed to essentially repeal or at least change the government's Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act which commenced on 9 December 2011 and which allows police to issue on-the-spot intervention orders under some circumstances, such as where there is a domestic violence context and a victim needs immediate protection, removing the perpetrator.

During the election campaign, the Liberal Party said that they would remove that power to issue on-the-spot orders from police and we would ask them to reconsider their position in that matter. The current system already allows for victims to apply directly to the courts, but the new powers provide to police a key way of keeping women safe. By leave, I move to amend the motion, as follows:

After (c) delete 'calls on' and replace with 'acknowledge'

After 'Government' delete 'to more proactively' and replace with 'for its proactive initiatives to'

Insert '(d) acknowledge the need to work cooperatively across political persuasions to combat violence against women in our community'

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (12:32): I rise to commend the original motion to the house moved by the member for Stuart. The Premier has just told the house that he seeks to amend it, and we will certainly consider that. There is no doubt that the government has made some considerable movement in this important area, but we believe there is much more to be done and we think that that needs to be contained within this motion.

Domestic violence is a scourge in Australian society and it is a scourge that disproportionately impacts upon women and their children. The prevalence of domestic violence in our society is shocking especially when you consider that we are living in modern-day Australia. We live in a time where we have the entire breadth of human knowledge available on our smart phones, where we can speak in real-time to people on the other side of the globe, where our children are immunised against diseases that previously killed millions, and yet one in three women in Australia has experienced physical violence. It seems that there is no immunisation against violence. We still have so far to go.

I know that everyone in parliament is united in their condemnation of all forms of domestic violence. In fact, I was honoured to be approached to become an ambassador for White Ribbon Day, as have many others in this chamber and in the other place. I acknowledge the following South Australian ambassadors for the White Ribbon Foundation who serve in the state and federal parliaments.

They are: our Premier; our Speaker (the member for Croydon); the Minister for Regional Development; the Minister for Tourism, Recreation and Sport; the Minister for Police; the member for Stuart, who moved this motion; the member for Morphett; the Hon. Stephen Wade; the Hon. John Dawkins; the Hon. Russell Wortley, the President of the Legislative Council; the Hon. John Gazzola, the former president of the Legislative Council; the Hon. Jamie Briggs; the Hon. Christopher Pyne;

the Hon. Robert Brokenshire; the Hon. Mark Butler; Tony Pasin MP; Nick Champion MP; the Hon. John Darley; the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars; and the Hon. Mark Parnell.

Clearly, the commitment from parliamentarians to stop incidents of violence against women crosses party lines. We are united in our condemnation of all forms of domestic violence and we are united in our search for solutions. According to the Chair for the Foundation to Prevent Violence Against Women and their Children, Her Excellency Natasha Stott Despoja:

The biggest risk factor for becoming a victim of sexual assault, domestic or family violence is being a woman.

This is simply unacceptable. This means that, from the moment they are born, over 50 per cent of South Australians are at a significantly higher risk of violence. This violence is insidious. While a coward's punch thrown in a nightclub is widely reported, domestic violence usually occurs behind closed doors. It is often ongoing, over many nights, many years, and even over multiple generations. Often, it takes a woman or a child to die at the hands of a partner or a former partner before we hear about the campaign of terror being carried out in our neighbourhoods every day of the week.

Only last week, we lost another brave South Australian woman to a violent partner in Encounter Bay. It is happening too often. The statistics are particularly disturbing: 89 Australian women were killed by their partners between 2008 and 2010; that is nearly one woman every week in that two-year period. As I said earlier, one in three women have experienced physical violence, and almost one in five women have experienced sexual violence since the age of 15. More than a third of women who experience violence by a previous partner said that their children had witnessed that violence. Domestic violence is so damaging and prevalent internationally that the World Health Organisation has labelled it an epidemic.

It is very appropriate that the member for Stuart move this motion in May, which as he so rightly points out is Domestic Violence Prevention Month; however, we need to address the issue of domestic violence in our community year-round. This is why I am joining with the member for Stuart in calling on the government to be proactive in their policies to reduce domestic violence here in South Australia. All South Australians have a right to be safe in their own homes. As parliamentarians, we need to work with communities, experts, advocacy groups, the police and health workers to find ways to reduce domestic violence in South Australia.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:37): I am also very pleased to support this motion in its amended form and I would like to commend the Premier on his enduring leadership in this arena, and his deep commitment to resolving issues around domestic violence. I would also like to commend the member for Stuart on the moving of this motion, on his words today, and obviously also on his deep concern and commitment around the issue. I would also like to acknowledge the Leader of the Opposition in that regard.

I have a lifelong commitment to preventing violence against women and children, and I am very proud to be part of a Labor state government that has, amongst its top priorities, the safety of women, and that has been relentless in developing and implementing measures to prevent and respond to domestic violence, as I am sure many of us in this place are.

As has been mentioned, I am deeply saddened and very sorry that just last weekend we lost another South Australian woman to domestic violence here in South Australia. Through the media, we heard about what she had endured for many years, and saw the deep impact that this had on her, her children, her neighbours and our broader community.

I too am deeply saddened that over 12 months, on average, one woman per week is killed in Australia as a result of intimate partner violence; that domestic violence is now one of the leading causes of death in Australia for women under 45; that one in three Australian women has experienced violence since the age of 15; that approximately one in five Australian women have experienced violence from a current or previous male partner; and that in 2012, around 41,600 women (5.5 per cent of South Australian women) experienced physical or sexual violence in the previous 12 months.

I am very saddened by the generational impact that domestic violence has on our community, and angered by the power inequality which exists in our community, which fundamentally is at the core of violence against women, and which indeed is our collective responsibility to address.

On the evening that I delivered my inaugural speech in this house the week before last, women, men and children along with parliamentarians from every part of our political landscape gathered at a candlelight vigil just a few hundred metres from here to remember those we had lost and to reaffirm a growing sentiment across our community to say enough is enough, to say that we must work together to ensure that not one more woman is lost to domestic violence—not one more—and to say that we want no women harmed or fearful for themselves and their children, nor feeling isolated and powerless as a result of domestic violence.

I wholeheartedly support the Premier's amendment to this motion and wholeheartedly commend our state Labor government's strategic, comprehensive and proactive approach and commitment to preventing violence against women. As our Premier mentioned, our A Right to Safety initiative is a demonstration of that commitment, particularly through our Women's Safety Strategy, which has at its core the Family Safety Framework which seeks to ensure that families at risk of violence are interacted with in a structured and systematic way with a very strong emphasis on the sharing of information, responsibilities and collaboration by service providers.

Our ongoing priority commitment to women's safety continues through a range of services already in place, including emergency and ongoing support services, crisis response, ongoing counselling and accommodation services for women who experience violence, specialist domestic and Aboriginal Family Violence Services, domestic violence safety packages which provide safety upgrades to houses to support women and children to stay in their own home, programs targeting men who use violence to break their cycle, and a range of non-government family support programs focused on families where women and children have experienced violence.

Our South Australian Labor government has also provided additional funding for specific initiatives such as \$868,000 over four years for the Don't Cross the Line campaign; \$411,000 over four years for the coroner's position, which is now an ongoing commitment to review domestic violence related deaths; \$120,000 per year for the Victim Support Service for the Family Safety Framework from 2012-13 from the Victims of Crime Fund and SAPOL; and \$244,000 per year for Yarrow Place Rape and Sexual Assault Service from 2012-13 from the Victims of Crime Fund. In the recent election we further committed to the development of a database to identify domestic violence serial offenders and the factors most prevalent in domestic violence related deaths.

In 2009 this government introduced the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act which commenced in 2011. Importantly, this legislation gave police the power to immediately issue intervention orders in circumstances where there was an immediate risk to a woman from a perpetrator. It is beyond comprehension that during our recent election campaign those opposite championed the removal of this power to issue on-the-spot intervention orders, a dangerous position which would have threatened the safety of women in imminent danger.

It is also beyond comprehension that through their recent budget their federal Liberal colleagues in their vicious attacks on our most vulnerable citizens, including those escaping domestic violence, have put at risk ongoing affordable housing options for them. The National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA) is included in the 2014 federal budget but at a reduced rate. This is likely to reduce funding to South Australia through this agreement by \$1 million. The South Australian government already contributes about 50 per cent to NAHA Funded Homelessness Services, significantly more than in every other state and territory in Australia.

The National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness is not included in the forward estimates. In fact, \$44 million has been cut from the agreement, with the commonwealth only committing to funding for the 2014-15 financial year. It is likely that the commonwealth will not continue to provide funding for this after 2015-16 which will significantly reduce funding to homelessness services, including women's domestic violence services.

Women make up almost two-thirds of those seeking the support of specialist homelessness services, with about a quarter of services' caseload attributable to domestic violence. These changes will affect women (and their children) who face homelessness through domestic violence and, as we heard from the Premier, housing security and economic independence are key factors in securing safety for women and children escaping domestic violence.

In contrast, our state government is—and will remain—strongly committed to ending domestic violence and responding appropriately whenever, wherever and however it occurs. We will continue to work with the tireless and dedicated workers in the community sector (including those in

my electorate of Reynell who work tirelessly for the Southern Domestic Violence Service and Centre Care Catholic Family Services) who commit their lives to supporting women experiencing domestic violence, all service providers, and those of all political persuasions to prevent and end violence against women in our community. It is together and only together that we can ensure that not one more woman experiences domestic violence in our community.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we continue, I would like to acknowledge the visitors in the gallery today. We have Aaron, Audrey, Fred and Sarah who are South Australian participants who will be attending the National Indigenous Youth Parliament next week. We welcome them and wish them well in Youth Parliament.

Motions

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

Debate resumed.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:46): I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Stuart that this house recognises Domestic Violence Prevention Month, condemns all forms of domestic and family violence, and calls on the government to more proactively address the prevention of domestic violence throughout South Australia.

I particularly note one of the emerging trends in the discussion about domestic violence was recognised in the member for Stuart's motion in paragraph (b), the discussion of domestic and family violence, because of course we are talking about a phenomenon that does not just occur inside the home, it can occur in all sorts of places. There is one horrid example of which every member I am sure is aware—and I will dwell on a little later. I think that talking about domestic and family violence is an important emerging trend and I am sure that there will be suitable discussion on that and about services in particular.

I am somewhat disappointed that the government has decided without notice to move an amendment that changes the direction of part of the motion that the member for Stuart has moved. We will consider it in the coming couple of weeks as to what the appropriate response is. Can I say that the reason it is important to call upon the government to do more to proactively address the prevention of domestic violence is that there will always be more to be done so long as there is one death—let alone one a week—due to domestic and family violence in Australia. That is the sign that there is more to do and more that the government can do.

If the members opposite who have moved this amendment think that they have done enough and are therefore to be congratulated as if that is the end of the game, then I think that they have set a very high bar for themselves. I would say (and I am sure that the member for Stuart would agree) that we would set ourselves the same challenge were we on the other side and in government. Any government that does not acknowledge that there is always more to be done has set a very high bar indeed, so I think that they should perhaps reflect on that. Nevertheless I do not want to dwell on the matter because I think that there is significant bipartisan support and significant goodwill for the efforts that the government is making to combat domestic violence—and the efforts that all governments make to combat domestic violence.

Of course, we do not just have a role as legislators—and the government as funders—in the area of domestic violence. We also have a role as community leaders in leading the discussion on this. That is why the member for Stuart in his comments referred to the number of White Ribbon Ambassadors in this house and the leader acknowledged the work of other White Ribbon Ambassadors in other houses. It is important that we change the culture. It is important in particular, given the overwhelming preponderance of domestic violence against women, that men take a lead role in changing that culture and acknowledge the significance of the issue.

As the member for Stuart said, all demographics are affected by domestic violence. So many Australian and South Australian women have been the victims of physical or sexual violence by people who are supposed to love them the most: their partners, their families, their parents, and unfortunately, even current partners.

I note that the victim support services in South Australia estimate that about six South Australian women will be killed by a husband, a partner or a boyfriend this year. Today, unfortunately, due to the sittings of parliament, I know that a number of members who would probably have been there otherwise will be unable to attend the domestic violence vigil in remembrance of the death of Graziella Dailier in Murray Bridge.

I note that a number of people do listen to the proceedings of parliament online so, for those who can attend, it is at the Local Government Centre at 2 Seventh Street, Murray Bridge and anyone is welcome to show their support for victims of domestic and family violence and can bring a red rose to place beneath the domestic homicide remembrance flag. Graziella Dailier's body was found on Friday 16 May and her partner then killed himself. She was a mother of three and a grandmother of two and I cannot even bring myself to imagine what her family are going through and have gone through.

The member for Reynell, in her contribution, recognised the inaugural National Candlelight Vigil that was run by the Coalition of Women's Domestic Violence Services on the day of her maiden speech. I regret I do not have the date to hand but I acknowledge that other members may have attended before I got there. I was only able to attend after the rising of the house and was pleased to join the Hon. Michelle Lensink MLC and actually meet the family of Zahra Abrahamzadeh, in particular, Arman, whom I had previously seen speak at one of the breakfasts at the Festival Centre, and her daughter, Atena, who spoke very bravely at that vigil about the experiences of her family.

It is so important that those who are able to, those who feel comfortable in doing so, in sharing their experiences, help change the culture. They help change people's perceptions. They help bring this matter to the light, so that it will encourage an improved culture in our community. Zahra Abrahamzadeh was stabbed eight times by her estranged husband, Zioalloh, at the Persian New Year celebrations at the Convention Centre in March 2010 despite a restraining order.

Members who are aware of the case would be aware of the struggle that her family went through prior to her death to ensure that the necessary protections were in place, and the inquest that took place last year identified a number of areas where things could be improved. As a result, domestic violence training has now been given to police assistance line operators and I think there are other things that still need to be dealt with by the inquest. There is still some discussion within government departments about the workloads of certain people that may have led to other issues being an issue and I do not wish to go into those today, but the result of the inquest is there for everyone to read.

I want to acknowledge the significant work done by so many people in this area in South Australia and the ones I am familiar with are related to domestic violence support services in particular with whom I have a relationship. My office in fact assists the Eastern Adelaide Domestic Violence Service. Last year was our first and this year will be our second quiz night raising funds for that service's educational programs.

I acknowledge that on 17 October we hope to again raise in excess of \$5,000 as we did last year to support those educational programs. It is domestic violence month and one of the staff members at the Eastern Adelaide Domestic Violence Service wrote to me a couple of days ago some words that I would like to share with the house:

It has been a horror month both locally and across Australia in terms of the murder of women and children during 'domestic disputes'. As usual our staff are run off their feet in attempting to meet the needs of individuals and services that require specialist services. It is a great comfort to us that there are people like you all working behind the scenes in support of the work that we do.

I think that as members of parliament, it behoves us all to get in touch with local support services for women and families who have been victims of domestic violence and who are able to move forward with the support of those services.

In terms of culture, can I suggest as the White Ribbon Foundation does: the White Ribbon Foundation asks all men to swear to never commit, excuse or remain silent about domestic violence. I am sure many members of the house have made that pledge and will continue to do so, and it is worth renewing.

Therefore, with those words I commend the member for Stuart for bringing the motion to the house. I commend the motion to the house, certainly in its initial form—we will have a look at the

amendment—and urge everybody to do whatever they can to bring that message to their communities and help continue to improve the culture so that we may indeed one day see an end to all domestic and family violence.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:56): I rise today to support the motion brought by the member for Stuart in recognising Domestic Violence Prevention Month together with condemning all forms of domestic and family violence. The call for the government to be proactive has never been more timely. Clearly, other members of the parliament today have confirmed not only their commitment to the objective here but also that it is necessary to actually have some action in ensuring that that objective is achieved.

During the recent state election campaign, and until shortly thereafter, I was the opposition spokesperson for women, a position I proudly held. I was pleased to present for consideration during the election a number of proposals, including a commitment of \$200,000 to Yarrow Place, which is a rape and sexual assault service which provides extraordinary work to those who are victims of rape and sexual assault amongst South Australians, and which had published their plight in having to provide services but were then reaching weeks and months of waiting times to provide that service.

So, that was a commitment made by the Liberal Party to provide that funding. We are disappointed that the government's attitude had not been to provide for that, but we made that commitment. There were also provisions for us to support domestic violence advocacy and education services and to have some legislative reforms, including reforming the provocation defence in respect of the grounds for murder charges. These are all on-the-ground initiatives which we felt would assist women particularly, but certainly children of family violence also.

The death of Zahra Abrahimzadeh has been referred to by other speakers. In fact, the Speaker and I were at the occasion of the Persian national day dinner and we both actually left shortly before this tragic event occurred. It is well-publicised now as to what had occurred, and in particular what seems to be the failure of people who are vested with the responsibility of support, when notified, to act.

I have spoken at length in this parliament about the coronial inquest that followed the death of Robyn Eileen Hayward and the disgraceful abandonment of the authorities—police and others—in the lead-up to her death when there had been a known perpetrator of the violence against her. He subsequently was shot dead by police officers during the time of apprehension, but here are two deaths that have ultimately been the legacy of the failure to act when there had been reporting.

I have also said that I do not blame any government or authority for the fact that we have domestic violence in this state, but I think once they are notified of it they then have a legal and political responsibility to act, and I will be continuing to make adverse comment about them if they fail to act. With that, Deputy Speaker, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

Petitions

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE VOLUNTEERS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett): Presented a petition signed by 38 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to recognise and value Country Fire Service volunteers and extend to them the same workers compensation provisions for cancer cover as are being offered to Metropolitan Fire Service firefighters.

NORWOOD CORK TREE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition): Presented a petition signed by 1,111 residents of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters Council area and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to preserve the Norwood Cork Tree growing in the proposed Coles redevelopment site, adjacent to The Parade, Norwood, and protect it from destruction.

*Ministerial Statement***JUSTICE REFORM**

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) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Earlier this year, I had the distinction of being Attorney-General, minister for police and minister for corrections at the same time, albeit for a brief time. This created a situation not often seen in our state, where one minister was responsible not only for the police that arrest an offender, but also for those who prosecute, the judge, and those who supervise them in prison.

During this period, I was struck by the often disjointed approach taken when reform is conducted within silos and is not part of an end-to-end strategy. That is why I asked the Premier to consider creating a new portfolio of justice reform which would have oversight of all of the areas of the justice system with a mandate for reform across the board.

This government has a proud record of reform in our justice system. Crime is down drastically and court outcomes are more in line with community expectations. However, our criminal justice system faces immediate challenges. There is no denying that. Our remand rate is the highest in the country and, in spite of a high number of judicial officers for our size, we have the longest waiting times for trials in the country.

These are symptoms of a system that is in need of cultural and structural reform. The government has previously established the Criminal Justice Reform Council, which includes representatives from all parts of the criminal justice system. I now chair this council as Minister for Justice Reform. All members of the council have agreed to pursue reform during this term.

I want a justice system that is more accessible, citizen-focused, efficient and fair. An accessible system is not only easy to use and navigate, it is also low cost. A citizen-focused system is one that works for people; it does not expect them to work for it. An efficient system maximises the use of the state's resources consistent with appropriate benchmarks. A fair system is consistent with impartiality and is timely.

We intend to move the culture and practices of our criminal justice system closer to these goals. The first step is to make sure we can assess the quality of the system at important parts of the justice process. As citizens we need to have confidence that the system is working not only effectively but efficiently.

