

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 8 May 2014

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. R.P. Wortley)** took the chair at 14:16 and read prayers.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Park Lands Lease Agreement Between the Corporation of the City of Adelaide and the Minister for Education and Child Development

By the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills (Hon. G.E. Gago)—

Minister's Response to the Recommendations made in the 15th Report of the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation

By the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation (Hon. I.K. Hunter)—

Reports, 2012-13—
National Environment Protection Council
South Australian-Victorian Border Groundwaters Agreement Review Committee

By the Minister for Water and the River Murray (Hon. I.K. Hunter)—

Murray-Darling Basin Authority—Report, 2012-13
Water Industry Act 2012—Plumbing Standard—Technical Regulator

Question Time

FOOD HUB

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, and the Minister for Science and Information Economy, a question about the high-value food manufacturing centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: In last year's budget, under the then department of further education, employment and science technology one of the government's initiatives was to provide \$1.1 million per annum indexed, phased in from this financial year, to establish a high-value food manufacturing centre. It stated:

The centre will build a collaborative partnership between industry, government, universities and researchers that concentrates resources on the key issues facing the food manufacturing industry. The centre will focus on processes that add value to our produce, to support increased export of our food and produce.

My questions to the minister are:

1. Can she provide an update as to the status of this high-value food manufacturing centre?

2. Given that in his speech on Tuesday, the Governor said that the Department of Primary Industries and Regions will take responsibility for food manufacturing, which will allow the department to focus on the entire supply chain from paddock to plate, has this program been shifted into Primary Industries and Regions or is it still in her agency?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:20): I thank the honourable member for his questions. In terms of the advanced food manufacturing grants program, called—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: It's a centre, not a grants program. It's a centre.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Yes, that's right. There were applications. There were calls on 2 April 2014 to support projects that will result in the assistance of commercialisation of research, resulting in new and improved food products or manufacturing processes. A Food Hub advisory group made up of food manufacturing industry experts will be established to provide project advice and strategic direction to the Food Hub.

The high-value food manufacturing centre (the Food Hub) was announced as a \$4.5 million project over four years as part of our 2013-14 state budget. The Food Hub will focus on problem-solving services and innovation support to increase productivity and export capability of small to medium enterprise food manufacturers.

Progress to date includes appointing a Food Hub project manager, developing governance arrangements, a set of scope and objectives on which the Food Hub will focus, as well as publicity material outlining the Food Hub services. In relation to the grants program I referred to, which was released in February 2014 and closed on 2 April 2014, assessment of those applications is currently underway.

The Food Hub is actively developing linkages with the food industry via Food SA and research organisations, in particular the University of Adelaide, and they will develop strong links with key regional food sectors. The Hon. David Ridgway is quite right: the responsibility for the management and oversight of the high-value food manufacturing centre as of 1 July will rest with the Department of Primary Industries and minister Bignell.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:23): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Water and the River Murray regarding the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The Murray-Darling Basin Plan is vital to water security and the equity of water entitlements for irrigators. To date, every single drop of water committed to environmental flows in South Australia by this government has come from—or is going to come from—food producers in one form or another and, despite assurances of support from the Premier, the amount of water available to irrigators will be reduced by up to a third, which means fewer jobs and less economic activity in river communities.

As part of South Australia's commitment to the plan, the state is expected to return 183 gigalitres for environmental flows. Of this, the South Australian River Murray Irrigation Industry Improvements Program will achieve 40 gigalitres, and the government has committed another 20 gigalitres but there is still 23 to achieve, without any outline as to where this is coming from. My questions for the minister are:

1. Can he please explain where this 23 gigalitres for the basin plan will come from?
2. Can he guarantee that the remaining gigalitres will not come from South Australia's food producers?
3. If further water is to be taken from food producers, what support will this government provide to assist food producers to adjust?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:24): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. The basin plan came into effect on 24 November 2012 and the state government is now working with the Murray-Darling Basin Authority and other basin jurisdictions to progress implementation arrangements.

To underpin implementation of the basin plan, the South Australian government has entered into an intergovernmental agreement with other basin states or jurisdictions which outlines how we

will work together. The intergovernmental agreement includes commitments to work collaboratively to plan for the use and management of environmental water, and to establish joint government arrangements to support the effective operation of adjustments to the sustainable diversion limit, as well as commitments for commonwealth government funding.