To that end, I want to see the regular publication of statistics in place by the end of this year. This will allow the system to be transparently inspected by all, and I want to get feedback on how we are going in order to guide more targeted change to the system. Following this, I intend to seek input from those who work and use the system to guide development of new procedures and policies. The outcome of this process is to be a number of reform bills to be introduced into the parliament, probably early next year.

Reform is not something that only new governments do, nor is it something that existing governments should be afraid of. Further reform of our criminal justice system is something that government intends to continue over the next term.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The SPEAKER: I was informed the minister was a late scratching, withdrawn at the barrier.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: A ministerial statement, sir, based on the fact that the member for Unley has come in here and apologised for his incorrect statements yesterday in question time.

The SPEAKER: No, the minister will seek leave for any ministerial statement. Everything that she said to that point is out of order.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am sorry, sir; I was just responding to your comment that I was a late scratching. I am a late scratching for a ministerial statement because of the apology that was tendered earlier today, but I do have papers.

The SPEAKER: Does the minister have some business in order?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I do, sir.

The SPEAKER: The minister is called to order for the outburst.

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Health (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Carrick Hill Trust—Annual Report 2012-13

Death of—William Edward Hunt Report of actions taken by SA Health following Coronial findings 19 August 2013

By the Minister for The Arts (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Tandanya—National Aboriginal Cultural Institute—Annual Report 2012-13

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. J.M. Rankine)—

SACE Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2013

Teachers Registration Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2012-13

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Motor Accident Commission—Charter

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

SA Rock Lobster Fishing Industry Fund—Annual Report 2012-13

Eyre Peninsula Grain Growers Rail Fund—Annual Report 2012-13

Industry Advisory Group—

Alpaca Annual Report 2012-13

Apiary Annual Report 2012-13

Cattle Annual Report 2012-13

Deer Annual Report 2012-13

Goat Annual Report 2012-13

Horse Annual Report 2012-13

Pig Annual Report 2012-13

Sheep Annual Report 2012-13

Industry Fund—

Apiary Annual Report 2012-13

Cattle Annual Report 2012-13

Citrus Growers Annual Report 2012-13

Deer Annual Report 2012-13

Grain Annual Report 2012-13

Olive Annual Report 2012-13

Pig Annual Report 2012-13

Sheep Annual Report 2012-13

Wine Industry Fund—

Adelaide Hills Annual Report 2012-13

Barossa Annual Report 2012-13

Clare Valley Annual Report 2012-13

Langhorne Creek Annual Report 2012-13

McLaren Vale Annual Report 2012-13

Riverland Annual Report 2012-13

SA Grape Growers Annual Report 2012-13

*Ministerial Statement***NOVITA CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:07): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: This being my maiden ministerial statement, I ask for the courtesy of the house not to be interrupted.

The SPEAKER: No such convention exists; feel free.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Conventions have to start somewhere. Tomorrow the iconic South Australian charitable organisation, Novita Children's Services, will celebrate its 75th anniversary of caring for South Australian children living with disability and other special needs. Over the past few decades there have been vast amounts of change in our understanding of disabilities, our collective sense of social responsibility and, importantly, the recognition that as a society we must ensure every child is given every opportunity to live a fulfilling life.

Novita has been at the forefront of this change and has a strong history of innovation and willingness to step into the future. Novita Children's Services began in 1939 and was then known as the Crippled Children's Association of South Australia, until 2004 when it changed its name to Novita Children's Services. Novita, being a combination of two Latin words: 'nova' meaning new and 'vita' meaning life, presents a more contemporary view of disability.

The SPEAKER: Point of order. This isn't a delayed point of order from private member's time when so many members on the opposition side were reading their speeches?

Mr WILLIAMS: No, sir. I believe it is the practice of the house when a minister seeks leave to make a ministerial statement that they provide a copy of the statement so that members can read along. Notwithstanding that it is the minister's maiden ministerial statement, it appears that he has overlooked that convention of the house.

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is absolutely right.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Apologies, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Accepted.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The Crippled Children's Association was formed to care for children affected by the polio epidemic of the time. The establishment of the association was made possible following a gift of £50,000 by British industrialist William Morris—from the famous Morris Motors Ltd, who later became Lord Nuffield—to the commonwealth government to assist our nation to care for Australia's children with disability.

This gift was gratefully received by former Governor-General of the commonwealth, His Excellency the Right Honourable Sir Isaac Isaacs, who also happened to be the first Australian-born Governor-General. This gift assisted not only South Australia but many other states to establish organisations similar in origin to Novita Children's Services.

At the heart of Novita's history and indeed the present is its dedication to providing a better quality of life for children with disability. Novita's key strength is its ability to evolve, grow and continue providing and improving the services it delivers to South Australia's children and young people.

I would like to acknowledge the work of the CEO of Novita, Mr Glenn Rappensberg, who has been at the helm of Novita for the last 15 years. He had led enormous change and implemented a range of new services not only to prepare Novita for the rollout of the NDIS but also to ensure that it is one of the most respected organisations in the not-for-profit sector.

As the leading service provider of child development, rehabilitation and disability services, Novita is at the forefront of continuing to provide the opportunity for children living with disability to reach the developmental milestones that we expect of any child. I would also like to acknowledge

the board of directors and all the employees of Novita who help this organisation in being held in such high regard by the community.

Anniversary occasions like this remind us to remember the many children and their families this organisation has helped in the community over the last 75 years. It is also important that we acknowledge the South Australian community for its philanthropic support of Novita. I am confident that Novita will only grow stronger with the continued rollout of the NDIS.

The Premier (the member for Cheltenham) will be attending a celebration tomorrow at Government House. Novita supporters, staff, families and children will also gather in Rundle Mall from 10.30am to celebrate the 75th birthday with free activities, including painting a large memory mural. The Premier and local children will come together at 11.45am to release 75 balloons.

I encourage the house to continue to support Novita's work in making a positive difference in the lives of young people with disability and their families throughout South Australia. I would like to wish Novita, its staff, clients, the families and carers all the best for the future.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament delegates from the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation, who are guests of the member for Ashford.

CLERK, RETIREMENT

The SPEAKER (14:13): I draw to the attention of members that the retirement of our esteemed Clerk will become official on 30 May. It is therefore my intention to begin advertising and the process for recruitment for a new Clerk of the House.

This is the last day on duty in the house of our Clerk, Mr Malcolm Lehman. Malcolm joined parliament on 1 September 1986. Over the course of the next 27 years, Malcolm worked his way through the House of Assembly in the Bills and Papers Office and was then secretary of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee and secretary of the powerful Economic and Finance Committee. Malcolm appears in a parliamentary educational video of the late 1980s sporting a mullet.

In 1994, he was supervising parliamentary officer in the Bills and Papers Office from whence he became Acting Clerk Assistant. In June 2002 he was appointed Acting Deputy Clerk until October when he was appointed Deputy Clerk and Serjeant-at-Arms for the next three years. From February 2007, he started as Acting Clerk, and on 5 September 2007 he was appointed Clerk. As Clerk, Malcolm bravely refurbished the House of Assembly lounge. Malcolm replaced the mission brown furnishing that had adorned the lounge for decades—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Sorry?

Mr Pisoni: The Dunstan memorial furniture.

The SPEAKER: Malcolm's preparedness to wear the dissatisfaction from members and media criticism speaks of his courage—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: But I was the one who had to deal with it!

The SPEAKER: I call the Minister for Health to order—and his determination to improve the institution of parliament. Malcolm also played a big role in the tasteful upgrade of Old Parliament House.

Malcolm has always provided me with prompt, thorough and accurate advice. He remains calm in the most chaotic question time. Malcolm's reports are always balanced, allowing the reader to feel that he or she has made the decision. When Malcolm was campaigning for the Executive of the Clerks at the Table organisation, he issued a flyer which proclaimed:

Malcolm Lehman is the hardworking deputy clerk of the Parliament of South Australia. His integrity, reliability and dedication to all things parliamentary is legendary. Mr Lehman's good taste in things that matter, food, wine, clothes and conference destinations mark him as the man you want representing your views on the Executive.

An honourable member: Did he win?

The SPEAKER: Who could resist? Malcolm tells me he is retiring to tend a neglected walnut grove and to build a house at Robe, once the Governor's summer residence. On behalf of the house, I wish Malcolm the best in his retirement and thank him for his service to the house for almost 28 years. Malcolm, you are held in high esteem by both sides of the house.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Upon indulgence, sir, can I just pass on our best wishes to Malcolm Lehman. We congratulate him and commend him for his extraordinary, long service to the Parliament of South Australia—his dedicated service to the Parliament of South Australia. On behalf of all of those people on this side of the house, we wish you all the very best for a long and very enjoyable next component of your career.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:17): On indulgence, sir, may I join the Leader of the Opposition, and indeed the whole of the house, in wishing Malcolm all the best for his future. We all rely in large measure for the orderly conduct of proceedings in this house on the guidance of the Clerk. I know, sir, you are greatly assisted by the role of the Clerk.

I do want to add my congratulations to the way in which Old Parliament House has been refurbished. I only had an opportunity to first meet there just during the course of the last week, and it is a credit to the choices you made about bringing that beautiful old historic building up to a proper standard.

The SPEAKER: Hear, hear!

Question Time

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO TRADE UNION GOVERNANCE AND CORRUPTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): My question is to the Premier. Has the government been asked to provide state letters patent for the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption?

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) (14:18): I thank the honourable member for his question. Yes, there has been a request, and the nature of the request was such that the exact dates I can't recall, but I believe that an initial piece of correspondence came to the Premier during the caretaker period, if I am not mistaken. As you would appreciate, thereafter we had an election, and a period of time when—

Mr Marshall: Some time ago now.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: A little while, yes, indeed; yes, indeed. Anyway, the request was made; the request has been noted, and the government has decided that, as every other state has done, we will cooperate.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: I think we did it in Executive Council.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: In fact, the Executive Council meeting this morning put into effect the decision to that effect. That is how contemporary the news is that I bring you, Leader of the Opposition: it is fresh from the Minister for Health, who was there this morning.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Would the leader like to ask that as a supplementary question?

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO TRADE UNION GOVERNANCE AND CORRUPTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): I am happy to, sir. My supplementary to the Attorney-General is: when will this correspondence be sent to the Prime Minister?

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) (14:20): I think the normal formality, if I am not mistaken, is that it would be gazetted and that there would be some formal notification of the Prime Minister, emanating either

from the Premier's office or Government House or somewhere. The fact is important matters—request was made, election, caretaker, etc., etc.; request considered once the matter had been settled, request approved. The Minister for Health today was a witness (I am reliably informed by him) to the actual Executive Council resolution that the royal commission support would be forthcoming from South Australia, and it is now a matter of however long the nuts and bolts take for that to occur.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Premier. Prior to endorsing the Hon. Russell Wortley as the President of the other place, did the Premier investigate allegations of corruption against this member?

The SPEAKER: Again, I wouldn't have thought that the Premier in the House of Assembly is responsible for the appointment of the President in the other place. I just think the question is out of order. Deputy leader?

Mr Marshall: Sorry?

The SPEAKER: I don't think the Premier has any responsibility to the house for the appointment of the President in another place.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is called to order.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is called to order. The leader has a question.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO TRADE UNION GOVERNANCE AND CORRUPTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): Does the Premier require of officers of his government that they stand aside in the case that they are under investigation for corruption by a royal commission?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:22): If those opposite have allegations they wish to advance before a—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: If they have allegations they wish to advance, then they should take those allegations to the relevant authority. We are cooperating with a royal commission into these matters. You have heard today that we are giving all of the necessary legal backing for that royal commission to carry out its work. If you have got something to say to them, trot along and say it, but I understand that somebody at least has walked outside of here and made allegations of a similar nature and they have found themselves with a defamation writ and they have had to pay some money to the Hon. Russell Wortley. All I would suggest is take some care to find some substratum of fact before you actually do advance an allegation, because it could end up being very expensive for you. Beyond that, if you have something cogent to put forward, put it forward.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO TRADE UNION GOVERNANCE AND CORRUPTION

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary question.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, the leader.

Mr MARSHALL: Is the Premier aware that any royal commission into alleged corruption by the President of the South Australian Parliament could not proceed until the letters patent had been received from your government?

The SPEAKER: The leader means the 'letters patent'.

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) (14:23): Yes, it is like 'finance' and 'finance', isn't it? It is one of those things.

The SPEAKER: Indeed.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think have already explained that the necessary steps from the point of view of the state have been undertaken, the penultimate step, as I understand it, being the formal approval in Executive Council which occurred this morning. There is no question, no issue and no question but that the government is participating as requested by the commonwealth and supporting—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is indicating his guilt by ducking behind the pillar.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Indeed, the member for MacKillop is correct.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question is to the Attorney-General: as the state's most senior legal officer with powers to investigate corruption at all levels and, given that the letters patent are on their way, what action is the Attorney now going to take to investigate the alleged corruption against the President of the other place?

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): Can we just take a moment to reflect on the actual history of this particular matter. In about 2005 I think or thereabouts, the then honourable—and I am not trying to say that he is not honourable now if you know what I mean—but the then Mr Redford—

An honourable member: He is still Mr Redford.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: He is still Mr Redford, indeed, he is probably the Hon. Mr Redford because he was here for a while. So, the Hon. Mr Redford raised certain matters of course under the cloak of privilege concerning the Hon. Russell Wortley, who at that stage was merely Russell Wortley—

An honourable member: As he then was.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As he then was, indeed, and as I understand it that went absolutely nowhere. A little bit later—and I may or may not be correct about this—I think the Hon. Mr Lucas might have on occasions said things, and certainly Mr Ridgway, I think in—was it 2011—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I think so.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —or thereabouts, the Hon. Mr Ridgway in another place basically regurgitated, as I understand it, the original propositions advanced by Mr Redford. So there is nothing new or unique about this. To add a little bit more of a frisson or colour to this thing: during that period of nearly 20 years, those who have decided that they wanted to advance this proposition in places other than in this room and in one another few hundred metres up the road have wound up in court—and very unsuccessfully.

So, it would appear that nobody—other than those people who stand in a place covered by parliamentary privilege—is sufficiently confident of their facts to say anything publicly about the matter. It also appears to be the case that they are not even sufficiently confident to have advanced it in circumstances of qualified privilege, for example, having gone to the police and made a bona fide and legitimate or honestly-held complaint about facts known to them. No, none of that.

A little while ago, this place passed a piece of legislation which means that every person in this place is a public officer for the purposes of the Independent Commission Against Corruption Act—every one of us as a member of parliament. I would remind those who reckon they have got something to say and have got some facts at their disposal that there are mandatory reporting elements contained within those provisions. So if I am being asked whether I have any information

which I should be reporting to anybody, the answer is, 'No, I do not.' Nobody has provided me with any information at all. The only thing I know of is a couple of slurs in the parliament under the protection of privilege. If any member of the opposition, or anybody else for that matter, has any facts at all that they wish to advance—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —I would encourage them please—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —to go to the relevant authorities and disgorge that information, because they have something that I do not. But I would make the point: do it that way, do it properly or risk a repetition of the unhappy legal consequences of those who have chosen a different path.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL PRESIDENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): A supplementary question sir: has the Attorney-General asked Mr Gazzola for copies of the statutory declarations lodged by Alan George Cotton of 7 September 2011, or the declaration of David Alan Butler on 27 September 2011?

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) (14:29): Happily, I have absolutely no knowledge whatsoever of what the member for Bragg is speaking about. It does, however, remind me that, in spite of the Hon. Mr Ridgway having expressed various concerns a while ago on the public record—of course, in the other chamber, not out there—he then went ahead and voted for the Hon. Russell Wortley a few days ago anyway—so he, evidently, has gotten over it, but leave that to one side—as did, I think Mr Lucas. Am I correct in that?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Men of principle.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Absolutely; yes. They voted for him, in spite of having raised the same thing about him—goodness me! But look, the member for Bragg has information in her possession which is clearly very significant. I would encourage her to do with that information what I have encouraged everyone else to do: take it to the relevant people and invite them to make such investigations or inquiries as they deem appropriate. It is not my job to, on behalf of the member for Bragg, be sent around asking people questions.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Eliot Ness.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes. No, I am not going to go there. Can I say again: if you have got information, deputy leader, please take it to somebody who can make some use of it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is warned a first time, and the deputy leader is called to order. The member for Davenport.

PUBLIC SECTOR APPOINTMENTS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:31): My question is to the Premier. Why is the government undertaking an international search to replace the chief executives Rod Hook and Fred Hansen, but proposing to appoint the commissioner for public employment without the position being advertised at all?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:31): Well, I don't think we have entirely settled on the approach that we'll take in relation to the commissioner for public employment but, should we proceed with a course which I outlined yesterday as a possible course, maybe a more likely course, of appointing Ms Erma Ranieri, it's because of the unique circumstances associated with the bringing together of two functions of government—one which has a vacancy and one which has an incumbent. Obviously, it's not the same situation. We are looking for—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: In those two other cases, we are looking for new leadership, and so we are seeking to cast our net as broadly as possible so that we can—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —in fact, attract the best possible candidate. So, each of these vacancies needs to be considered on its own merits, having regard to whether there is somebody obvious that we want to promote to the position or whether, as in this case, there is an existing incumbent for, if you like, one part of the role that we are seeking to create. So, that's the process that we are now giving thought to, but it's a very different situation.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Davenport.

PUBLIC SECTOR APPOINTMENTS

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:32): Following the Premier's answer, where he suggests that they are advertising for the replacements of the chief executives Mr Hook and Mr Hansen to get 'the best possible candidate', as the Premier said in his answer just given to the house, how can you guarantee, Premier, that you are going to get the best possible candidate for the position of public sector employment commissioner if you don't conduct an advertising campaign to seek the best possible candidate?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:33): One only needs to give a moment's thought to the circumstances I outlined to actually realise that, when you have somebody who is an existing incumbent in a central element of a role that you are seeking to amalgamate then, first, you would want to give consideration to whether, if you did advertise, you might drive such a candidate away. That might be the first thing that you might want to consider. Secondly, if you were satisfied with the quality of the work—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Another factor that you may wish to take into account is the question of continuity. Ms Erma Ranieri is presently supervising the public sector renewal program. It is proving to be a very significant, successful program, and continuity is a relevant issue to take into account in that regard, but each of these cases needs to be considered on its own merits. Sometimes, we will not go to a public advertisement for a position.

It may well be that we have identified somebody who meets all of the requirements of government from within the service. Other times, as in the case of the commissioner for public employment and the public sector renewal body being amalgamated, there will be an existing incumbent and that will obviously be a factor that will bear on our minds. Each of these cases need to be considered on its own merits.

NEWPORT QUAYS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Did the government enter a settlement agreement regarding Newport Quays in December last year and, if so, on what date?

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) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for her question. The question as to the exact date is something that I would need to check, because I do not want to mislead the honourable member or the house about this matter. My recollection is that, yes, there was a period during which there were elements in dispute between the government and the terminated contractor at Newport Quays.

There were elements of the financial arrangements between the two which were clear pretty well from the beginning and there were elements which required further work. I am very happy to try to get the exact date for the honourable member. But can I say, if the honourable member's question

is directed toward some remarks made in another place to the effect of something like, 'The moon landing occurred at Universal Studios,' then I do not know that that is going to help anybody very much.

Ms CHAPMAN: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: A supplementary from the deputy leader.

NEWPORT QUAYS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): Given the Attorney's comments as to the source of the question, he might like to have read *The Advertiser* from last year which referred to the \$3.4 million settlement, but my supplementary to the Attorney as Minister for Housing and Urban Development is: who signed the agreement on behalf of the state government and the Newport Quays consortium, and were any of those persons involved in the Adelaide Capital Partners option for sale agreement?

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) (14:37): There we have it crystallised, for everyone who is paying attention—that is Neil Armstrong stepping down off the steps in Universal Studios and it is Hangar 51 as well. We have Roswell in there. This has covered every single conspiracy theory that I have ever heard of.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, sir. The Attorney-General might want to make a spectacle of this parliament in answering a question—

The SPEAKER: This had better be a good point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: —but my point of order is that this has nothing to do with the question as to who the signatories of this agreement were and whether they were all the same as the ACP agreement.

The SPEAKER: I think there should be some scope for levity both in asking questions and answering questions and, on that score, the Deputy Premier qualifies. Continue.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will do my best to find out the answer to those questions. I do not know off the top of my head who signed what documents. I can tell you, though, that there were court proceedings about matters. It may well be that the actual execution of those depended on the value of them, because there are Treasurer's Instructions about who has delegations to do what, but I will find out about it. And I can assure the honourable member that the person sitting to her left is not Elvis.

VOLUNTEERING STRATEGY FOR SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr GEE (Napier) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Volunteers. Can the minister update the house on the implementation of the Volunteering Strategy for South Australia and in particular on the government's election commitment to develop a new volunteering recognition scheme?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I'm sorry, did I miss something up there?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Did the member for Morphett want to say something? The Minister for Volunteers.

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) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for the question. As members of the house are aware, last week across Australia we celebrated National Volunteers Week. The theme of the week was 'Celebrate the power of volunteering'. What that points to is the two-way outcome of volunteering: volunteers giving back to the community and also what volunteers feel as they are part of being included in the community as well.

I had the pleasure of joining various community groups across our state at functions and events, and I was delighted to be joined on the march on the Monday by the member for Morphett and the member for Adelaide, as well. We had a very diverse group of volunteers who were there to show their commitment to volunteering.

We estimate that more than 900,000 people volunteer in South Australia who contribute so much to supporting our communities. Perhaps even more importantly, South Australian volunteers are estimated to contribute more than \$5 billion to our economy each year. That is why I am pleased that in February this year the South Australian government endorsed the Volunteering Strategy for South Australia 2014-2020, along with three other partners: Volunteering SA & NT, Business SA and the Local Government Association of South Australia.

I would like to take the opportunity to thank the former minister for volunteers for his leadership in developing the strategy. The strategy will act as a blueprint for volunteering into the future and help guide our work to promote and support volunteering across South Australia. The implementation of this strategy has been facilitated in a cross-sector partnership through a volunteering partnership board, comprising senior representatives from each of the four partner organisations, plus an independent chairperson. Four working groups, all with high-profile, independent chairs, have been created and are charged with implementing the strategy through a three-year operational plan.

I was pleased to attend the first plenary meeting of all board and working group members last Friday to mark the formal commencement of implementing the strategy. The level of energy and enthusiasm in the room was infectious, and it was wonderful to see each group map out their work over the next 12 months. Importantly, the volunteering strategy will undertake work to recognise and promote volunteering as a pathway to both employment and retirement. Volunteering delivers many benefits to people, including personal wellbeing, learning and developing new skills, employment, motivation, and a sense of achievement.

Once again, I emphasise that the theme was 'Celebrate the power of volunteering'. Through volunteering, people of all ages can diversify and develop their skills, leading to better employment outcomes. In recognition of the significant benefits volunteers contribute to our state, both in building stronger communities and in economic output, our government committed at the last election to implementing two initiatives that will recognise the contribution volunteers make through a volunteer recognition scheme and a time exchange scheme.

The time exchange scheme, also known as 'time banking', is a volunteering scheme based on the principle of reciprocity, whereby participants essentially earn and then trade credits of time with other registered members of a time bank. Time banks are set up by local organisations that allow people to use their skills to help others by exchanging hours instead of money. The volunteer recognition scheme will recognise the contribution of volunteers in a number of ways, such as through discounts, free tickets or promotional offers from participating businesses and organisations.

I look forward to continuing to work with the partners of the volunteering strategy, and on behalf of the government of South Australia I thank each and every volunteer for all the work they do in making South Australia the great place it is.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion. Has the minister apprised herself of the truth or otherwise of allegations about the behaviour of her media adviser, Jason Gillick, in particular that he allegedly said to a young female journalist, 'You shouldn't be here, you f-expetive Tory b-expetive,' then allegedly shoving the journalist, on the evening of the election?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:44): This is a very serious matter, and I take it very seriously. I have responsibility for the contractual arrangements with staff members. They are supervised on a day-to-day basis by my chief of staff. On this particular matter, without going into the details of the allegation, I hasten to add that the recitation of the facts of the matter are not matters about which I am advised are accurate. Suffice to say, there was conduct which I regard and certainly my chief of staff, in exercising the responsibilities he has in relation to this matter, to be utterly unacceptable. It has been the subject of a first and final warning in relation to that staff member.

I can make the clearest possible statement of principle about these matters: that people who are going about their work in the employment of this government should behave respectfully and decently and should not behave in an aggressive or threatening manner to anyone, let alone to members of the press who may be working in close proximity to them. That is a matter of grave significance to me.

I also want to make clear that, in relation to this particular matter, there was an acknowledgement of misconduct, and an immediate and full apology, which I understand was accepted. There are also circumstances which are to some degree—to some degree—capable of mitigating the nature of the matter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: But, in any event, they do not excuse the conduct. I am satisfied that the matter has been properly attended to.

Mr GARDNER: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary, I neglected to call the Minister for Health to order earlier. The deputy leader is warned a first time, the member for Hartley is warned a first time, the member for Finniss is called to order. And, in a further tranche, relying on the last answer, the member for Hartley is warned a second and final time, and the members for Heysen and Unley warned a first time. Member for Morialta, supplementary.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:46): My supplementary question is also to the Premier. What is the nature of what the Premier terms 'mitigating factors' that have led to this offence only being dealt with by what is described as a 'first and final warning'?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:47): I'm not going to go into the nature—

Mr Marshall: Why not?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, I refuse to. These are staffing matters which are not traditionally exposed in this fashion. What is appropriate is to know the standards of conduct that I have applied to this matter, the principles that have governed this matter, the fact that the particular disciplinary action has been carried out in accordance with those matters.

I'm not going to traverse on the privacy of the individuals involved, except to say that we have insisted on a certain standard of behaviour. This has fallen well short of that standard of behaviour, and the relevant disciplinary action has been taken, but a judgement has been made and I believe, in the circumstances, the correct judgement, that termination of employment was not appropriate in this case but that a final warning was issued in relation to this conduct. Having regard to all of the circumstances, I believe that is the appropriate judgement.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): Supplementary to the Premier.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

Ms CHAPMAN: Could the Premier explain to the house how his management of this issue, and there not being any confirmed dismissal of this person, is in any way consistent with his presentation this morning in support of the member for Stuart's motion condemning violence against women?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:48): Well, you see, this is what happens when you're not fully apprised of the facts and you seek to draw—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, I simply—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, would you be seated. The deputy leader is warned for the second and final time, and the leader is warned for the second and final time. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: In the bid by those opposite to make a political point, what they are going to do, what they seek to do (and it has been consistent throughout the week, and I must say that there are some people on our side that have contributed to this as well, to the reduction of the view of all of us, the diminishment of all of us) is to drag matters into this place which don't belong here—allegations against people without a shred of substratum of fact in relation to the Electoral Commissioner, allegations in relation to—

The SPEAKER: Premier, point of order. Member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: I take offence at what the Premier has said and ask him to withdraw.

The SPEAKER: Be seated, Premier. That is a bogus point of order. You may disagree with the Premier, but that you disagree with the Premier is not a point of order and it is not in order to interrupt his answer to give an impromptu speech.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: What are the offending words?

Mr GARDNER: Standing order 127 describes that if offending words are used then they are to be brought to the attention of the Speaker immediately.

The SPEAKER: And what are the offending words?

Mr GARDNER: The offending words are when the Premier identified that members opposite seek to bring matters into this house of the dubious nature that he described.

The SPEAKER: If people cannot say that in this house there is not much we could say, so I think it is a glass jaw to take a point of order about that. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is an important point to make during the course of this week when we have seen a series of allegations made without a substratum of fact, which essentially cast doubt on the integrity of officers in relation to a land deal, people in relation to their office holding in the other place, and now we are seeking to drag a staff member—

Mr Pisoni: That's what they said about the state bank question.

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —into a matter of public controversy in this place when I have told the house that I take this matter incredibly seriously, that the standards that I have applied—

Ms Chapman: You gave the person a warning—a warning!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Exactly, a warning—a final warning. Somebody that is on pain of dismissal—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, would you be seated. If I see—

Ms Chapman: I am going, don't worry. It's a disgrace! You represent all South Australians.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition uses as the basis for her outrage the use of a particular fact in relation to this matter which I am advised is simply not truthful.

Ms Redmond: But you won't tell us.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The allegation of physical contact is simply a matter which is not truthful, yet she seeks to traduce the reputation of an employee in this place to try to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Bragg, seeks to advance her proposition—her outrage associated with a particular piece of conduct which

is based on a fact which is simply not proven, I am advised, having regard to the investigations that were carried out. If I had the alternative view, I would have arrived at a completely different conclusion in relation to this matter, but it is simply wrong to come into this place, throw allegations of a very serious nature, not advance—there is nobody here that was involved directly in relation to these matters, but to seek to actually treat as a question of fact something which has the effect of traducing the reputation of the people that are actually involved is outrageous; it has happened too often this week and all of us should reflect on what it does to the standing of all of us in this house.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary, the member for Unley has been called to order and warned twice. He continues to offend; I ask him not to. The house should also note that the member for Bragg took herself out of the house of her own volition and was not ejected under the sessional order. Supplementary question, member for Morialta.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:53): If the accusation suggested does not, as the Premier indicates, have any basis, why indeed did he give the staff member a first and final warning?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:53): If those opposite would listen closely to what I say: the elements of the recitation of the conduct were not in all respects matters that were matters of fact; not to say there wasn't a basis for a finding of misconduct and, therefore, a proper basis for a warning. It demonstrates the peril of people coming in here and making assertions on the basis of things they simply do not understand. This matter was taken incredibly seriously, and my bias in relation to these matters is that I have zero tolerance for them, but I am obliged to undertake—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes, it is. I am obliged to undertake a proper process and understand the true nature of the facts and weigh up all of the matters before I take a particular course of action. Now, the individual in question is under no illusion about the seriousness with which this matter is taken. There won't be any tolerance of anything that is in this nature.

Ms Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, those opposite think they know the facts in relation to this matter. It is for people to carry out conscientious investigations, to actually understand the context, to actually see whether there is indeed contrition and to actually understand what the other person (who was the subject of the conduct) thinks about the matter. All of those matters were properly taken into account and a proper disciplinary outcome was undertaken. It is simply wrong to come in here and suggest otherwise.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:55): I have a supplementary question. Given that the Premier will not outline what the mitigating factors were in this situation and he will not identify what part of the allegation is allegedly not true, can the Premier confirm indeed that it is not his view that unless physical violence takes place it cannot be classified as violence against women?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:55): Of course that is not my view about the matter and it is utterly outrageous to suggest otherwise. What we had was an episode which involved conduct on a particular occasion between two individuals. That was the subject of an investigation. It was subject to certain findings about what happened. It was subject to an apology, and a judgement was made about what the appropriate disciplinary action should be in relation to this matter.

I make clear again that it is a point of principle for this government that we take the question of the respectful behaviour of our staff in relation to other people, whether they be members of the public or fellow employees or other people with whom they have contact in the course of their duties, to be a matter of grave concern to us. They should always behave in a courteous and respectful manner, and conduct of the nature of that which was alleged is unacceptable.

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is called to order. The Member for Morialta.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (14:57): Can the Premier advise the house who conducted the inquiry into the matter for which he gave the staff member a first and final warning?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:57): It was carried out by my chief of staff.

POLICE RECRUITMENT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Police. Is the government on track to meet its revised promise to recruit 300 additional police officers by 2017-18?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for his question. The most recent advice is that we are on track but I will get up-to-date figures because it has been some time since I received the last advice.

POLICE RECRUITMENT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:57): Supplementary question: given that the minister says that he has been advised that it is on track, can the minister explain his answer, given that official SAPOL documents obtained under freedom of information reveal that as at 30 June 2017, seven years after promising 300 additional police officers, the government is only expected to have recruited 79 additional sworn police officers, leaving 221 to be recruited in the last 12 months?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for his question and I just reaffirm my earlier answer. I will seek clarification.

POLICE RECRUITMENT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:58): I have another supplementary. Can the minister advise whether police cadets are included in the recruit 300 target?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for his question. I think I was asked a similar question in the first week I was in this place. If the cadets pass their course then they are recruits.

POLICE RECRUITMENT

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:59): I have a further supplementary. It might help the minister to answer the question if he knew that if they have not passed the course then they are cadets, they are not sworn officers. They are cadets because they have not passed the course.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:59): The advice I received is that they are not called cadets any more because they are either sworn officers or unsworn officers. Once they pass, subject to their probation period, they then become full officers.

Mr Gardner: Wish you had this much information about our first three questions.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, as I said, in terms of the actual figures, I can confirm those figures for the member.

POLICE CELLS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:59): Supplementary, sir: given the minister's answer—and again I try to help him provide an answer to the house—

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is called to order, because he is making unnecessary commentary without seeking leave of the house to make an explanation. In fact, that is his second and final warning. Would he like to ask a question?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, sir. My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Can the minister guarantee that no prisoner sentenced to more than 15 days is held in a police cell?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:00): As the honourable member would know—and I will help him with the answer—my agency (the correctional services department) is required to carry out court orders, and that is our primary responsibility. What we do is ensure that if the person is required to be held in custody then they are held in custody, and they will be held in custody after an appropriate risk assessment and subject to accommodation; it is as simple as that.

POLICE CELLS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:01): Supplementary, sir: my question was specifically about prisoners being held in police cells. Can the minister guarantee that no prisoner sentenced to more than 15 days is held in a police cell?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:01): Mr Speaker, I thank the honourable member for repeating his question, and I repeat my answer.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart would like another question?

POLICE CELLS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:01): A supplementary question: given the minister is unable to provide this guarantee, is the minister aware that it is illegal to hold prisoners sentenced to more than 15 days in police cells?

The SPEAKER: Everyone is presumed to know the law.

MARINE PARKS

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. How will the government respond to job losses arising from the marine park sanctuary zones—job losses that were anticipated in evidence given to the Select Committee on Marine Parks?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:02): The ambition of the marine parks scheme for South Australia is not to cost jobs: it is to actually grow jobs in regional South Australia. What we have set up is a world-class system of marine parks—19 marine parks—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —that will permit us to protect our pristine natural environment into the long term, and ensure that we are able to warrant ourselves to the world as a place that protects its beautiful natural environment. Now, there is an opportunity to do this—before the various insults that accumulate—through urban development, runoff from agriculture, fishing, other activities—

Mr Pederick: It's called the fishing industry.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, there are many more threats to our marine environment than occur from fishing; that is just one of a number of important threats that occur in relation to our marine environment. One only needs to look at—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —the Gulf St Vincent to realise that the damage that has been done to the marine environment—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —in Gulf St Vincent is something that has accumulated over decades and decades of multiple insults from various sources. The point is to try and actually protect these beautiful pristine areas while they are still capable of protection. That will be in the long-term interest of the economy and jobs in our regions. So, regions will be able to promote themselves to the world as having a pristine environment; people can visit and see the natural environment in its 'undestructed' form. They will also be able to market their seafood—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —as having been grown in marine parks. This opportunity has already been understood by a range of businesses on the West Coast who actually promote themselves as having grown their fish and—

An honourable member: What are they?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, Clean Seas, for one. Why do you think they chose—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: And he will be the first. I know Hagen; he will be the first out there marketing himself as having grown his fish in a marine park. That is exactly what will happen in the long term. The problem for those opposite is that they have the most myopic vision of the future of South Australia. They cannot see over the horizon. Over the horizon there will be increasingly large numbers of countries that have actually degraded their natural environments such that when they try to sell food from those environments, people will have grave doubts about the integrity of that food.

Food integrity is one of the great opportunities for this state in the future, so just look over the horizon just a few yards to see what the future looks like, and that is long-term prosperity. The jobs of the future actually reside in protecting and preserving our pristine natural environment. This is not about costing jobs: it is about growing jobs into the future.

The SPEAKER: Before the member for Flinders asks a supplementary, it is my melancholy duty to call the member for Flinders to order. He has otherwise had a record of exemplary behaviour. The member for Heysen has not and is warned a second time. The member for Chaffey is warned a first time and should have been warned many more times. The member for Finniss is warned a first time. And the member for Stuart is not the Speaker's pet, as claimed by the member for Ashford.

MARINE PARKS

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:06): A supplementary question. My supplementary question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Has the minister received a briefing about the economic impact on the communities adjacent to marine parks—10 and 14 or any marine park, for that matter?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:06): I am happy to give an answer to the question as the Minister for Regional Development and also a member of the inner cabinet. I have received from the Mayor of Ceduna a very large folder. It has some issues in it. I am halfway through that and having a look at it, so to answer the member's question I have that, but bear in mind that marine parks are not my portfolio. I have indicated to people on my trips around the whole state that it has come to my attention there may be some economic degrading of the opportunities in the sanctuary zones.

I have indicated that if those people can give me some substantial accusations or information that economic opportunities or growth are being affected, then I will consider that and then talk to the relevant minister. However, on my journeys around the area, while most people are very in favour of marine parks as such, there have been some who are saying that the location and the size of them may not be relevant. I have the information from the Mayor, Alan Suter, and I am a little way through that. If the member can bear with me, I will go through that and get back.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned a first time. The member for Goyder.

MARINE PARKS

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:08): A supplementary, if I may, Mr Speaker, to the Minister for Regional Development. While you have been provided with some information from some community groups as part of the marine parks, have you in your rather unique position sought a briefing in full from government departments, predominantly the department of environment, about the implementation of marine parks and the economic impact they will have on regional communities adjacent to those marine parks?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:08): Thank you to the member for the question. Yes, I have had a briefing from the minister relevant to that. Again, all the risk assessments have been done for all the marine parks and, again, I reinforce that it is not my portfolio but I have given an undertaking that, if there is economic effect after the sanctuary zones come into effect—and I think it is in October this year—I am very happy to look at that and then talk to the relevant minister about the issue if and when that time comes.

MARINE PARKS

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Could the minister identify the environmental threats posed by the state's fisheries to the marine park sanctuary zones?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:09): Those opposite have never understood this debate; they have never understood it from day one.

Mr Pederick: No, we started the debate.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned a first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, I will tell you who started the debate: it was John Howard. He is the one that committed us to marine parks, and we have been dutifully implementing his—

An honourable member: And you know it.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned a first time for making the obvious point.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I just work here!

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned a second and final time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: There is a serious point here, and I know that this has been advanced repeatedly, and we have travelled the length and breadth of South Australia. The former minister, who is no longer here—it's worn him out, the member for Kaurana—and then the former minister, who is sitting here, the member for Colton, the former minister for the environment, we have been making the same points—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: And the former minister from the previous government, too.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —that's right.

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned a first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We have all been dutifully implementing the John Howard agenda in relation to marine parks, but the sense of it is this: every single intervention in relation to the natural environment makes a contribution to its potential degradation.