This includes arrangements for investing in projects that address physical or operational river constraints and sustainable diversion limit adjustment projects which can offset water recovery requirements under the basin plan. Under the agreement, the commonwealth government has committed to make over \$13 million in funding available to the South Australian government in recognition of the additional costs associated with the basin plan and to support the development of business cases for sustainable diversion limit adjustment projects.

To guide the state's implementation of the basin plan and related programs, the government has released the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Plan implementation strategy 2013-19. This implementation strategy outlines the key actions that are being pursued to ensure the basin plan is fully integrated with the South Australian ongoing water management arrangements. Work to execute that strategy is progressing, I am told.

We have been progressing arrangements for the \$444 million suite of environmental and industry diversification projects that were secured by the government during negotiations to develop the basin plan. They were secured by the government, I should say, hand in hand with the irrigation community, the river communities, and across all the state with the notable exception of the Liberal opposition, who were very slow—very slow indeed—to come to the support of the River Murray communities.

The government is also investing effort in reviewing and adapting the state's existing Murray-Darling Basin water management arrangements—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! We can't hear the honourable minister's answer.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: The government is also investing effort in reviewing and adapting the state's existing Murray-Darling Basin water management arrangements, including water resource planning and allocation, water quality and salinity management, environmental water management and water trading.

A central part of successful implementation of the basin plan will be the introduction of new sustainable diversion limits in each of the state's three water resource plan areas by 1 July 2019. The introduction of new sustainable diversion limits will require 183.8 gigalitres of water recovery from the South Australian River Murray system. South Australia has already recovered over half of the water required; the remaining water recovery will be achieved with input from relevant industry organisations through willing participation.

Through projects such as the industry-driven South Australian River Murray Sustainability Program, environmental works and measures in other projects, we are confident that our water recovery target will be met. The South Australian River Murray Sustainability Program is a great example of government and industry working together to benefit our environment, our communities and our industries. The program will support regional development and industry redevelopment projects to recover water for the environment.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Can honourable members please allow the minister to give his answer in silence. If you want to have a discussion, that's what the corridors are for.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr President, for your protection. It appears that the members opposite have no interest in Murray River communities, Murray River basin planning or how the water is actually being planned for return to the river into the future.

The state government will continue to work with the commonwealth and South Australian irrigators and relevant industry organisations to develop additional projects as required, including through the water recovery advisory forum. Some highlights of recent activity in regard to regional investment and environmental water include the South Australian River Murray Sustainability Irrigation Industry Improvement Program. There was a strong response to the expression of interest

process, I am told, for round 1, with more than 200 expressions of interest received and assessed, and 80 per cent of applicants were invited to submit a full application.

Over the last couple of years, 1,686 gigalitres of environmental water have been delivered to South Australia to improve the health of the South Australian River Murray and the Coorong, the Lower Lakes and the Murray Mouth. The Murray-Darling Basin Authority recently publicly stated that without the increased environmental flows delivered by the basin plan, dredging would likely to have been required during 2013-14 to keep the Murray Mouth open. It is only through this government's working through Murray communities that we have been able to deliver this basin plan, despite the best efforts of the Liberal opposition to oppose it at every stage—

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: You were slow to sign up to the agreement.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Well, the government will sign up to an agreement when it is in the interests of the state, not when it is in the interests of your mates interstate—New South Wales and Victoria. The government signs up to an agreement when it is in the interests of South Australians: you sign up to agreements because you get told to do so by Tony Abbott.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:30): When will the government release the details of how the final 23 gigalitres is to be obtained?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:30): In the fullness of time, sir.

CLARE VALLEY WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:30): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Water and the River Murray in relation to Clare Valley water.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The covering letter for the deal between the member for Frome and the Australian Labor Party to form a minority government says:

The Labor Party is also prepared to investigate a number of other issues and projects that communities in the electorate of Frome have identified as significant to them.

One of the issues relates to water. The fifth issue reads:

Relief for Clare valley winegrowers in respect to their water requirements, in particular by investigating the possibility of periods of interpeak water use and night time use.