It is not suggesting that it is the fishing industry on its own that makes that contribution. It is the fishing industry in combination with what happens onshore: the sorts of wastewater and stormwater run-off and agricultural activity. It's boating activity, whether it be recreational or fishing, how bait is left behind in fishing grounds, how ropes are left behind, how lines are left behind, how petrol that is discharged from boats associated with the area actually fouls the area, and how

particular species are actually fished in a particular way which means that it changes the whole natural ecosystem within a particular area.

It is absolutely crucial that there be some places, some reference areas, where those things are entirely left alone, and that is all the sanctuary parks are within the broader marine park movement. In fact, most marine parks are capable of being fished in. There is only a very small proportion of the state's waters which are entirely protected from fishing or indeed any other activity except the most limited activities in relation to recreational pursuits.

It is the wrong question to ask what is the effect directly of fishing in relation to marine parks; it is fishing associated with a whole range of other particular insults which can degrade the natural environment of an area.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I must say that I have seen many consultation processes across government in the last 12 years. I do not think I have seen a more comprehensive process than the one that has actually been undertaken in relation to—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —the marine park process, and at its end it required men and women of goodwill to come together and actually reach a compromise. That was brokered by the former minister, the member for Colton, who brought together the groups—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —commercial interests—

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss: if his lips move once more, he will be out.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The commercial interests—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It's a Kangaroo Island thing to leave without being named.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir: I believe it is unparliamentary to bring to the attention of the house a member who is leaving the chamber.

The SPEAKER: Well, if you like, I can remedy that by expelling him under the sessional order. It's your choice.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Men and women of goodwill have come together to seek to broker a compromise in relation to this matter. The member for Colton played a central role in that, and there were hard decisions to be made, there were judgements to be made. The commercial sector, the recreational fishing sector and the environmental sector came together. Not everybody got what they wanted, but we, I think, have been left with a first-class system of marine parks.

PUBLIC SECTOR SCREENING

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:14): As the last Kangaroo Island person standing, I'll give this a crack and see how we go. My question is to the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion. Can the minister advise why a 'national criminal history record check and screening assessment' from the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion does not meet the screening requirement for employment in the health department? With leave from the house, I will briefly explain.

The SPEAKER: Well, if you must.

Mr WINGARD: A constituent of mine seeking employment with the health department has provided a screening assessment obtained by the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion

as part of a pre-employment process. He has been informed that the health department finds this assessment inadequate and requires another assessment, at a cost of \$120.

Mr Bell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is called to order. 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) (15:15): I am familiar with the case. The person has, in fact emailed me directly. I am investigating the matter and will get back to that person with a response.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Mitchell.

PUBLIC SECTOR SCREENING

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:15): How many different types of police checks are required for the departments?

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) (15:15): As I said, I need to double-check. I need to find out what the circumstances of this request were. The person has emailed me directly. I have referred it to my department to find out what the circumstances were and why the person was instructed to obtain a second check. I have to find out what the circumstances are.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Mitchell.

PUBLIC SECTOR SCREENING

Mr WINGARD (Mitchell) (15:16): I am just inquiring how many different police checks there are. There are so many different types. How many types are there?

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) (15:16): I am advised there are two.

The SPEAKER: The member for Goyder, who has been interjecting modestly and wordlessly for most of question time.

REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA CABINET COMMITTEE

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. It was announced that one of the first tasks of the Regional South Australia Cabinet Committee will be 'to establish an application and assessment process' for the Regional Development Fund and the Jobs Acceleration Fund. When will the details and the application process for the funding programs be released, and when will applications open for the fund?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:16): I thank the member for his question. The cabinet committee he is talking about is having its first meeting on Monday. From there, we will be progressing the terms of reference, etc., and then we will come back to the member later on, but certainly the first meeting is on Monday.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA CABINET COMMITTEE

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:17): Further to the minister's answer, given that he is chairing the committee, as I understand it, has he set in place a time frame for when these issues must be resolved and the funding is available to be applied for?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:17): As I just indicated a minute ago, the first meeting will be on Monday. As we have indicated before, it has five ministers on it and will cover as many portfolios. To the member: I'm the chair; I'm not dictating the time frame. It is a cabinet meeting, reporting directly into the cabinet, and I will get back to the member personally once we have made that decision.

REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA CABINET COMMITTEE

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:18): Further to the minister's answer, are you taking to that meeting—

The SPEAKER: No, I am not doing anything.

Mr GRIFFITHS: My apologies, Mr Speaker. Is the minister taking to the meeting that he has referred to on Monday a draft example of the processes and details of the application so that at least we can get some indication of when applications are able to be lodged?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:18): To the member for Goyder, the terms of reference I have indicated a minute ago will be taken to that first cabinet meeting, the committee. We will then report back into the cabinet. I am not going to put to you a time frame. I want the terms of reference and the time frames very, very clear.

We haven't even had the committee meeting at this particular point, so I think it's presumptuous of anyone to ask me as the chair, or any member of that committee, when we can come back. Certainly, we want to get this out of the way as quick as we can, member, and I have given you my undertaking before personally about the issues. We will get that resolved as quick as we can.

The SPEAKER: Speaker's discretion: member for Kavel.

LENSWOOD RESEARCH CENTRE

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (15:19): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: They've been so quiet the last few days.

Mr GOLDSWORTHY: You can't get rid of me that easily. My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Will the minister guarantee that the government will not sell the Lenswood Research Centre?

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) (15:19): I thank the member for Kavel for his question.

Honourable members: Kavel.

The SPEAKER: Rhymes with 'marvel', minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The big issues that they go after—all the things they could do to save the world and they worry about the pronunciation of an electorate. I met with the horticultural group the other day and I am aware of a proposal by local people to keep that land for another purpose. Before we make any decision to sell off that land, we will have discussion with locals up there to see what they would like to happen with the research facility and the site.

*Grievance Debate***COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT**

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:20): On 6 May, I asked the Minister for the Public Sector about whether there was going to be an open and transparent merit-based process in relation to the appointment of the new Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. I asked a question about whether there was going to be a public advertisement in relation to that position. The Minister for the Public Sector gave an answer that said, 'I am yet to turn my mind to such an eventuality.'

The opposition has been advised that on 7 April, the minister took a cabinet submission to cabinet in the terms that she was advising cabinet that at some future date she would be appointing a particular person—Erma Ranieri—to that particular position, the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. I have today written to the member for Frome, the Minister for Regional Development, because as a minister, the member for Frome gets all cabinet submissions. When I asked the Premier about a cabinet submission dated 7 April, the Premier did not say there wasn't one.

I have written to the Minister for Regional Development, the member for Frome, asking him to look at his cabinet submissions and see if there is a cabinet submission dated 7 April, or indeed

any cabinet submission, that goes to the question of the appointment of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. The reason I do that is simply this: the Minister for the Public Sector told this house on 6 May that she had not turned her mind to that question. If there is a cabinet submission dated 7 April, nearly a month earlier, where the minister has notified cabinet of her future intention, then clearly the minister had turned their mind to that question.

The member for Frome is in a unique position. He can speak freely of cabinet matters if he wishes under his agreement and certainly I know the member for Frome will be the person who will set the standard for the ministry, because if a minister has misled the house—and I do not allege that quite yet—if a minister has given wrong information to the house, then the member for Frome can be the conscience of the cabinet and speak freely, because we know that this government has no problems with members of cabinet speaking freely. The house will remember the former member for Adelaide, of blessed memory, who was given permission to speak freely about cabinet matters.

So I have written to the member for Frome. I have written to him because, if it is true that there is a cabinet submission on 7 April in the terms that I have outlined, then I am going to allege that the minister has misled the house, and it is up to the member for Frome to consider my letter. I look forward to his response in due course.

The other issue I want to raise is simply a response to the Deputy Premier and the Attorney-General in relation to his speech yesterday in relation to electoral reform, which is responding to my Address in Reply speech. It is somewhat, I think, embarrassing for the Attorney. The Attorney and I have a reasonably good understanding on a lot of things, but the Attorney makes the point in his contribution that:

...the two-party preferred vote, everyone should remember, is a mathematical construct. It actually does not exist in the real world.

He then goes to say:

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.

I will just draw to the house's attention to the fact that section 83 of the Constitution Act, for which the Attorney-General is responsible and which was put in place as a result of a statewide referendum, requires the consideration of the two-party preferred vote. That 'artificial construct' is actually in the state's constitution at the will of the people of South Australia. I am sorry, Attorney, on that matter I think you are wrong.

Time expired.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:25): I rise to speak about the very important issue of public transport in this state and in particular public transport in the southern suburbs. As we all know, a good public transport service helps people spend less time commuting and more time with their families. It also improves opportunities for people for work, study and other economic opportunities.

For many years, we had a public transport system that was ignored in this state. When we came to government, we had a situation where not one metre of railway track had been added to our public transport since the 1970s. There had not been any major purchases of rolling stock in at least a decade. Our bus service was privatised by the Liberals, just like they privatised Modbury Hospital, and our bus system did not go to the outer southern suburbs like Aldinga and Sellicks Beach. So, we had to rebuild this system. In particular, we had to rebuild the railway system in this state, which was falling apart.

I am pleased to report that this government, in conjunction with the previous federal Labor government, have extended the railway to Seaford Meadows and Seaford stations, which is a dramatic improvement for public transport in my electorate. We now have new electric trains running on that track, and they are faster, safer, quieter and larger. Anyone who has been on one of these trains has reported how fantastic they really are.

I congratulate the Minister for Transport as well for his work recently in re-looking at the timetables for this service, and we are going to deliver on our election commitment to ensure that there will be faster train services for people in the outer south. Under the timetable that he has proposed, which is out for consultation, there will be 39-minute services from Seaford in the morning

and 34-minute services from Noarlunga, which will be a massive improvement against the time travelled on the road and which will drive more people into using public transport rather than driving in cars. For our system to continue to improve, we are going to have more electric trains coming over future years.

We also have more park-and-ride car parks available at Seaford, Seaford Meadows and more being built at Noarlunga at the moment. We also have services available now for people in terms of real-time arrival information for trains and buses, which is a huge advantage for people to know when their bus or train is actually going to arrive. We also have a modern ticketing system, and we did not face the troubles that Victoria and New South Wales had with their ticketing system. We now have a modern ticketing system for public transport that was delivered on time and on budget.

I would like to thank the people of the south for their patience over the recent years as we have rebuilt public transport services in the south. I know it has been difficult. I am personally somebody who uses the train, both in my previous job and now regularly in this job as well, to get between my house in Port Noarlunga South and the city. I know how important it is, and I know that it was particularly difficult during the situation where we had substitute buses, and I thank people for their patience.

But all we heard from the opposition during that period was negativity and trying to be populist and trying to jump on board that period of construction, and what we did not hear from them was any positive plan for what they saw as their improvements for public transport. The reason we did not hear that is because they did not have any plans for public transport. In fact, I was there during the election campaign at the Business SA lunch, where the Premier and the opposition leader were speaking.

The opposition leader was asked what his plan is for public transport, and he said he did not want to spend any more money on public transport, that he did not want to invest any more money in our system—not one cent more. I think that sums up the view of the opposition in terms of public transport. They are all about criticising; they are not about investing, and they are not about promoting any future plans for the service.

Here on this side we are about investing in public transport. I am happy to report that one of Labor's commitments in the election was to buy the land for a future rail corridor extension down to Aldinga Beach. As I have said, we have now extended the rail line to Seaford. The next stop, inevitably, will be down to Aldinga. We need to secure that land to ensure that that corridor is protected so that we can extend the rail down there in the future. I can inform the house that people in Aldinga are very much in support of that move and very much want to see the rail extended down there in the future. They know, as we on this side of the house know, that you need to invest in public transport, and only Labor has the track record of actually doing that.

ALMONDCO

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:30): I rise today to talk about a 70th birthday that I attended over the weekend, and it really was quite a celebration. It was, of course, Almondco's 70th birthday. It was celebrated at their 'newer' facility just out of Renmark, and it is a world-class facility. The Almondco business originally started in Adelaide, where it had a couple of destinations, and it used to process a small industry, a boutique industry, as it was once upon a time. Some of the historians on the weekend said that back in those days they used to crack the almonds individually, one by one, to process them and get them out to market. However, in today's world, Almondco is one of the world leading processors and marketers and, proudly, it is in the electorate of Chaffey.

It is a regional success story, where it has come from in its humble beginnings to where it is today. It started exporting in about 1996, and it started producing about \$50 million worth of turnover. In today's climate it is turning over about \$170 million. Its exports have increased up to around 40 per cent of its product. A lot of those markets are now newer markets into the UK, Europe, and particularly into the Middle East, India and Japan, where they seem to perform well in some of the big markets that Almondco are sending their product to. Russia is one of the new destinations and is also looming as one of the new drawcard markets.

Almondco employs about 500 seasonal workers, so it really is a regional heartbeat to the region of the Riverland. It has about 100 full-time staff. That employment base is underpinned by 140 growers, who are obviously vital to the region's economy. More importantly, almonds are

probably one of the most buoyant horticultural crops grown in a large quantity sector. As Almondco expanded its business over the last 20 years, I drove past it from home to one of my orchards, it was always mind blowing and eye-opening to see the new extension, the new expansion.

Of course, the latest expansion was the pasteuriser, a \$4 million investment that now makes their entire product. As some of you here today would know, in harvesting almonds they are shaken off the tree onto the ground, they are swept into windrows, and then they are picked up. In doing that, they incur some bacteria and disease, so almonds are now processed through that pasteuriser, and it makes them a safe product. It has also increased that investment. A \$4 million investment has picked up \$40 million worth of new market investment. I think that is a great investment. Global consumption of almonds is outstripping supply.

On the Sunday, not only the CEO but the board of directors were there. I commend not only Brenton Woolston, the CEO of Almondco, who is the face of the business, but also the board for its vision because, over the last 20 years, at their new facility at Renmark, their vision has led the rest of the world. The way they produce their new products and how they present and market their products, they are a world leader, so it really is a great attribute to the almond industry.

What they are doing with their leading technology is that they are bringing the rest of the market with them. Being world leaders, they are also bringing other almond-marketing businesses, particularly Nut Producers Australia, with them, and they are working and moving forward at a great rate of knots. It is great to see. I would like to acknowledge the Lacey family for their foresight many years ago. Andrew is the deputy chair at the minute, and his vision has been exemplary. Anyone in this house who is passing through the Riverland, do drop in to Almondco and visit the Almond Hut.

Time expired.

FEDERAL BUDGET

Mr GEE (Napier) (15:36): I stand to lament the devastating impact on my electorate of the brutal federal budget that will divide our nation. The changes in this budget will, over time, further entrench the intergenerational disadvantage in my electorate. It will increase poverty and homelessness amongst our young people and will unfairly impact our pensioners and the general health of our population.

In the last week, I have visited service providers in my community who work with the poor, victims of domestic violence, the disabled and their carers. They all anticipate that the demand for their services will increase due to the cuts and new taxes in this budget. Elderly people are already contacting service providers; they will not be able to afford their medication or a visit to the doctor. One service provider is already seeing up to 45 people a day seeking assistance with food, bills and furniture. This will only get worse.

The largest impact will be on families and young people. Families who trusted Mr Abbott before the federal election will now feel his government's cuts to family benefits. One-quarter of the families in my electorate contain one parent. Under these cuts, a sole parent family with school-age children could lose up to \$20,000 over the next four years. This is a massive hit that will see our children suffer as families have to survive with less or work a second or third job.

Medicare will be dead due to the proposed introduction of the GP tax and new fees for x-rays and blood tests. These charges will see elderly people and children in my electorate denied medical care due to their financial situation as the Abbott government turns doctors into tax collectors. It is estimated that, over the next four years, a family with two adults and two children could pay up to \$1,000 in medical costs. This is on top of an increase in the Medicare levy. The Abbot government has betrayed not just those people who put their trust in them at the last election but all Australians. The fair go has ended.

It is estimated that the changes to the family tax benefit, along with the other changes which will destabilise the family budget, could lead to stress on families and possibly an increase in domestic violence. Sadly, service providers who assist women are expecting an increase in referrals to them. Domestic violence was the single largest cause of homelessness for women and children last year. This is a disgrace.

Based on the last census, about 20 per cent of the residents in my electorate are aged 15 to 30 years old. These young people will be hit by the changes to Newstart and Youth Allowance,

including the six-month lockout. These measures will push young people in my electorate into poverty and increase couch surfing and will severely impact on their self-esteem and mental health. It will especially affect young people from broken families, those with learning difficulties and gay and lesbian young people, who are more likely to live away from home; they will be left behind.

The reality is that not every student sails through school, finishes year 12 and walks into the workforce. Those days are gone. For a variety of reasons, young people in my electorate with dyslexia or learning difficulties will be hard hit. The budget will cause youth unemployment to rise. As a result of this budget, Australia will cease to be the clever country producing quality teachers, nurses and doctors. University education will be out of reach for many of the students in my electorate. Increased university fees, increased interest and repayment at a lower income will see Australia having to import professionals, rather than produce them at home.

Local government will be hit, too, in this budget through cuts to local roads funding and cuts to federal assistance grants. These cuts across the three northern councils of Salisbury, Playford and Gawler will easily exceed \$1 million. Councils will decide, through their budget processes, whether rates will rise, services will be cut, or work delayed to make up for this shortfall—again, another impact on the community.

The final part of the budget I wish to discuss is the rise in the fuel excise, which will act as a mini GST. I say this because, although the increase will have a small impact on families filling their tank, it will have a far greater hit across the community as the cost of goods and services—

Time expired.

BANGOR BUSHFIRE

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:41): I rise today to advise the house of some of the issues about the Bangor fire, which happened in my electorate in January this year, shortly before the last election. I acknowledge that it was not the only bushfire taking place at the time: there was a very serious fire in Eden Valley as well, which was equally devastating. However, I am going to speak about the Bangor fire, which broke out on Thursday 16 January but really took hold, with devastating consequences, on the evening of Friday 17 January.

The fire burned out of control in two broad phases. It was nearly back under control, but it broke out again, and those two phases ran for about six weeks and had an absolutely devastating impact upon our community and stretched the emergency services people just about as far as they could be stretched at the time, given that they were also contributing to efforts in other parts of the state.

I would like to offer my personal thanks to all the people who contributed, and of course I think about the services: the volunteers and the professionals in the CFS, MFS, South Australia Police, Ambulance Service, and SES. I also thank the many community people who contributed, including local government and private businesses, who all contributed to that effort. I also have to acknowledge many public servants who took time out of their own off-duty lives to contribute their professional skills and abilities to access services in contributing to the recovery effort. They really did a wonderful job as well.

We were very fortunate that there were no deaths, but there were some minor injuries. Very unfortunately, six homes burned down and were lost, and that is very serious. We have had four bushfires in the last two years in the electorate of Stuart, all very serious bushfires, but this was the most serious by far. As well as that, 90 per cent of the pine plantation of the Wirrabara forest burned down.

I am very concerned about the fact that the government and ForestrySA are not rushing to commit to replant that forest. I really do understand from ForestrySA's perspective that, if you just looked at a cost-benefit analysis based on the commercial revenue to ForestrySA alone, it may not stack up. I really do understand that, and that is the job they have to do. They have to work within their constitution and obligations, and their board and other officers have to make those sorts of decisions.