My questions are:

1. Will the minister assure the council that the investigation of relief for Clare water users will look at the needs of water users in other regions?
2. Will the minister assure the council that any changes that come out of the investigation in relation to the relief for Clare water users will be made available in other regions to users in comparable situations?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:31): I thank the honourable member for his most important questions. The Clare Valley irrigators currently pay, I am told, the same for SA Water supplies as every other irrigator across the state. The system is the fairest way to spread the costs of providing and maintaining basic water facilities across our entire community. The \$34.8 million Clare Valley water supply scheme provides for long-term sustainable irrigation, while delivering economic benefits to the region.

The scheme also provides potable water to townships of the Clare Valley region, and enables bulk water to be transferred from the Morgan-Whyalla pipeline to the Swan Reach-Paskeville pipeline to support Yorke Peninsula. This scheme was in answer to calls from residents and businesses in the region to support long-term sustainable irrigation. Some of the irrigators currently access an off-peak transportation rate for supply over winter.

One of the aims of the Water Industry Act is to increase competition in South Australia's water market. As part of the changes to the water market the government is currently developing a framework for third party access to water and sewerage infrastructure, including SA Water's infrastructure. A draft bill to implement a third-party access framework is being developed and will go for further consultation shortly. In the meantime, I am advised that the Clare Region Winegrape Growers Association has put a formal request to SA Water to seek a permanent third-party access arrangement outside the off-peak period. I understand that SA Water responded to this request on 23 August 2013, seeking further clarification so that the request can be properly assessed.

On 11 September 2013 I met with now minister Brock, MP, member for Frome, and the Clare Region Winegrape Growers Association to further discuss their position. Following this meeting I requested information from SA Water on a process for providing water to the Clare Valley area during the off-peak and on-peak period, and the impact of offering a reduced transportation rate during summer. I also sought information in relation to the Clare Region Winegrape Growers Association's third-party access application, and asked if SA Water could assist the association in preparing its application.

Clare Valley Water Supply Scheme irrigation customers already receive a reduced price, based on the statewide pricing principle that protects regional customers by ensuring the prices are no greater than those applying to metropolitan customers. That aside, SA Water is willing to assist the Clare Region Winegrape Growers Association in any way it can to further develop their third-party access request, and any other options available to them, and will continue to work closely with the growers association, as SA Water does with anyone who comes to them asking for assistance with any of their own local issues.

CLARE VALLEY WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:34): I have a supplementary question. Can the minister explain why it costs three times as much for on-peak water as off-peak water?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:34): The honourable member again shows her ignorance in these issues.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Just answer the question.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I will if the Hon. Mr Ridgway would cease interjecting. One must understand that there are competing demands on the water infrastructure, dependent on various issues, such as the time of year, the season and cost of electricity, of course, because there are peak prices for electricity as well, and pumping water is a primary cost of that.

If the honourable member would like to find out about these issues, I can supply her with a briefing document about the cost of water, its supply and why the prices fluctuate in terms of seasonality and also the pricing effect of electricity.

CLARE VALLEY WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (14:35): I have a supplementary question. Given the minister's answer, can the minister assure the house that, if there is to be any reduction, badly needed in the Clare Valley, it will be equitable to all relevant regions that primary produce, from Mount Gambier to the Western Australia border?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for his most important supplementary, which goes to the point, of course, that there would be inequities in the system if the Liberal Party had won government and privatised the assets of SA Water.

It is only this government that has committed to supplying postage-stamp pricing across the state, where we will not be impacted by the private investors who would come in and raise the cost. Just as they did with electricity, they would do the same to South Australian consumers all over again. That is what they are committed to. You saw the audit commission plan at the federal level. We are all waiting for the South Australian Liberals to sign up to that and sell off the last remaining assets that they did not manage to sell off last time, but their plan was foiled.

CLARE VALLEY WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:36): I have a further supplementary question. Would the minister like to read the following headline, ABC News, dated 21 February 2014? Of course, you wouldn't, minister, because it says, 'SA election: Liberals say no plan to privatise water.' Will you desist from misleading the house?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:36): This is the fig leaf they hid behind. The member for Norwood (now Dunstan), when he was pressed on radio, 'Will you privatise SA Water,' he said, 'Er, no.' 'Well, what about the assets?' and there was stunned silence because we know what their plan was: tell the electorate that we won't privatise SA Water—

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Can't you read?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: —but in their back pocket we all know that there was a plan: 'We'll flog off the assets, and we'll just leave SA Water as a contracting company in the hands of the taxpayer.'