It is absolutely imperative that the government understands that there are so many other benefits to the community that have to be considered and so many other flow-on jobs, such as the local ForestrySA jobs, all the benefits to all the contractors who work in the forest, the sawmillers

nearby at Jamestown, the beekeeping industry, and many others. This house may be aware of the Morgan Sawmill, which employs 44 people in Jamestown, most of whom live in the electorate of Stuart, but many live in the electorate of Frome as well. It is one of the most significant employers in the upper Mid North southern Flinders area.

There is extraordinary heritage value to the forest, as well as wonderful recreation and sport value to the forest. It is an asset that is used significantly, and I applaud ForestrySA for the access they give the public to the publicly-owned land they manage on behalf of the public. They are very good about allowing people to bushwalk, ride and run sporting events from time to time. They really do a good job, and all of that will be lost if this forest is not replanted.

Grazing rights for local farmers are very important, and there are myriad local benefits that must be included in the government's overall cost-benefit analysis when it decides to replant. I am advised that the cost is around \$5 million so, yes, it is a significant amount of money but, yes, among other priorities, it is quite affordable for the government.

I also advise the house that I have written to and spoken with the Minister for Forests and the Minister for Regional Development, and they have both agreed to come and visit the forest with me, and I am very grateful for that. They have been approachable and both have said, 'Yes, we'll come and have a look.' I will give them full marks if they are then able to come back and convince cabinet to replant the forest—that really is the goal. I want this whole house and all of cabinet to thoroughly understand how important is the replanting of this forest.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:46): In the days since the federal budget has been handed down we have seen just how much damage can be done in a short period of time by a conservative government. It does not take long for those who believe government has no role in society, who have faith in the laissez-faire free market system and who spout rhetoric about the health of the economy without reflecting on the health of those in the economy, who it should benefit, to unwind protections and safeguards installed over decades of progressive governments.

I do not recall in the community so much discussion about the federal budget. Many people are very shocked, as it gets unpacked, by what will be the implications of the budget. We are starting to see in the last few days the true colours of the federal government. It is not easy to shock me, but I was shocked to hear that the services of Disability Discrimination Commissioner, Graeme Innes AM, will no longer be required by the federal government.

In looking at the sort of track record Graeme Innes has (I have had the pleasure of working him over the years), I remind the house that he has been involved in a number of initiatives—and maybe this is why he is not going to continue in his job—the 'Same sex: same entitlements' inquiry, which resulted in the removal of discrimination across federal law, and the drafting of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and its ratification in Australia.

He also developed, with others, a national disability strategy and the Disability (Access to Premises—Buildings) Standards 2010. I know that this is an issue in which the Leader of the Opposition is interested, particularly access to premises and heritage issues. It is very interesting that this outstanding public servant now does not have a job, and presumably the emphasis on disability will be different under this federal government. I will be interested to see, with Graeme Innes finishing his job, what is put in place to take up these very important issues.

The other area to which I will speak briefly involves the concerns I have in regard to the federal government's very short record already on the environment and what might happen in that area. One of the most significant achievements of the last federal government was the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. For those of us who were in the last parliament, the 52nd parliament, that discussion was taken up by everybody in this house. A lot was said and a lot of work done by a number of parliamentary committees, including the Natural Resources Committee, in regard to the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

So one of the first actions of the Abbott government is to undermine that plan by rephrasing water purchases and I think raising doubts with everyone concerned about the ability to achieve the targets set by that plan. In the last budget the commonwealth government established a 1,500-gigalitre cap on water buybacks in the Murray-Darling Basin, further restricting options for achieving targets necessary to ensure the health of the basin.

Then there was the issue of the federal government looking at science—or the total lack of regard, with regard to science—to address climate change. The Abbott government has outlined its plan to address climate change by direct action and a plan to repeal the national carbon pricing mechanism. A carbon pricing mechanism (once endorsed by the Prime Minister himself when in opposition) is widely regarded as the most efficient manner of reducing carbon emissions. Rather than taking the advice of economists and scientists the Liberal government has chosen to implement its own direct plan.

The Liberal government has turned its sights on renewable energy, commissioning a review of the federal government's renewable energy target. The review, headed by businessmen and self-professed climate sceptic, Dick Warburton, is expected to protect vested interests in the electricity market at the cost of renewable energy investment.

Motions

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:51): I move:

That this house calls on the commonwealth government to reverse measures in the 2014-15 commonwealth budget that will harm the provision of key services and benefits to the South Australian community.

This budget has a context and the context is a federal Liberal Coalition government that has already firmly established the value system by which it will govern for the people of South Australia. One that has been absolutely clear from day one of this new federal Liberal government is that they govern for a very narrow and privileged section of our community, and this budget is framed with precisely that same set of values in mind.

There is an eerie resonance between the way in which this federal budget has been framed and the way in which those opposite would have framed their first state budget had they achieved office here in South Australia. It is based on this fundamental principle: that is, that they do not govern for the ordinary, everyday working men and women of this nation; they govern for a narrow, elite group of privileged people in the Australian community. It got off to a bad start: there is no clearer evidence than one of the early acts of—

Mr Marshall: There's been a ruling on that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The former Labor government proposed two changes that made the superannuation system a little fairer: one would refund the tax paid to low income people, those 3.6 million people who earn less than \$37,000 per year—the previous federal Labor government legislated that change. The other proposal would increase the tax on superannuation contributions for 128,000 people who earn more than \$300,000. Their super concessions would be taxed at 30 per cent, not 15 per cent. This is still a concession but just a smaller one. So super contributions would remain subject to the flat 15 per cent tax for incomes between \$37,000 and \$300,000.

One of the earliest acts of the incoming federal Liberal government was to repeal the low income super contribution, effectively increasing tax on super to everyone who earns less than \$37,000, and then, in the same breath, not proceeding with the higher tax rate for people on over \$300,000. How could you make those two corresponding measures as part of the early decision of your government unless you wanted to send the clearest possible message about for whom you govern? Lower middle income earners actually receive no tax concessions for saving for their retirement, while people on high incomes receive very substantial concessions.

When the former assistant treasurer, the current Liberal senator Arthur Sinodinos, was confronted about that grotesque inconsistency in priorities he said this: 'We've always been on the side of those who are aspirational.' What warped value system sits at the heart of a remark like that, the notion that people on low incomes, people who might actually be a cleaner or someone who might be hospitality worker, do not have aspirations for themselves and their families, and that those who actually have high incomes—on many occasions due to the circumstances and privileges and opportunities that have been made available to them—are the only ones with aspirations?

What this betrays is a view about the distribution of wealth and opportunity in this nation, and a view by the Liberal Party that it is desirable, that it is a desirable distribution of wealth and opportunity, a desirable distribution of resources. It is not just that they do not think it is amenable to change through public policy, they actually believe in it. They believe in tradition, they believe in these things not changing. They believe in status, they believe that things are the way they are for a good reason.

We have never accepted that on this side of the house. We have never accepted that the unequal distribution of wealth and opportunity is something immutable, something that should not change. We are restless with that. Sure, we understand that these things are often resistant to change and that it requires the application of intelligent public policy to actually improve the quality of our community, but there are many programs that sit at the heart of striking at those inequalities in our community. That is what we spend all our time and effort dreaming about and thinking about, and that is why all of us on this side of the parliament got into this business of standing for parliament.

This is what is at the heart of the attack that exists within the federal budget. One only needs to look, for a moment, at the things that were chosen for cuts and the things that were chosen for protection to understand that the Liberal Party of Australia has made a choice about for whom they govern—and it is not ordinary, every day, working Australians. Look at the cuts and the way in which they fall.

There is the reduction in funding to young people. Newstart benefits for the unemployed: people under 30 will have to wait for six months to be eligible for benefits; the eligible age for Newstart is being raised from 22 to 25, costing people aged between 22 and 25 who previously qualified for Newstart \$96 per fortnight. There are the higher university costs due to the uncapping of university fees in 2016 and higher interest rates on those, with increased fees. The minimum income threshold at which people begin repaying their debt will also be lowered by 10 per cent. In addition, there are cuts to public funding to South Australian universities.

In relation to those disposable incomes of people who are actually the subject of these cuts, a single person on Newstart of 23 years of age would have a loss of \$47 per week—18.3 per cent of their disposable income. When one compares that to the contributions that are offered by other members of the community, it is a grotesque set of priorities to allow the burden of adjustment to fall so unfairly and so harshly on those who can least afford it.

When we look at the families that are affected by this, the cut-off for family tax benefit is reduced from \$150,000 to \$100,000. Previously, the family tax benefit B extended to families with children under 18, it is now cut off for families where the youngest child is six or older. Families will pay more for fuel, with excise increasing every six months. Families will pay \$7 every time they visit the GP. Families will pay \$5 more for medicines on the pharmaceutical benefits scheme, 80¢ for those on concession cards. Families will also be expected to provide greater financial support for adult children for longer due to the changes to Newstart.

We also see, in some of the cruellest cuts, cuts to Aboriginal programs. There is a cut of \$534 million from Indigenous programs across Australia, with \$9.6 million in annual funding for municipal services and essential services in South Australia's regional and remote Aboriginal communities and homelands. This decision will affect more than 4,000 Aboriginal residents in more than 700 homes in 60 locations, from the Coorong to the Nullarbor, from Oodnadatta to the Flinders Ranges, and small, very remote homelands on the APY lands.

We have also seen deep cuts that will affect pensioners. South Australian pensioners will, of course, have to pay the \$7 co-payment to see the GP, waived after 10 visits per year for concession card holders; \$30 million per year in concessions will be stripped; seniors healthcare card holders will lose the seniors supplement; fuel prices; the Seniors Card harder to qualify for; and the pension age will rise to 70, affecting any Australian born after 1966.

We also know that in this very same budget there were promises made which were simply dishonestly and manifestly breached: \$80 billion in health and education cuts without notice to the states, in direct contradiction of specific promises made by the Prime Minister in the lead-up to the election, not just promises that were the subject of agreements between sovereign governments (commonwealth and state governments), not just promises that were repeated ad nauseam in the election campaign but, just in case we did not get the message, promises that were actually reduced to writing and put on billboards so that when people went into their polling booths they could be

expected to vote on the basis of those solemn assurances. They were reduced to writing so that the last thing you saw before you walked into the polling booth were those specific commitments, and they have been directly and dishonestly breached.

The dishonesty does not end there. When we were meeting a few weeks ago with the Prime Minister not a word was said. The largest single cut in generations to state funding, with direct breaches of agreements between the commonwealth and state governments, and not a word of it was breathed to the various state and territory first ministers by the commonwealth government. That explains, to some degree, the fury that has emerged from not only this state but also the state premiers and chief ministers of every other state and territory, with the possible exception of Western Australia.

What we know from this breach of promise is that it did not rest there. It was actually concealed from us on budget night. There was no reference to the \$80 billion cut on budget night. It was not hard to find, it was in the budget papers. You would have thought the largest single cut announced in the budget papers might have got a mention in the budget speech, but no, Joe Hockey decided that that was not a matter that was the subject of comment.

Indeed, what did occur shortly after the budget was handed down is that the Prime Minister sought to assuage and minimise the nature of the criticism by suggesting that these cuts were not going to occur tomorrow, or next week, or even next year: they were going to occur beyond the forward estimates. What we now know is the cuts emerge from 1 July; the cuts begin deeply in 1 July and they amount to \$898 million over the next four years. Almost a billion dollars of cuts to the South Australian government, and that is before they ramp up.

There is also a deep deceit at the heart of this federal budget, and the federal government has not made out its case; it has not even got to first base. There are two essential points it makes: we have got a debt crisis and we have got a budget emergency. It is simply false. Australia has recorded higher economic growth than our peers. According to the IMF, Australia recorded economic growth of 2.4 per cent in 2013, 2 per cent for Canada, 1.9 for the US and 1.8 for the UK; Spain's economy contracted by 1.2 per cent; and Germany grew by 0.5 per cent. So, a survey of the world tells you that we have, in relative terms, strong economic growth.

What we have, though, is a difficulty in relation to the recovery of receipts from a growing economy. What we know is that 10 years ago we were recovering, by way of receipts, 25.6 per cent of the economy; we now recover almost a full 2 per cent less: 23.6 per cent of that growing economy. That accounts for almost double the challenge for the federal government: not this mythology about 'blue-sky spending' by the federal government, but in fact a growing economy where there are sections of the economy that simply are not pulling their weight.

I can remember seeing a slide that Joe Hockey put up at one of our early treasurers meetings where he explained in pretty exasperated terms that we have this budget emergency. He actually showed these graphs, and it became apparent that the greatest level of the challenge was not actually on the spending side: it was actually on the receipts side. He also mentioned that one of the sectors of the economy that was not pulling its weight was in fact the mining sector, and I did mention at the time, 'Well, if we only had a solution to that, Joe; if we only had a solution to that.' There is a mythology about what the nature of this so-called budget emergency is.

What of the debt crisis? Australia has very low government sector debt compared with our peers. Australia's general government net debt to GDP was 13.5 per cent in 2013, and it is forecast by the IMF to rise to 16.1 per cent in 2014. This compares with the 2013 general government net debt to GDP of 73.5 per cent for advanced economies and 72.4 per cent in the Euro area—many orders of magnitude above what we experience here. So, the case is not made out.

What the case is based on is the value system that I spoke of earlier: it is pulling out your true agenda to actually hack into those programs which are about addressing questions of inequality—about making a fairer South Australia. If you do not believe in them—if, in your heart, you are there for the aspirational people—why on earth would you be spending money on these things? The great public sector projects, the great projects of civil society directed at the reduction of inequality, are our universal health care system and our universal public education system.

The great achievements of modern civil society are to put everybody on the same level in terms of their health and wellbeing, and their trajectory for learning and earning throughout their life.

What we believe in is that you give everybody that opportunity; that is how you are going to grapple with the question of inequality. But, if you do not actually believe in the project—if you do not actually believe that inequality is something that is deserving of minimisation—why on earth would you spend money on it?

That is at the heart of their cuts. That is why they can hack into this in such a deep and dishonest fashion, and it is for us to stand up to it and resist it because it is about the nature and identity of our South Australian community.

What this means in real terms is something in the order of 600 beds in the healthcare system in just one year alone at the end of the forward estimates—equivalent to over 40 per cent of all hospital beds in regional South Australia if you wanted to turn it into another metric. These are the things we are going to have to grapple with in our upcoming budget, with very little time to grapple with what has been a catastrophic attack on South Australia's revenues.

The other element of deception in relation to this budget is the way in which there are just so many wires and mirrors that are actually produced, this notion of the \$20 billion health fund which we are somehow all meant to cheer about. People are meant to pay with health and wellbeing now in relation to closing hospital beds and paying for the GP visits, somehow to get a photograph of a fund that may accumulate at some stage in the future, a fund which actually only accumulates on a drip-feed out of the interest savings that accrue through the \$20 billion being taken to the bottom line of the budget. It is essentially an illusion, but to link those two things together just indicates that they understood that this was a budget that was going to have a sales problem, and it looks like a retrofit. It looks like some genius in the federal cabinet has strapped this solution on, to link the \$7 co-payment to this fund.

If it is a fact, if it is, using their chain of reasoning, a budget emergency, how on earth can you afford \$20 billion? Of course it is a wonderful thing to spend money on medical health and research, but do you do it at the expense of basic investments in health and education? You cannot simultaneously run the line that there is a budget emergency and then say you have \$20 billion lying around to be able to invest in medical research. It does not pass the common-sense test. It is an illusion, just as the high income supplement is.

Obviously, when they looked at this budget, and somebody stood back and looked at it all, they said, 'Well, this isn't going to fly,' so the first thing they did was grab onto the fact that the politicians had a wage freeze (which was already recommended by the remuneration tribunal) and thought, 'We'll own that and say that we are doing that because that looks like we are all making a contribution, so we are really tough on ourselves.'

Then they thought they would reach into high-income earners because they thought it would be a bit embarrassing to be there on these extraordinary salaries and not look like they were making a contribution. But if you look at the relative contributions of somebody like Tony Abbott and that person on Newstart, you can see that it is a grotesque distortion of the burden of effort. It falls disproportionately on low-income earners in this community and actually rips away those supports for those people who are seeking to get a leg-up on the ladder of opportunity in this nation.

This is a budget that fails just about every test. It is dishonest, it portrays a value system which is not consistent with Australian values, which is a fair go, and it rips away at the programs that are central to our purpose as a political party. This will be known as a Liberal budget. So, when Tony Abbott comes to us and puts into our budget this poison pill, by ripping out \$5.5 billion, and then says with a bit of a smile on his face, 'I'm open to a discussion if somebody wants to come and have a chat to us about GST. It won't be my GST; it will be their GST,' we are saying we are not having any part of it.

This is your policy proposition. This is your idea. You argue the case for it. You argue why we should be doing this in the first place, and then you argue every step of the way, every policy proposition and every natural consequence that flows from it. There is nobody with a straight face who continues in that federal cabinet who believes that state governments can consume these cuts. They think we are going to come trotting back to them and say, 'Please give us the GST.'

Whatever the resolution of this is, it will be owned by the federal Liberal Party. It will be their solution. They need to run this case and, for present purposes, what we are doing is resisting these

changes because they are unfair, they do not make sense, and we will be resisting them as far as we possibly can. Obviously we are going to have to grapple with what emerges.

We do not know whether some of it or all of it will survive. We have to prepare a budget on the assumption that this is a budget that we are going to have to live with, or at least in large measure live with. We will be campaigning against these individual measures and we hope that there will at least be some, if not all of them, ameliorated but we have to be realistic. The commonwealth has set its sails on this path, but we will make sure that they accept full responsibility for them.

For those who are sitting here, just consider for a moment if those opposite had had the good fortune of occupying the Treasury benches at this time. We would be looking at precisely the same thing—massive cuts to jobs, an audit commission delivering similar recommendations and similar responses from the elected politicians here, saying, 'It is not me, it is these fellas. They are giving us all these recommendations. Sadly, we are just going to have to adopt them because we have this shocking budget emergency.'

What actually happened at the last state election was that the South Australian community, God bless them, put a massive spanner in the works in what was the biggest fit-up in commonwealth-state relations in the history of this nation. It was all on the way. There would have been a cosy deal between all the states and territories and the commonwealth government, and we would have been 'enjoying' life under an Abbott government with the opposition here in government quietly bringing in their support behind these programs.

Fortunately, we are in a position where we can stand up and resist these things. We are taking a leadership role in the nation. We have been able to cobble together a coalition; I do not know how long it will last, but I hope it will last as long as is necessary to defeat these cuts. I hope this house can send a very clear and certain message to the federal government that these cuts are unacceptable and that we get their reversal.

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (16:16): I rise to speak on this motion, and I indicate to the house that I will be the lead speaker and the only speaker from Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition, and we will be supporting this motion. However, I trust that this chamber will not be spending too much time on this issue. I believe that there are plenty of appropriate forums for the Premier, and for the opposition for that matter, to express their consideration and concerns regarding the federal budget. I do not think, given the fact that we have a supply bill before this house, that we should be spending an inordinate amount of time concentrating on this issue. If we do not pass the Supply Bill—

Members interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: Well, the members opposite laugh, the Minister for Education in particular. How will her teachers feel if this government—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: Sorry, it's just that you keep talking and I just assume you have something pertinent to add to the debate. Are you moving a standing order or—

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker: number one, I did not laugh, I smiled pleasantly at the Leader of the Opposition, which I do often, and I have not been talking incessantly. I have been sitting here quietly listening to him.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am required to ask you what the point of order is.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am being misrepresented by him is my point of—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr MARSHALL: Those opposite may smirk or smile lovingly at the opposition, as we have just had attested, but the simple fact of the matter is that the government opposite have asked us to consider a supply bill to approve the appropriation of \$3,941 million. The government is asking those on this side of the chamber to trust them to spend that money without providing a budget. I come from the private sector—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am just saying it to myself, but I am hoping someone is listening. The leader is entitled to be heard.