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Can't you read?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: It's not a problem with my not being able to read; it is a problem of their not being able to tell the truth to the electorate.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Maher.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Maher has the floor.

INNOVATION VOUCHER PROGRAM

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (14:37): Thank you, Mr President. My question is to the Minister for Science and Information Economy. Will the minister provide an update on the latest industry grant under the innovation voucher scheme?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:37): I thank the honourable member for his important question. Indeed, the innovation vouchers grant program is a strong example of what can be achieved through a collaborative approach, bringing industry and business together with research for projects that support the state's key priorities.

The program is a joint initiative of the DFEST and the Department for Manufacturing, Innovation, Trade, Resources and Energy (DMITRE). I am very pleased to say that the local business Ferguson Australia has been awarded a \$20,000 grant by this government to assist to develop innovative food products from lobster waste. The project aims to help grow South Australia's excellent lobster industry, and we see Ferguson Australia working with Flinders University. I also understand that SARDI is also providing some support as well.

The intention of this project is to develop innovations in lobster processing using waste materials from the lobster, such as the head, the shell and the organs of the lobster, which end up as waste from processing. It is research that could have an enormous impact on the lobster industry. The reduction in waste and management costs will also improve environmental sustainability and potentially growth in revenue and profitability.

This is a significant industry for South Australia. The Australian southern rock lobster fishery is one of the state's most important and valuable export industries. It exports about 1,500 tonnes of product in an industry worth \$200 million a year. Ferguson Australia hopes, with its collaboration with Flinders University, to look into three new prototypes for export using this processed waste from the lobster, including a homogenised lobster oil product, a flavoured stock based on a protein powder, and what is known as a bioavailable extract as a demonstration of future pharmaceutical product potential.

In fact, all three innovations have enormous potential and demonstrate the value-add that we can get from our existing industries with the right partnerships and some targeted government assistance. They will also have a higher retail value and a longer shelf life to reach potentially wider export markets, and that is an important consideration for our export products.

This Innovation voucher grant will also allow Flinders to undertake research to develop a proof-of-concept process to produce functional food ingredients from food grade lobster products. Work will be done by our world-class SARDI to develop prototype food products for potential marketing. This shows that the Innovation Voucher Program is a great mechanism to encourage research, expertise and collaboration to strengthen the innovation and competitiveness of our state's small and medium enterprises. By providing the mechanism for local businesses and researchers to work together, we facilitate them to solve problems or to create new products that they could not have done on their own. Of course, that helps them reach new markets.

We see collaboration throughout this program from the individual business and researchers involved to the joint responsibility by two government departments. It is work that strongly aligns with our state government's strategic priorities of premium food and wine from a clean environment and growing advanced manufacturing, and of course realising the effects of the mining boom. It is certainly a real win-win, and I congratulate Andrew Ferguson on receiving that grant support.

DISABILITY UNMET NEED

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:42): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Disabilities questions about the unmet needs list in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: When I was first elected to this place some four years ago, one of the early issues I raised in question time was the public monthly disclosure of the growing unmet needs list for disability services and support in South Australia. As of January 2012, that information has indeed been available on the website of the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion and, while it has been shifted about, through website upgrades and changes, I am fortunate that I am still able to find it via Google.

While this transparency by government is positive and welcome, and indeed should be required, the figures being reported each month tell a less happy story and there continues to be a growing source of constituents calling my office in crisis and/or close to crisis as they struggle across the four services of accommodation support, community support, community access and respite.

Despite all of the increases in disability funding and the rhetoric that the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) will be the panacea that solves all problems in disability, the numbers being reported on a monthly basis show otherwise. In January 2012, category 1 reported unmet need of 1,217 services across 995 clients. In February 2014, the most recent report available, the same category 1 figures show that there is unmet need of 1,818 services across 1,504 unique clients. This is an increase of 50 per cent in both cases—unmet need and unique clients. Remember, this is just in category 1 (critical need) meaning clients are homeless or at immediate risk of harm to self or others. My questions are:

1. Is the minister aware of the ballooning unmet needs list in disability services?
2. What will the minister do to prevent the unmet needs list growing further and reduce the clients and services going unmet each month in South Australia?
3. Does the minister agree that, given the NDIS (all going well, and we've no guarantee that it will) is still six years away from full rollout, claiming the NDIS will solve this problem is not good enough?
4. Does the minister agree that the 1,500 South Australians on the category 1 unmet needs list are not having their basic human rights met under the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities?
5. Is the minister concerned that in this case we are in breach of the convention and optional protocol of the United Nations convention, and is he concerned about our reputation at a national and international level, given this?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her most important questions, and I will refer them to the Minister for Disabilities in another place and bring back a response. I just want to briefly put some comments on the record at this point, and that is to say that since coming into office this government has significantly increased assistance for people with disabilities.