Mr MARSHALL: —and we would not be asking for expenditure without providing a budget, but that is exactly and precisely what the government is asking us to do.

Not only that, but we have three days to get the Supply Bill through. So it is rather perplexing that the Premier wants to play politics with this particular issue and jeopardise supply being granted before the end of the financial year and jeopardise the cash flow of this government. We are not going to do that; we are not going to participate. I will be the only speaker and I will keep my remarks brief.

Of course, we have a history of this with this Premier. Only in March last year he moved a motion regarding the future submarines project where he made an extraordinary attack on the federal Coalition who were in opposition at the time. I believe that many of the comments that the Premier made in that clearly political debate were the start of a soured relationship between the now defence minister for the country and this government. I think that is one of the reasons why we still fail to have had a meeting between the Premier and the defence minister at a time—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: You are not the Premier. This is at a time when defence spending is critical for this state. I do not think there is one person in this chamber nor one person in this state who does not appreciate the magnitude of the problem that we have in South Australia with the 'Valley of Death' that is fast approaching because of the inaction of the federal Labor government over an extended period of time to implement the white paper and the DCP which they promised to the people and most importantly, to the people of South Australia.

The federal budget handed down on 13 May was a tough budget. There is no doubt about that. I have already made it clear in my public statements that there are a range of measures in this budget that the opposition simply does not support. We certainly said before the election that we did not support the Medicare co-payment and we have made that statement publicly since. We do not support many of the cuts in health and education simply because in South Australia we cannot afford any diminution of the revenue flows from the commonwealth to our state. We do not have enough money to run our state at the moment because of the financial ineptitude of those opposite who have run our state's finances for the last 12 years.

We have also said in particular that we do not support the cuts to the supplementary road funding to South Australia. We have made those points and we have made them very clearly in the media—public comments—and privately to the Coalition in Canberra. We believe that South Australia is missing out without the supplementary roads payment coming to South Australia—about \$17 million per year. Without that supplementary road payment, our share of the local roads funding under the federal assistance grants program is sitting at 5.5 per cent, yet we have 11 per cent of road length here in South Australia and of course, around 7 per cent of the nation's population.

The supplementary road payment which I believe was brought in by John Howard when he was prime minister of Australia took our share from 5.5 per cent up to 7.9 per cent. This was particularly important for South Australia. In addition to this, it was the Liberal government which asked the Commonwealth Grants Commission to look at a funding split and that commission recommended that South Australia get 8.9 per cent of the funds. So we certainly do not support this budget measure and I have made that very clear in my correspondence with minister Truss and also in conversations with minister Briggs, and we hope that there can be a resolution of this issue which would certainly help South Australia.

However, we are extremely concerned on this side of the house that those opposite will seek to use the federal budget as a smokescreen for their own chronic financial mismanagement over an extended period of time. Labor's record is nothing but appalling. Their record of rising deficits, increasing debt, massive debt interest being paid on a daily basis in this state, their appalling mismanagement of the Workers' Compensation Scheme, and the loss of our AAA credit rating, all occurred, not since September last year when the Coalition came to power federally but when the Labor Party was in power in Canberra.

So, it is a bit rich, quite frankly, to be given a lecture by those opposite about what we should be doing here in Australia at the moment. They have presided over a complete wrecking ball against our state budget and against our economy.

I am looking forward to the Treasurer's speech in this house on 19 June because I can tell you what he is going to say. You may be in the seat at the time, so he may say, 'Deputy Speaker, it is a particularly tough time at the moment, and there has been a deterioration in the accounts beyond our control—federal government, international issues, all of these things. It is not our fault but, don't worry, in two years' time—

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: There will be a surplus.

Mr MARSHALL: —we will be back in surplus.' This has been the narrative. This has been the embarrassing, repetitious narrative of this hopeless government over an extended period of time. We went to the polls on 15 March, and the government opposite said quite clearly that they would return this state to surplus in 2015-16. That is only 13 months away, and we are looking forward to them fulfilling that commitment, that promise, that they made to the South Australian people over an extended period of time.

I have taken a look at this federal budget, and I have compared it with the MYEFO which was handed down in December. Despite the incorrect assertions of the Treasurer—which were quite worrying, let's face it—that I had the numbers wrong, I had them right. I made it very clear, when I went onto radio that morning, that when we compared the MYEFO numbers which came down in December with the budget that was handed down last week, there was a—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I just need to remind the Treasurer that, according to the Speaker's notations, there is not a lot of leeway here, and I want to hear him speak later. I just want him to contain himself until later on. The leader. Let's be careful.

Mr MARSHALL: Thankyou, Deputy Speaker. The Treasurer admitted on the radio that morning that he had been up nearly all night—a little bit like the Premier who fell asleep in the chamber earlier this week, according to media reports—but he got it wrong. So, I made it very clear that the difference between the MYEFO—I am sure he has got a briefing on what that is now—and what was handed down in the budget was a \$1.4 billion difference. In fact, there was \$60 million in this current financial year, \$233 million next financial year, \$438 million in the 2015-16 year and \$666.5 million in the 2016-17 year.

Do you know what the Treasurer said? I will tell you what the Treasurer said. He said: 'It's a little bit embarrassing for Steven not to be able to read the budget figures.' That is what he said. He said: 'It's a little bit embarrassing—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I might have to call him to order in a minute. Leader.

Mr MARSHALL: He said: 'It's a little bit embarrassing for Steven not to be able to read the budget figures.' It must be not a little bit embarrassing: it must be humiliating for the state Treasurer to get it so wrong and repeat it on radio, with all of his Treasury advice, because, you see, Deputy Speaker, I was right—it is so humiliating.

I will point the Treasurer to this part of the budget. In fact, if you go to the 2014-15 federal budget, Budget Paper 3, page 93, table 3.22, and also the MYEFO on page 65, and do that comparison, you will see that there is an uplift of \$1.4 billion. I will accept the apology whenever the Treasurer is ready to provide it.

We on this side are very concerned for many reasons, one of which is the Treasurer's numeracy skills. The second, of course, is this smokescreen that those opposite want to use to distract from their own level of incompetence going forward.

Even if we go to the Treasury figures, which compare the GST that was updated in February—not the MYEFO, as I was talking about on the radio, but the GST figures from February compared to the budget—there was again an uplift over those four years of \$260 million, and when you add those to the uplift between the MYEFO and the budget for the specific purpose payments, there was an uplift of revenue into this state over those years of \$855 million.

That is the situation here in South Australia, so we reject those opposite who want to say, 'All of our problems in South Australia are somebody else's fault.' We say to those opposite, 'Take responsibility. Take responsibility for your figures and deliver a budget which realises the promise that was made to the people of South Australia in the lead-up to the election.'

In fact, I understand that the state education minister advised the federal education minister that she was surprised to hear that the federal budget provided more education funds in the forward estimates than were provided by the former Labor government. State Labor, of course, as we know, in the documents that it provided in the Mid-Year Budget Review and the update that was received prior to the election, planned to cut \$230 million out of its own forward estimates for education.

You do not see the Premier standing up in outrage at the Minister for Education and Child Development and saying, 'This is appalling. Do you know how many teachers we're going to have to sack?' We do not see the Premier doing that. We do not see the Premier calling a meeting of all the interest groups saying, 'These cuts are outrageous, minister. These must not go ahead.' No, we do not have that. We have absolute silence. That is the situation.

What about the Minister for Health? He delivered a very interesting speech in response to a question in this house only earlier this week in response to evidence that was provided to the Budget and Finance Committee of this parliament. The Minister for Health completely and utterly disputes the number which has been mentioned by the shadow health minister. Fair enough.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Rob Lucas lied.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'm sure the Minister for Health will tell us in his contribution later.

Mr MARSHALL: So he can say that people lied.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader, you're on.

Mr MARSHALL: Okay, that's a new ruling. Here we have a situation where the minister wants to accuse those in another place of being a liar, and he wants to do that repeatedly.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Yes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will have to call the Minister for Health to order.

Mr Gardner: I think he has been warned, ma'am.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can only read my own handwriting. I am calling him to order.

Mr MARSHALL: And yet, when the opposition asks the obvious next question, 'What is the size of the cuts envisaged by your government over your forward estimates delivered in last year's budget?' there is no answer; no answer whatsoever.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: No, no.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: And this is the problem. The government put together its budget. It has developed historically, and we will wait to see whether the Treasurer this year follows this convention, but historically, it has been put over a four-year period referred to as the forward estimates, so when we take a look at cuts to those planned expenditures in the forward estimates, they add up to an extraordinarily large number as provided in evidence to the Budget and Finance Committee.

Yet, when it is disputed by the minister opposite, he provides no evidence of what that cut actually is and yet he is happy to call a meeting. He in fact says that the budget cuts beyond the forward estimates here in South Australia will amount to the closing of a hospital. He might like to share with this house today in his contribution what are his state government's proposed cuts to the budget that was handed down in this place 12 months ago. He might like to do that, but I wonder whether he has the courage. I doubt it, but he could prove me wrong, and I look forward to that moment.

The Hon. S.W. Key: Why should he?

Mr MARSHALL: The member for Ashford asks, 'Why should he?'

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Don't respond to interjections.

Mr MARSHALL: Well, the member for Ashford asks a very good question.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: She is not going to interject again.

Mr MARSHALL: I will tell you why he should: because the people of South Australia, I believe, deserve to know exactly what is in store for them. It is one thing for the government to stand out there and create this big scare campaign, but what is it going to be doing to the people of South Australia themselves? That is something which I think needs further explanation by the Minister for Health.

One thing that I was very pleased to learn about in this budget which came down was the federal government's commitment to the north-south corridor. You may recall prior to the election that this was an issue which was quite controversial and received a great deal of public scrutiny. Let me just take the house through some of the fundamental issues associated with this project.

Tony Abbott, the now Prime Minister who was in opposition, came down to South Australia, and he had a sum of money that he would like to spend. He took a look at the plans that the state government had offered to the people of South Australia. In fact, on its own website the number one priority was the Darlington project. This was a project that had been offered to the people of South Australia at the 2006 election and offered again at the 2010 election. It seemed a logical project and it was a high priority project identified by the government to move on immediately.

He came out and said he would put \$500 million towards this state government-identified project, and we were very happy that the Coalition had committed to this if it won the federal election. What happened then just seemed incredible to us. We then had the state government backpedalling at a million miles an hour saying, 'That's not our priority project.' Well, it is on your website—lo and behold, it came down from the website. It came off the website; it was not their priority project and their priority project was of course the Torrens to Torrens project.

So, the Coalition won the federal election and we had the then minister out there, via the media mainly, saying, 'We don't want this project down there. This is our priority project: Torrens to Torrens.' Let me tell you what the state Liberal opposition did: we sat down with the Prime Minister and said, 'We don't think that we should deny the people of the south.' They have been denied and let down by state Labor over an extended period of time. They were promised in 2006, they were promised in 2010—it is a little bit like that project for the Grange Road underpass. These things get promised; they just do not get delivered.

So, we said to the Prime Minister, 'We believe that we should be doing the entire project'—and guess what? The Prime Minister backed the state Liberal plan to do the entire north-south corridor. Have I received a letter of thanks from those opposite? No. Have I received it, Deputy Speaker? Not a skerrick, not a call, not a note, not an e-mail—nothing.

I feel quite left out, because I put my heart and soul into those negotiations with our Prime Minister to deliver the north-south corridor while those opposite were playing politics on a daily basis through the media saying, 'We don't want the Darlington, we want the Torrens to Torrens.' The state Liberal team was sitting down with the Prime Minister saying, 'We want to do the entire north-south corridor' and that is why we were so pleased—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: So that's why you took it out of your costings and put it as a saving—whoops!

Mr MARSHALL: That, surely, Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, I will have to call him to order.

Mr MARSHALL: So, just for clarity on this, there is a de-escalating warning system. He's on his final warning—what is he going to get next? The next castigation is 'Good morning, minister'—give me a break!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can only read my own writing, and I am definitely going to call to order both the Treasurer and the Minister for Health. They are putting me in a very invidious position.

Mr MARSHALL: Deputy Speaker, I can only presume that these things are cumulative over the entire day, and I would have thought—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, but I can't see anything on this side.

Mr MARSHALL: I commend legibility classes to the Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hang on—it's the bright lights!

Mr MARSHALL: I feel that the best outcome for South Australia was realised. We are going to embark upon the north-south corridor. That is what is good for South Australia. It is going to lift our productivity, and I think it is precisely the sort of project that we should be working on here. It is a pity those opposite wanted to play out the negotiation via the media, which did not deliver anything for South Australia. It is disappointing, but I am glad that the Coalition and the state Liberal Party worked together on this important project.

I tell you, if you need any further evidence, Deputy Speaker, of the inability of this government to work with the Coalition, you only need to look at one piece of evidence, and that is the evidence provided by the total infrastructure funding to South Australia out of the long-term national infrastructure pool. South Australia received \$2 billion out of \$50 billion. That is well below what our state is entitled to. I put it to you, Deputy Speaker, that there is one very simple reason for this, and that is that we do not have a long-range productive infrastructure plan in South Australia. When I came out in the lead up to the election, in fact probably more than—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr Gardner: I think the Speaker has ruled on forced laughter, madam.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The federal Speaker has ruled on infectious laughter, I think. I didn't find that one infectious. I do not want to hear it again, though.

Mr MARSHALL: We do not have a long-range productive infrastructure plan in South Australia; it is disgraceful. The methodology this government has used to allocate our finite capital in this state towards our priority projects is nothing short of appalling. It is based upon marginal seats, electoral cycles, pet projects, and it has not delivered for South Australia. If you need any evidence of that, just take a look at the money we received from the federal budget compared with the other states of Australia. It is appalling, but we had no shovel-ready projects here in South Australia.

In fact, it should be humiliating to those opposite that the federal government had to provide the funding to even do the work for the feasibility study for the two projects. What had the department been doing for such an extended period of time? They have their nice glossy \$36 billion transport plan but no detailed feasibilities on any of the priority projects. What we need in South Australia, as a matter of priority, is an independent statutory authority charged with the responsibility of developing a long-range productive infrastructure plan for this state. We need that over a 25-year period. It needs to be done independently of government so that we can have a plan for our roads, a plan for our ports, and our rail, and our electricity, and our water in South Australia so we can take this productive infrastructure handbrake off our state and start catching up with those who have much better planning regimes than we have in South Australia.

One of the other things I was pleased about in the budget that was handed down was the continuing commitment from the Coalition to abolish the carbon tax and to abolish the mining tax. I know, quite frankly, that in their heart of hearts those opposite—well, most of them—would realise that these two issues are a massive handbrake on our capacity as a state. There is no-one who does not see the very logical relationship between the carbon tax and our extraordinarily high electricity charges in South Australia.

For a government that purports to represent those people who are disadvantaged, those people who are struggling to make ends meet, the most practical thing they can do is to implore their colleagues in Canberra to support the abolition of the carbon tax. This issue was taken to the electorate in the federal general election held in September last year. The people voted: they do not want it. The very least they can do is to change their stance.

The Premier has spoken on many occasions, and he is wedded to the carbon tax. I do not believe for one second that those opposite, who are all hanging their heads at the moment, support it. This is a very important reform that we need, and so is the abolition of the mining tax, which is a

further handbrake on this state's growth. I think this state Labor government should be encouraging their federal colleagues to support the abolition of the Mineral Resources Rent Tax.

One of the most worrying things about this budget from state Labor's perspective is that they did not receive what they thought they were going to receive, that is, the \$333 million contribution to their jobs program. I do not think anybody really believed that it was going to come, but it does raise the issue that we now have a government without a jobs plan for South Australia at a time when we have an extraordinarily high and increasing unemployment rate here in South Australia.

The government abrogated their responsibility to the commonwealth. They said, 'Look, we haven't got any money, so if you give us \$333 million we will have a \$393 million dollar recovery program.' That money has not been included in the budget, so the question that now needs to be put to the government is: what are they going to do to stimulate our economy, to create employment and to keep our young people here in South Australia? We are yet to hear anything. We have heard a lot of protests of, 'This isn't fair,' but we are yet to hear anything from this government about what they are going to do differently.

We took a plan which was not reliant on the federal government but which was self-reliant on the people of South Australia to turn our economy around. We took a plan—in excess of \$250 million worth of initiatives—that we would have put in place to stimulate our economy. It was a combination of important and long overdue tax reform here in South Australia, as well as specific targeted policies and programs to help those areas of our productive capacity in this state to get moving. A big part of that plan, of course, was the regions in South Australia. We were extraordinarily proud of the policy and the commitment in terms of dollars that we took to support the regions in South Australia.

Some cynical people opposite might say, 'That's because the Liberals have a lot of seats in the regions.' I make this point: we did it for one reason and one reason alone—because this state's economy has stopped dead in the water and we believe the regions are a powerhouse of opportunity to get our economy moving. The government, of course, have never had any interest in the regions and were dragged kicking and screaming by the member for Frome to make an investment in the regions, and we welcome that.

We welcome the commitment the government has made to the regions, but it was not something they wanted to do; it was something they were forced to do in their quest to hold on to government. They do not really believe it in their heart. You wait, if they are not reliant on the member for Frome's vote in the future, it will go just like that because they have had plenty of opportunity over 12 long years to show their support for the regions, and we have had nothing.

They are only interested in marginal seat programs. That is in contrast with what we took to the election, and I was very proud to take to the election, that is, we took projects in Hammond, a safe Liberal seat, and in Taylor, a safe Labor seat. Why did we do it? We did it because we knew that was what was best for the state, and we knew that, if we were going to get ourselves out of this mire that Labor had wedged us in after 12 years of economic mismanagement, we needed these sorts of programs. I was buoyed to read in today's *Advertiser*—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: We have had all sorts of funny words coming out of the government today; I will not go into them now. It was an excellent article by Tory Shepherd, and she was talking about the tens of thousands of jobs which are going to come to South Australia as a result of the Coalition's medical research future fund, a \$20 billion fund which the article states is going to be the largest in the world. It goes on to quote the federal Minister for Health the Hon. Peter Dutton:

For SA as the economy transforms, it really is going to provide tens of thousands of jobs directly and indirectly.

He also stated:

SA will be one of the main beneficiaries of the \$20 billion MRF Fund, not just for the next decade, but for decades to come.

This seems to me to be excellent. I have not heard from those opposite who are very proud, and rightly so, to talk about the new SAHMRI building, but you have to have some funds to conduct the

work in the SAHMRI building. There is no point in just having an edifice; there is no point in just having a facade—

Mrs Vlahos: Do you mean an edifice or an Oedipus?

Mr MARSHALL: A facade. I think this will be a great thing for South Australia. It is now over to the government and it will be interesting to see how it conducts this debate. As I said, we do not have a lot of time here in South Australia. The Premier himself, on multiple occasions, has said that we face very challenging times. I would rather refer to the wise words of the member for Frome who said in this house yesterday:

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.