In terms of our concerns about what is happening nationally, we are horrified—not to put too fine a point on it—at what the Tony Abbott federal government is contemplating in terms of changes to the national disability scheme. There are threats that funding will be significantly eroded and services significantly dismantled, so there are grave concerns about the impact that might have on services for those people suffering disabilities. Of course, we see that as part of the DNA of Liberal governments, don't we, Mr President—to slash and burn, and to cut and strip back all of those really important services that support the community—

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: Point of order, Mr President.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: —things like Medicare—

The PRESIDENT: Point of order.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: My point of order is one of relevance. The minister is going across debating with herself about the commonwealth and not sticking to answering the question.

The PRESIDENT: The minister will answer the question as she sees fit.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Exactly, and this goes directly to the question that the Hon. Kelly Vincent asked: she asked about our concern about what is happening nationally, and that's exactly what I am addressing—our concerns about what is happening nationally, not only in terms of disability services but those other services that people with disabilities also access, such as Medicare and vocational services. I spoke in this place yesterday about the federal government, Tony Abbott's Liberal government's attack on—

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Point of order: the minister has been here long enough to know that the title of the Prime Minister is actually the Hon. Tony Abbott; as she has the title Honourable, she should use it.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: We see that not only are attempts to dismantle Medicare and vocational services being considered, and I talked about that in this place—that something like \$74.6 million is being looked at by the federal Liberal government to dismantle those services—but also, as to support such as the aged-care pension, we are looking down the barrel of a gun in that respect. In terms of that last question, we are deeply concerned; in fact, we are horrified at what the implications of that might be, not only for people with disabilities but for the community generally.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:49): Supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, Hon. Ms Vincent.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: Thank you Mr President. I will just paraphrase my last two questions for the sake of clarity. Does the minister agree that, given we have 1,500 South Australians on the category 1 crisis unmet needs list waiting for services, we are damaging our reputation as a state, given our obligations under the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:49): I've answered the question at length.

SA WATER

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Water and the River Murray. Will the minister advise the council of the government's position with respect to SA Water remaining a public asset?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:49): I commend the questioner for his fantastic question, on point as always and coming at a time when we see the federal government prowling around the states looking for assets to privatise, to flog off, to harm Australian consumers. We have a willing opposition here prepared to sign up to it willy-nilly, take our assets and drive up the prices. That is what they want to do, but that is not what Labor does. This question is very important because it touches the very heart of the government's policy, and it is something that is obviously important for all South Australians.

This government takes its responsibilities seriously. We are not interested in a quick fix. I therefore wish to remind the chamber that the government is committed to keeping SA Water and its assets firmly in the hands of South Australians.

SA Water is a publicly owned asset operating in the private market. There is always an inherent challenge when a corporatised agency (a change introduced by a Liberal government)—and I remind the chamber who corporatised SA Water in the first place; I think it was, in fact, a Liberal government—is responsible for providing the public with a service for the common good. What this means is that SA Water must constantly evaluate its business against these competing demands, and SA Water has shown that it is more than able to do this.

The past months have been a very significant time for SA Water during some significant organisational change for them. The government's vision for all South Australian utilities is that they be efficient and offer supply at competitive prices. This is why the state government has introduced the economic regulation of SA Water, reforms which have already resulted in water prices dropping by an average of 6.4 per cent and increases of no more than CPI for the next two years in the regulated period. Nevertheless, efficiency and competitive measures should not mean a drop in service standards either.

SA Water has over 750,000 customers and, as outlined in the National Water Commission's National Performance Report in March of this year, servicing these customers is no mean feat. I could talk a great deal about how SA Water is responsive to its customer base. I have written a letter to honourable members outlining a way that they can encourage their constituents to feed back to SA Water, and they will be getting that letter very shortly.