I put it to you, Madam Deputy Speaker, that this motion is really going to slow down the process of the Supply Bill. I can think of no more important legislation at this point in our cycle. We started late this parliamentary year. We started late at the request of the Premier who was overseas at the time. We should have started much earlier in accordance with the draft program that was given to the opposition last year. We did not do that so now it is incumbent upon everybody to work as diligently as we can. We do not need stunts. What we need is a hardworking, diligent, focused parliament—focused on the important work of resurrecting our flagging South Australian economy.

[Sitting extended beyond 17:00 on motion of Hon. J.J. Snelling]

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) (16:53): I rise to support the motion. I just want to first touch on a few matters of debate that the Leader of the Opposition raised. He said in his remarks to the house that the state Liberal Party wanted to do both sides of South Road; they wanted to do the entire corridor, that they were passionate about not only Darlington (because it was a state priority) but also passionate about doing Torrens to Torrens.

However, when they published their costings document during the election campaign and in all public remarks they said they would cancel Torrens to Torrens. I wonder how the Leader of the Opposition can stand up in this place and say he supported Torrens to Torrens when his own candidates in the western suburbs were saying things like:

The Liberal candidate for West Torrens Serge Ambrose said traffic issues along South Road needed to be looked at immediately, and looked at holistically—

These are really great words from the local Liberal candidate in West Torrens. He was really getting fired up about South Road. He continued:

—rather than these piecemeal solutions that the state Labor government was talking about.

It continued:

Mr Ambrose said his party would not commit to funding for Torrens to Torrens.

The Leader of the Opposition took it out of their costing document, showed it as a saving and they will spend money on Darlington, but comes into the parliament today and tells the parliament, 'Oh, no, don't look at my costings document. What I really meant to say was if we had won I would have done both, but forget what I put to the people.'

That does not pass muster. That does not pass a test, and I have to say, if that is the cavalier attitude people have to the parliament, what would they be like as premier? We all know that when the shadow treasurer stood up and did his costings remark a week before the election, in that document it showed a removal of funding from Torrens to Torrens, yet the Leader of the Opposition tells the parliament, 'Oh, no, we were right behind it all along—other than what we published, other than what we said and other than what we campaigned for.' There is a word for that in Greek: it is called hypocrisy. He also talks about GST—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Morialta?

Mr GARDNER: I refer you to previous rulings of previous speakers who have defined—you can sit down, Tom—hypocrisy when referred to by the statements in relation to a single member as being unparliamentary.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes; you may wish to think about withdrawing that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Okay, I withdraw. He misled the public. He misled the public when he said—in the parliament today he said to the public that he supported Torrens to Torrens, other than what he put to the election. I leave members to make their own judgments about what kind of person goes to an election saying one thing and then after the election says, 'I never said that. Don't worry about what I put my name to, it's what I was thinking. It's the vibe; it's the gist.'

In terms of GST impacts, let us go through the GST impacts from the latest federal budget. References to a \$1.4 billion increase in South Australia's GST grants in the commonwealth budget documents include changes to our GST share that are already factored in to the state government forecast. Over a billion dollars of the purported \$1.4 billion gain the Leader of the Opposition speaks of to South Australia over the four years to 2016-17, based on commonwealth budget predictions, will not flow to the South Australian budget.

This is because the increase in the commonwealth is now projecting for South Australia's relativity from 2015-16 has already been incorporated in our government estimates for some time. Of course, if you read the state budget forecast you would know that, but of course you did not. For example, since the estimates for GST grants in 2016-17 were first published, the South Australian government has been consistently projecting that South Australia's 2016-17 GST grant would be over 9.5 per cent, whereas up until the 2014-15 budget the commonwealth has been projecting that South Australia's GST grant share in 2016-17 would fall below 8.6 per cent, and 8.54 per cent in the 2013-14 MYEFO.

But of course, in the 2014 budget, the commonwealth revised up South Australia's projected GST grant share in 2016-17 from 8.54 per cent to 9.43 per cent—an improvement of \$540 million, compared to the government's previous estimates. We were right, they were wrong! State treasurers and state leaders should use the South Australian budget papers to make a point. It is a far cry from the \$1.4 billion claimed by the Leader of the Opposition, and if he wants to talk about humiliating, that is humiliating. It is humiliating that the man who purports to be our Leader of the Opposition and the alternative premier of this state cannot get it right.

Let us be clear about what he basically said today in his remarks to the parliament: he supports this commonwealth budget. I did not hear him once say that Liberal senators should vote against these measures, remembering that the Senate is the states' house, and that the South Australian Liberal Party sends representatives to that senate on their behalf, and that their votes impact on South Australia. So, \$898 million of commonwealth reduced funding measures across the forward estimates—\$898 million. It is the equivalent, as the Premier said, of losing 600 beds in four years' time in the health system, or equates to around 43 per cent of all the hospital beds in regional South Australia. So the people who elected the members for Grey, Barker and Mayo, all those Liberal senators, perhaps regional members in this house, could raise their voice in opposition for once to their own colleagues.

Campbell Newman has shown what it takes to lead a state, because he puts his state first and his party second. Mike Baird is showing what state leadership is about by putting his party second and his state first. Our Premier always puts his state first and his party second, and that is a test of leadership and a test that the Leader of the Opposition and the opposition fail. I have not heard them once say, 'Do not pass this budget, Prime Minister.'

Treasurer Joe Hockey was in town today. He was in Adelaide. I wonder if the Leader of the Opposition took the time to meet with him and, if he did meet with him, I wonder if he raised opposition to the commonwealth budget. All I saw on Twitter on budget night was applause for the budget from the Leader of the Opposition; indeed, he scurried out to give a comment to TV very late on the day after the budget to condemn some aspects of the budget because he was the only Liberal left in the country.

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, I don't think he condemned it: he just said, 'This might not be nice.'

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: He wrote them a nasty letter.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's right. He was so outraged he fired off a letter! He fired off a letter—and no-one has seen that letter, mind you. The Premier has made all his remarks about the Prime Minister public. The Premier is working with Liberal leaders around the country to try to bring some common sense to the budget.

The Premier spoke in his remarks about this fix that was in place had Labor lost the election. Imagine Australia with wall-to-wall Liberal governments in the aftermath of this budget. The tactic in this budget is clear: starve the states, starve them, hit them where they cannot possibly make up their revenue, and then they will come to us on their knees begging for GST reform. The last prime minister to attempt to GST reform, and be successful with it, was one John Winston Howard. He always knew, as did his treasurer, that the way you do tax reform is by spending money, not by starving people.

I think what he has done is callous, cruel and not in the best interests of the commonwealth or the federation, because no state premier, no state government, could possibly sign up to any tax reform—nor should they—that creates inequity and worsens the cost of living for ordinary South Australians on the basis of another government shirking its agreements, walking away from agreements, creating what I think is sovereign risk. If they had done this to anyone else, there would be court action.

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, yes, of course, there is the issue of private schools. So the Liberal Party has to take a long, hard look at itself. I cannot believe I am going to utter these words, but Cory Bernardi is right. Cory Bernardi has condemned this budget. He does not understand it, and he is number one on the Liberal Party's Senate ticket. In fact, he is held in such high regard within the Liberal Party that he was the man they put as number one on their Senate ticket. That is how highly they regard Cory Bernardi.

He thinks this budget has gone too far. He does not understand it, but I have not heard that from anyone else in the Liberal Party. Cory Bernardi is prepared to speak up. I often hear from Liberal members opposite, 'We are a party of ideas. We do not silence dissent. We allow 1,000 flowers to bloom. We are all out there talking about our ideas.' Of course, none of them are prepared to stand up to the Prime Minister and say that this is a bad budget for the country, other than Liberal premiers in other states.

You have to ask yourself: what kind of opposition cannot stand up for its own state? I will tell you what kind of opposition. One that has lost four elections in a row. Perhaps that is the reason they keep on losing, because they look inwards rather than outwards. They do not govern for the majority: they govern for a minority because, when they purport to put out policies to the public, they are targeted to a small group of people, their own constituencies, their own donors. They do not look beyond the horizon to look at people who need their assistance.

They put as their leader a man who says, 'I have no interest in social policies. I am not interested in health. I am not interested in education. I'm just not interested. I just want to cut taxes for my friends because I am from business.' That is just great; that is just dandy. What about our hospitals? What about our schools? What about our roads? What about the infrastructure we need to build our economy? What about some responsibility rather than blaming everyone else?

Then, to attack the pensioners—the people who grew this state, the people who built this state, the people to whom we owe a debt of gratitude. They do not owe us anything. They are the ones who built the factories, who built the roads and they are the ones who built the hospitals.

Picture the Australia Tony Abbott and Steven Marshall envisage. There has been a bargain in this country that pensions have been linked to wage growth. Why? We are an egalitarian country, because we want our pensioners not to be left behind—and they should not be left behind. They fought the wars, they grew our economy and they should be looked after.

This Prime Minister and this opposition leader support pensions being linked to CPI. On the face of it they think, 'Who could argue against that?' We all know wages grow faster than CPI, so what happens over a period of time? A whole generation of people who are on the pension—and the divide will grow more and more. We will then have what occurs in other countries: underclasses of people. That is the future that Tony Abbott and the Liberal Party want for our country.

Winning the last election in South Australia is probably the most important thing to have occurred in the last four years in this country, because there is a voice to stand up to those sorts of changes. I said it yesterday and I will say it again: former premier Dunstan said that the lights had gone out across the country in 1975 but a light flickered in this state, and that flicker would light the nation.

Our Premier is going to lead that fight against the very excesses that all of you have deep down in your DNA and that you believe in—survival of the fittest. Can't afford it? Bad luck. Pay. You are old; you are sick; you send your kids to school—tough. 'I'm a millionaire, why aren't you? I've made it in business, why haven't you? You want more wages? Bad luck! Productivity is not about improving operations, it is about wages and wages only.' I have to say this is the cruellest and most unfair budget I have ever seen.

The Liberal Party has to ask itself—after having lost the fourth election in a row—whether it can keep on toeing its own party line, whether it actually stands for anything, and whether it believes in anything, and this is its opportunity. Do you know what leader of the opposition Jay Weatherill or leader of the opposition Mike Rann would have done in this situation? He would have been standing next to premier Marshall condemning these cuts.

We would have flown to Canberra and demanded that our colleagues do all they can to try and stop these changes—hand in hand—but not our Leader of the Opposition, the only Liberal in the country who had to be brought kicking and screaming to condemn this budget, but deep down this is exactly what he believes. In fact, I bet you he thinks the cut in the company tax rate is the best thing in this budget and the \$80 billion cut to health and education—well, that is inevitable; that is someone else's responsibility.

'Let them go to private hospitals; let them get private health insurance; send your kids to private schools. Why have public education? Why don't we just reduce it all to a service provision? We will just pay people a subsidy and they can choose what private school they go to—any one of them: Pembroke, Pulteney, St Peter's, PAC—any of those four will be fine. If you have a girl, maybe Wilderness or Scotch.'

We believe in building an equitable country and an equitable state, and our promise is to govern for all South Australians. Our Premier will lead the fight, because he needs to lead the fight. There needs to be an alternative voice and there needs to be someone standing up in the dark and saying, 'This is wrong' and 'This is unfair'. That is what this government will do. We will shine a light on what they are attempting to do, and the opposition should join us rather than fight us on this, because it is for the benefit of all South Australians.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (17:09): I was astounded to hear the Leader of the Opposition come in here today and start his speech by saying that we should not be playing politics with this debate on this federal budget and that he would be the only speaker on their side to speak on this debate. I think that goes to the heart of what this Liberal opposition is all about. They have been—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order, member for Morialta?

Mr GARDNER: The education minister is verballing the Leader of the Opposition, who clearly said that we should be debating the Supply Bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What point of order is that?

Mr GARDNER: One of them, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: So there is no point of order.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: That is really cute coming from the great artists of verballing. We heard that yesterday in here in question time, and we saw an apology have to come into this chamber this morning because they—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: What point of order would you like to raise?

Mr GARDNER: It is 128: irrelevance.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, now we do need to hear what she is leading into. I know she is leading into something.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. This is a small-target strategy—so small that when we are facing the biggest crisis in South Australia, as a result of federal government cuts, we get one speaker from the opposition. The benches are empty—it is outrageous. They did not stand up to Tony Abbott and Christopher Pyne during the election campaign. They did not stand up to them when they were flagging what they were going to do.

Maybe the outrage of our school communities might give them some spine, when they see the schools in their electorates coming to talk to them about funds that are not going to be made available for their children—children who need help, children who need assistance. They come in here and bash the public education system day after day after day, but do they stand up for it ever? Do they ever come in here and talk about providing resources to ensure our kids can be the best they can be? Joe Hockey is talking about needing to restore the economy. There cannot be a bigger investment in the economy than our children.

I cannot imagine what it would be like to be a young person facing the cuts in this budget. Tony Abbott keeps repeating that young people must be either earning or learning, but because of the budget cuts he has made it is difficult to see how any of the young people can do either of these. Imagine facing six months with no income. Gee whiz, that is going to help you learn! That is going to help you earn! There is no support to help you get out and find a job, no support to help you get the skills you need, you are just on your own. You are cut off for six months. Do we hear anything about that? No, we do not. So, there is less support to stay in school and no support for six months for those who leave.

It is not just individuals who are suffering under this budget. Under Tony Abbott's cuts, schools and hospitals across South Australia will be \$5.5 billion worse off over 10 years. I am going to keep saying that number over and over again until the people of South Australia understand—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Morialta has a point of order.

Mr GARDNER: No. 128: it is against standing orders to indulge in repetition.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: She is moving on.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Madam Deputy Speaker, I just said I will keep repeating the number; I did not actually repeat the number.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: But I will repeat it: \$5.5 billion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you won't. You are just going to move on.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Over \$30 billion in federal funding will be ripped out of schools across the nation over the next decade—\$30 billion. If you are thinking about undertaking higher education, forget it. The Liberals have put the stoppers on that as well by effectively privatising higher education and pushing us towards a US style, where only the wealthy can afford tertiary studies. Universities will be able to set their own fees, which will drive up the costs of some of the courses and make university entrance for disadvantaged students even harder.

When I left school, going to university was not an option. I left school at 15. I had to go to work. It was not an option to go to university. That was for rich kids, and that is what this federal government wants to take Australia back to. They plan to decrease the government's contribution towards course fees, which is currently 59 per cent, by an average of 20 per cent, so students will have to pay more out of their own pockets.

Not only will students have to pay more but they will also have to start repaying their HECS-HELP debt earlier, and they will be hit with higher interest rates, which could be as much as 6 per cent. That is Christopher Pyne's version of helping disadvantaged people get an education they need. At every turn, the Liberals are making higher education more unattainable for Australia's young people. A generation of politicians who were the beneficiaries of free university education are now putting a university degree out of the reach of many young people across the country.

But perhaps what is most appalling is that the Liberal Party has gone back on its commitment to honour the Gonski agreement: \$320 million that would have come into schools in South Australia will no longer come into our schools. It is a cynical example of government that promised anything to get elected and immediately went back on its word. A government that cannot be trusted cannot be trusted with the education of our children. At the very first meeting I went to with Christopher Pyne and other state ministers of education, Christopher Pyne flagged that he would only fund one year of the Gonski agreement—one year—sending our schools into absolute turmoil.

There was outrage by the ministers, so eventually we got a four-year agreement, but do you know what? He was also saying, 'Well, come on in, Western Australia. Come on in, Queensland. Come on in, Northern Territory. You can dip your fingers in the bucket of money that's been provided to the states that have already signed up.' Not only was he going to commit to only one year but he was going to give access to the funding that had been committed to the states that signed up and share it out amongst other states as well. We now know that they have signed up to an agreement which does not mean they cannot withdraw funding out of their education budgets. It is a really nice cosy deal: the federal government put some money in for their mates and they can rip it out the other end.

The cuts that we look like facing in South Australia equate to approximately \$1,200 per student across 2018-19, or nearly 3,000 teachers—3,000 teachers. Imagine the difference that would make. Christopher Pyne said that Gonski was a blue-sky promise from the former Labor government. I say to Mr Pyne that there is nothing blue-sky about our six-year agreement. I would issue a word of warning to any state or territory minister who is contemplating entering into any contract with the Abbott Liberal government.

Joe Hockey said that the Gonski funding was a bonus. A well-resourced education system is not a bonus: it is a necessity. It is a fundamental right and it is the best investment any government can make. Mr David Gonski AC, a widely respected businessman, led the review into school funding. He is not exactly someone who could be described as a radical. Last night in a speech in Melbourne, Mr Gonski criticised the Abbott government's cuts to school funding in 2018-19. He said:

There needs to be a commitment to a properly funded needs-based aspirational system and a failure to do so will be to our detriment

He warned:

If the funding is wrong in 2017 it will be perpetuated and if circumstances and aspirations change after that date they will be presumably irrelevant.

The effect of Tony Abbott and Christopher Pyne's \$320 million cuts to South Australia's schools is to shatter the aspirations of students from 2017 onwards. At every turn the Liberals are undermining the right of our children to a world-class education.

And that is not all. The National Partnership Agreement on Indigenous Early Childhood Development to close the gap has been terminated. In South Australia, we have built four children and family centres with a focus on improving the enrolment of Aboriginal children and their attendance at preschool and it has been a great success. We have achieved that in Ceduna, in Whyalla, in Christies Beach and on the APY lands.

Not only has this provided vital education programs for young children, they provide parenting and family support and community development activities, programs such as community playgroups, occasional care, and even cooking programs where fathers learn to cook together with their children—all of these now compromised.

I will never forget attending the opening of the centre at Christies Beach. We had Karl Telfer there to do the smoking dance—a very nice-looking, strong, proud Aboriginal man. He invited the four year olds to dance around the fire with him. One little boy took up the offer—a little Anglo boy—and what a vision, to see a strong Aboriginal man do his dance and the little white boy dance with him. That is what we want. We want Aboriginal children to come out of these centres being proud of their culture, proud of themselves and on their way to a good education. The heart of that program has been terminated by Tony Abbott.

Christopher Pyne said the states are sovereign governments and that we should run the schools. If he really means that, then his position is surely redundant and he should immediately offer himself up as a budget saving. We no longer need a federal Minister for Education, yet at every

turn he tries to insert himself into every school gate around Australia, dictating how they operate. After the abysmal week he has had, and we have heard the talk of the nasty words he said in parliament, directing the supposedly impartial Speaker of the House to quell applause for the opposition leader's budget in reply, I am sure it is a cut the public of Australia could live with.

It really is time our state Liberals stood up to this federal Liberal government, who have absolutely no conscience. You cannot, after your disastrous election result, continue to play the small target strategy. It did not work then and it will not work for you in the future.

Mr GARDNER: Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: A quorum not being present, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I thank the member for Morialta for ensuring I had a greater audience to hear some of these figures. As I was saying, the Liberal opposition played the small target strategy. They essentially lost the unlosable election. They had some seats that were essentially gifted to them and they still could not pick them up, and, I have to say, Ashford was probably one of them. They needed a 0.6 per cent swing to pick up the seat of Ashford and I understand the campaign, pretty much run by the member for Unley—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have a point of order, member for Morialta?

Mr GARDNER: Standing order 128 again—irrelevance.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I'll listen as the minister proceeds.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I want to congratulate the member for Ashford; she had a 1.3 per cent swing to her. When you are in opposition and you are coming up against a government seeking a fourth term, you are in a pretty good position. You think perhaps you have got the ear of the public. You think that it is understandable that sitting members on the government side, or ministers, might suffer a swing; but it is unbelievable that in this last election it was opposition members that had swings against them. There were swings in Dunstan, swings in Adelaide, swings in Unley (2.2 per cent in Unley, 2.9 per cent in Davenport), Heysen, Kavel, Hammond, Bragg, compared to a 3.5 per cent swing to Labor in the Labor-held seat of Croydon. Croydon is now a stronger Labor than Bragg is Liberal. So it really is time—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Morialta has a point of order.

Mr GARDNER: The Premier has decided that it is more important than the Supply Bill that 'this house calls on the commonwealth government to reverse measures' etc., in this motion, and the Deputy Speaker is going absolutely nowhere near it; 128.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It has to be connected somehow so we are going to give you just a moment to connect it.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. It really is important that we have a Liberal opposition in this state that is prepared to stand up for South Australia and stand up to the federal government. It just goes to show the calibre of the opposition that only one person is prepared to speak on this motion. You are not prepared to stand up, you are not prepared to stand up to Tony Abbott, and you are not prepared to stand up to the leader's mentor, Christopher Pyne.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is now standing to raise a point of order.

Mr GARDNER: The minister's grievously reflecting on you, and I think you should seek her to desist.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I don't feel under any pressure. Have you finished your comments? The minister is winding up?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker, yes. I was saying it really is time the leader stood up to Tony Abbott and stood up to his mentor, Christopher Pyne—his mentor. Come on, guys! Stand up for South Australia, stand up for kids in South Australia, stand up for the families in South Australia, and stand up for our schools! They are in your electorates as well.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

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) (17:27): Madam Deputy Speaker, why is the Liberal leader in this state unable—completely unable—to do what every other Liberal leader in the country has been happy to do; and that is, unequivocally condemn this federal budget. We have had Mike Baird, we have had Denis Naphine, we have had Will Hodgman; we have had them all. The Liberal premiers have lined up and in solidarity condemned the cuts to health and education as a part of this federal budget.

But, what do we see from the Leader of the Opposition? The Leader of the Opposition thinks that \$8 billion torn out of the state's health agreement over a 10-year period is not that important. Leader of the Opposition, 'No, that's not that important.' Cut \$600 million out of the health budget in the next four years for South Australia, 'No, not that important,' says the Leader of the Opposition in this state. What is it? What is different about the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of the Liberal Party, in South Australia compared to the leaders of the Liberal Party in every other state in the country? Well, I will tell you what's different. The Leader of the Opposition here is a lickspittle—a lickspittle.

Mr GARDNER: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Just in case any members missed what I said, the Leader of the Opposition in South Australia is a lickspittle to the Prime Minister in a way that his Liberal Party colleagues in every other state in the country are not. The Leader of the Opposition said, 'This is not really a problem. What is all the bother about? Why are we debating a motion on federal cuts to South Australia?' I can tell the Leader of the Opposition why.

Mr Gardner: As opposed to your office's advice.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I know that the member for Morialta is very upset because his great mentor, the member for Sturt, Christopher Pyne, has not been doing too well lately, and I know the member for Morialta is deeply affected, but it nonetheless remains the case that the federal government is cutting \$600 million from the health budget over the next four years. To hear Tony Abbott say that this is not something that will affect state budgets over the forward estimates just shows his complete ignorance of state budgets—\$600 million.

In the 2017-18 financial year, South Australia will have \$270 million less compared to what it would have had if the commonwealth government had abided by its commitments and kept the National Health Reform Agreement—\$270 million. That equates to just under 600 hospital beds, roughly the size of the Flinders—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will speak to the whip.

Mr GARDNER: I realise the member for Torrens is new, but the ruling is—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will speak to the whip. Thank you. The Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: They do not like to hear it—

Mr GARDNER: Can I seek clarity on your ruling, Deputy Speaker, because—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not yet.

Mr GARDNER: —the ruling previously has been not only that flashes are not to be used but also—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will speak to the Speaker.

Mr GARDNER: —that cameras are not to be used in the chamber. Indulgence has been granted during maiden speeches, but we are a long way past that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will speak to the Speaker for you and I will speak to the whip. The Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Six hundred beds is the equivalent of closing the Flinders Medical Centre. The Flinders Medical Centre also has just under 600 beds. I can only begin to imagine what that is going to mean for our public hospitals, to remove in the order of 600 beds. Joe Hockey and Tony Abbott said recently that the states had been at the honeypot.

I issue a challenge to Joe Hockey—in fact, I issue a challenge to any member opposite: come with me and spend a night in one of our emergency departments. Come and spend a Saturday night at the Royal Adelaide Hospital emergency department. Come and spend a day—particularly a Monday—at the Flinders Medical Centre. Come and spend a day and come and tell the doctors and nurses who work their guts out in those emergency departments that they have been at the honeypot too long.

What a complete show of ignorance from the federal colleagues of members opposite! The fact that members opposite will not rise to support this motion—they sit there in stunned silence—just goes to show the absolute lack of courage that we see in the South Australian Liberal Party. It is a lack of courage that is not seen in Liberal Party branches interstate, where Liberal premiers are willing to stand up and put their states first and put their state before their party.

There is one other matter that I will briefly raise as part of this motion on the federal budget, and that is the \$7 co-payment, which Joe Hockey has compared to a couple of middies of beer. A couple of middies of beer do cost significantly more than \$7, I can assure the house—we would call them a schooner here in South Australia but—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: A pot in Victoria.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: And a pot in Victoria, the whip informs me. Nonetheless, \$7. Seven dollars might not be very much to Joe Hockey—in fact, it might not be very much to me, but I can assure the house that if you have a chronic illness and you have to see the doctor regularly, or if you have a family where a couple of kids have a chronic illness and you are constantly visiting the GP or having to take the kids to specialists, or getting blood tests or x-rays, that \$7 quickly mounts up.

Now, the Leader of the Opposition said, 'Oh, we should be grateful because all this money will go to medical research', and that we have the SAHMRI, and so on. Well, what the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: And here we see the same ignorance paraded before the chamber by the member for Morialta, exactly the same ignorance we have seen from the Leader of the Opposition this afternoon. Go to any medical researcher in Australia and ask, 'Do you want your research being funded from the chronically ill, from the elderly and from families with sick kids?'. I can assure the house that any medical researcher in Australia will say that we do not want our research funded by the frail, by the sick, by the elderly, by families with kids—this should be core business of government. This should not be something that is funded by a tax on the most vulnerable in society.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is interesting to hear the member for Chaffey support this tax on the frail, the elderly, on families with kids.

Mr GARDNER: On a point of order, standing order 128 to start with, that it is irrelevant, and further, the health minister is verballing the member for Chaffey.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is right beside you. If he has a problem, he can stand up, can't he? He is in his place now and I would like to know what is his problem.

Mr WHETSTONE: Standing order 127, Madam Deputy Speaker—I do take offence.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I favour standing order 75; I want to arrest you.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, he's being frivolous—it could cost you \$50, just be very careful. We are going to listen very carefully—we are not sure there was a personal reflection and we will ask the Minister for Health to be very careful.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I will be, as always, Madam Deputy Speaker, but I will not be silenced by members opposite, because I know they do not want to hear this. I know that they do not want South Australia's to hear the truth about their gutlessness, complete utter gutlessness in that they will not stand up for South Australia.

Mr GARDNER: I take offence at that, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am sorry, I was giving instructions to the whip—what happened?

Mr GARDNER: I take offence to the words used by the Minister for Health.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The advice I have is that the term was used more broadly than to you in the personal.

Mr GARDNER: Thank you, I am glad that it doesn't refer to me.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister for Health. We need to be very focused on the debate, I think. It is late in the day, I know, but it would be nice to have everybody working together.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Order, member for Chaffey! It would be nice to be able to finish the day on a good note.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. You are already on a warning and two ticks.

Mr Gardner: Why do you read his warning but not theirs?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Because it is right in the middle of the page, as it turns out! Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The motion should be supported. This is a shocking budget. Never before in Australian history has the commonwealth government unilaterally reneged on solemn undertakings given to the states. These changes will mean a complete withdrawal of the commonwealth government from funding public hospitals in this state, a complete abdication of the commonwealth government's responsibilities to help share the load of hospital funding, not only with South Australia but with all the states. It is something that every Liberal leader around the country has acknowledged, but somehow the Leader of the Opposition and members opposite have shown a complete lack of ability to put their state before their party.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Would the member like the call? If the member does not want the call, if I see his lips move again, he will be out. Yes, I know it is not much. If the Premier speaks he closes the debate, which means the member for Chaffey would be unable to speak. Is he clear about the consequences? The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (17:40): Thank you, sir. I will not traverse all the contributions that have been made up to this point, except to really correct one observation that was made by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the South Road project. We do, of course, welcome the federal government's contribution to the South Road project. Properly understood, though, I think considered as a whole the budget robs as much money from infrastructure as it puts in.

I think that was amply demonstrated by the shadow infrastructure minister (the member for Grayndler), when he was able to effectively demonstrate that the federal government, through the shifting of moneys around the place, has not actually made a net additional contribution to infrastructure. Nevertheless, South Australia has been a modest beneficiary of some additional

infrastructure funding. It also has had to suffer, of course, the cuts in the Tonsley Park urban rail project and of course the cuts to the Salisbury rail line project. So, in net terms there is not an enormous benefit, but nevertheless we do welcome that project.

I do need to correct a bit of contemporary history lest the Leader of the Opposition's recitation become regarded as factual. The truth is that shortly after the Prime Minister was elected we had a conversation on the telephone, and one of the topics raised was, of course, South Road because it was an issue of great importance. We had already started on the Torrens to Torrens section, and the federal election campaign amounted essentially to a cessation of that project and the commencement of Darlington.

We put the proposition to the Prime Minister that we should in fact do both projects. I was content when the Prime Minister came to town a few weeks later and stood up and said, 'I was speaking to my good friend the Leader of the Opposition, and he said to me, "Tony, why don't we do both?"' and he said, 'I think that's a great idea.' I was content to listen to that and allow the Leader of the Opposition to take the credit because I thought it was all to the best for South Australia if we get this project.

However, lest there be any confusion about the order of these things, we were talking to the Prime Minister about the very thing the Leader of the Opposition is now seeking to take credit for. I must say that it is a little hard to understand their point when they seek to rely upon a saving for the removal of some of our contributions to these road projects in their own budget costings. Nevertheless, the happy conclusion is that we are able to progress both the South Road Torrens to Torrens and the Darlington projects, and we will get busy on doing those two projects, which are two very important projects for the future of our state.

I commend the contributions of the house, and I look forward to strongly advocating on behalf of the people of South Australia for a reversal of these cuts.

Motion carried.

Bills

SUCCESSION TO THE CROWN (REQUEST) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SUPPLY BILL 2014

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 May 2014.)

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (17:45): I am very pleased to support this Supply Bill. It is a very important piece of legislation before this parliament which enables all the running of government. In particular, I would like to highlight one aspect of the running of government which is very important, that is, public hospitals in South Australia. We have all had experience with public hospitals in this state, and they do a fantastic array of work. However, this support is being fundamentally undermined at the moment, something that this parliament needs to pay very close attention to and should be very concerned about.

As we saw in last week's federal budget, this Liberal government in Canberra has decided to take an axe to funding to public hospitals. It has made changes to our health arrangements in such a wide array of areas that it is difficult to grasp the enormity of what is at stake. It includes the GP tax, cuts to the PBS, cuts to specialist visits, and cuts to preventive health, but it is the cuts to hospitals which really put at risk so much of what we do as a South Australian government and what this parliament should be taking care of. It really strikes at the heart of the basis of our federation.

In 2011, COAG agreed to some landmark health reform. All the states and territories signed up to that health reform, and what that guaranteed to states and territories was an extra \$19.8 billion which would go to public hospitals to 2019-20. Up until 2029-30, it was going to represent an extra \$175 billion for our hospitals. The remarkable thing about this health agreement was that for the first time the commonwealth would actually partner with the states in terms of funding hospitals for each

service. It would not just be a block grant for services, where there was a cheque for a certain amount that had no correlation with how many people actually needed treatment for cancer or for mental health or any other range of services.

For the first time, we would actually look at how many services were provided and what the cost of those services were, and the commonwealth would provide a share of that funding on that basis. That means that hospital services could grow together with the demand for those services and, as the population ages, there would be more funding for elective surgery, more funding for emergency treatments, as required. Members may have heard Tony Abbott, our Prime Minister, say in the media that there was no guarantee that this agreement would be continued in the future, in the out years. Even as late as this week, he said to David Penberthy on FIVEaa:

...we also said David, before the election, that yes we would honour the Rudd/Gillard deals on schools and hospitals for the first four years but we weren't going to be bound in the out years...

So, he said, 'Look, for four years we are going to commit to this but not in the out years.' Well, that is complete rubbish. Before the election the Liberal Party, in their document 'The Coalition's policy to support Australia's health system', explicitly said that it would:

...support the transition to the Commonwealth providing 50 per cent growth funding of the efficient price of hospital services as proposed.

It even boasted:

But only the Coalition has the economic record to be able to deliver.

Not only did they promise that they would match the agreement that was set out and agreed between the commonwealth and all the states but they boasted that they would be the ones who would be able to deliver.

What we have now seen is that agreement being completely kyboshed, thrown out within months of them coming to government. I think that really strikes at the core of the ability of the commonwealth and the states to strike agreements and to have confidence that each other will continue to meet their side of the agreement in the future.

In the past 20 or 30 years, there has always been a process with COAG of the states and commonwealth getting together. There has been give and take and argy-bargy, but at the end of the day there has been consensus agreements reached between the commonwealth and the states, between Labor and Liberal. What has now happened is you have the commonwealth unilaterally tearing up those agreements. They did not say, 'Let's go back to COAG; let's try and renegotiate a new agreement,' they just said, 'We will rip up this agreement and we will replace it with absolutely nothing, and there is no extra funding.' Essentially, the commonwealth has taken the approach that issues like the future of public hospitals are no longer issues of national importance that should be agreed through COAG, and they are no longer things that the commonwealth should be trying to assist with.

There were also agreements in terms of extra subacute beds and improvements for emergency departments and elective surgery, which had targets for states to reach, and if those states reached those targets then there was reward funding available for the states. It was an incentive that the commonwealth had put in place to say to the states, 'We want to see improvements in public hospitals.' The states agreed to that and took a wide range of improvements setting up a number of programs to improve public hospital performance. We have seen in South Australia huge improvements in elective surgery waiting times and also in emergency department waiting times. In fact, we are one of the best performing states at the moment.

But now, the federal Liberal government has said the reward funding that would be due to come to our state is going to be ripped up and made to disappear. I think that also adds to the ability for states to say, 'Well, how can we ever trust the commonwealth again?' If they are going to have such an agreement, we do all the hard work to meet the targets, and then the reward funding that was meant to come to the states is not there anymore. How can that trust continue?

Funding the running of a hospital is not like funding the running of a museum, a gallery or an office. With a static service, you can simply increase the payments on the basis of inflation, but with hospitals you have got hugely fluid costs that are determined on the number of people as patients who come through the door for services.

As everyone, including Tony Abbott, should know, the number of people requiring treatment is going to increase rapidly over coming years. As those extra patients come into emergency departments, there is going to be no extra funding from the commonwealth to cover those patients. They are only covering the patients that are there at the moment and adjusting that for inflation. There is not going to be any extra funding to account for more and more patients, and more patients who need extra services as the population gets older.

There is no shortage of expert advice on the future challenges for our health system and what needs to be done to address them. Nationally, we had the National Health and Hospitals Reform Commission give us a report, or a blueprint, on what needed to be done to fix our health system, and in South Australia we had a generational health review that did a similar thing. The overriding focus of both those reports is that governments needed to invest more money in preventing illness and treating illness early to prevent expensive and invasive hospital visits and procedures.

What we have seen in this budget is that not only is the commonwealth shirking its responsibility in terms of primary care and preventative health, they are cutting preventative health programs, both that they deliver and the states deliver. They are also cutting primary health care through Medicare Locals and through the GP tax; we have already seen GP clinics say that patients are staying away from getting the treatment that they need because they are worried about the impact of this tax, which has not even come into existence yet.

All of that is going to place extra pressure on hospitals, and at the same time, the state has less ability to fund the extra hospital presentations, so there is going to be more pressure on us to not fund primary health care and preventative health care programs as well. So we see a complete reversal of all the expert advice that the focus of the system should be on the primary and preventative end, and the state is going to have to focus what scarce resources we have on our acute system—on the last line of defence in emergency departments.

Under this agreement between the commonwealth and the states that the Abbott government has scrapped there was protection for rural and regional hospitals built into the agreement. That was that these hospitals would receive block funding to account for their low volumes that they would not fare by themselves well under activity-based funding alone. That means that while the busy metropolitan hospitals were getting funded on the basis of the number of patients that were coming in, regional hospitals could be sure that their funding would be secure in block-funded grants.

Because the volume funding for the larger hospitals is being wound back and scrapped by the Abbott government, that is going to place additional pressure on regional hospitals that have a low volume because the state is going to have to deal with all the patients that are coming into the larger, metropolitan hospitals, and regional hospitals are going to be squeezed, inevitably, out of the arrangement. I note the presence in the chamber of the Minister for Regional Affairs and I know he will be concerned as well about the impact that this will have on hospitals in his electorate if these cuts come through from Canberra. So we are going to see a massive squeeze there.

The cuts contained in this federal budget will hit South Australian public hospitals very hard. At the moment we have short waiting times in emergency treatment and elective surgery. The ability for us to continue those short waiting times is going to be very difficult with this funding cut. Anybody who you can talk to in the running of public hospitals will tell you that the easiest way to turn off the tap of funding is to increase waiting lists. You do not schedule as many elective surgery sessions as you otherwise would, and you force people into long waiting lists. For instance, we saw when the commonwealth under the Howard government cut the commonwealth dental health scheme that waiting lists in South Australia ballooned out to 49 months, a massive period of time for somebody to wait to get their teeth checked, and they are taking the same approach now with not caring about what waiting lists are going to be like in public hospitals.

The Hon. G.G. Brock: They might be dead by then.

Mr PICTON: The minister says he might be dead by then. I definitely do not think you would be.

The Hon. G.G. Brock interjecting:

Mr PICTON: Oh, other people would be—that's right. If you need cancer treatment or if you need some sort of very urgent care, it needs to be within days. You cannot wait months, you cannot

wait years. I think now our waiting lists for urgent elective surgery cases on average is eleven days in South Australia, which I think is an excellent achievement by our health system, but the ability for us to keep that low waiting time with this funding cut is going to be very difficult to maintain, and the cuts are huge in terms of over \$600 million impact to our hospitals over four years.

We have heard the Prime Minister and the Treasurer say that it is all in the out years, but that is not correct because there is a \$55 million impact in this coming financial year starting 1 July. The next year after that it is \$112 million and the year after that \$168 million, rising to 2017-18 when the impact will be \$269 million, which is a massive impact for our hospital system, and it will only grow and grow after that.

We know that it will hit people who are poorest the hardest, because people who are poor cannot afford private health insurance, they cannot afford to get the best specialist doctors to treat them, and they cannot afford to skip the public waiting list lines that will be necessitated because of this cut. We have seen with some of the people on the other side of this house that none of them have come out to criticise the Abbott budget cuts to our hospitals, and they seem to be trying to promote this argument, and we are starting to see how they are going to respond to the budget cuts.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order from the member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr PICTON: I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

At 18:00 the house adjourned until Tuesday 3 June 2014 at 11:00.