In recent weeks there has been talk, as you would know, sir, about the privatisation of public assets around this country. The federal government has offered states an additional 15 per cent one-off funding on the money that each state can raise through asset sales—

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Is this your vision?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Well, when we talk about vision, the Hon. Ms Lensink, the vision of your colleagues, your Liberal Party, is to flog off assets. That is your vision.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: You know that's not true.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: That's all you have, empty rhetoric of an empty party bereft of ideas—

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Point of order, Mr President. This minister knows that the ownership of the things he is addressing to this side of the council is not 'your' and he should address his remarks through you.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable minister?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Mr President, I stand chastised. As we know, those opposite have a plan of just selling off assets. They are bereft of ideas and they have paid the price for it. The payment, of course, from the federal government would only be paid if the money is used on infrastructure projects approved by the federal government that must commence within two years. They are the parameters being laid down, as I understand it. The federal Treasurer calls this the 'asset recycling pool'.

Here in South Australia we know a thing or two about recycling, and this does not sound like a scheme we would want to implement here. Selling SA Water or its assets would be a short-term cash injection, as opposed to decades of provision of essential services that South Australians

depend on. Selling SA Water would also undermine our state's water security, something that this Labor government has guaranteed after being neglected by the former Liberal government.

A report commissioned last year by an august organisation called the Electrical Trades Union in Victoria concluded that electricity prices have risen more steeply in South Australia and Victoria than elsewhere since the sell-off of the public electricity assets, public no more.

According to this report there are no long-term benefits to government from a sale of assets to pay down debt and, as I have said before, the sale of public assets is a short-term solution. This Labor government is a government which plans for the longer term. We are not interested, as I said before, in quick fixes for political gain. We prefer to invest and ensure that SA Water remains an industry leader and sets the bar for every other water utility in Australia. This is our long-term plan.

However, the Liberals here in South Australia, in addition to their colleagues in Canberra, have no long-term plans at all. They, who are happy to watch the federal government remove its support from Holden's in this state, would also be happy to carve up SA Water. This is their plan: 'No privatisation of SA Water but we will not tell you what we are going to do with the assets.' This is privatisation by stealth, and this state government will not let it happen.

Keeping SA Water in public hands means that any profits can be used for the good of the state of every South Australian. It means they can be invested in public services rather than falling into the pockets of investors who, frankly, do not live here and do not care about the state. Keeping SA Water in public hands means that we can continue to deliver a public health service to South Australians regardless of the return, which means that we can invest in remote and regional communities or areas that a private company would be ignoring.

Keeping SA Water in public hands means that SA Water can continue to be at the forefront of technology, innovation and water quality research. Keeping SA Water in public hands means that prices will be regulated by ESCOSA and that SA Water is accountable to its owners, the taxpayers of South Australia. This state government will not allow SA Water to be sold off and carved up, as the Liberals would like, because we have a state-of-the-art asset here in South Australia, one that we will keep in public hands for the good of all South Australians.

SA WATER

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:56): I have a supplementary question. If the corporatisation that the minister referred to earlier on in his response was such a bad idea, why hasn't he undone it?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:56): The wily, tricky Liberals over there are putting words into my mouth. What they were doing was setting up SA Water for a long-term privatisation. We know which Liberal government corporatised SA Water, the same Liberal government that sold off ETSA. That is what they are doing; that is what their plan was, and that is what they would do if they ever got into government in South Australia: SA Water would be gone.

SA WATER

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:57): I have another supplementary question. Is the minister casting aspersions on the performance of Allwater?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:57): I have no idea how the honourable member could come to that conclusion. However, given their election promises, I am not surprised.

SCHOOL CHAPLAINS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:57): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the minister representing the Treasurer and, indeed, the Attorney-General as well in the other place.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: *The Australian* newspaper reported this week an article which stated:

State governments have lined up in a High Court challenge to stop federal funding of religious chaplains in schools, casting further doubt on hundreds of commonwealth-funded programs.

In addition to the chaplaincy program, not just casting doubt on the chaplaincy program but, in the words of *The Australian*, 'hundreds' of other programs. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is the state government a fellow opponent to the commonwealth in the High Court action contesting the validity of federal chaplaincy funding as well as other programs, as insinuated by *The Australian*?

2. If so, and given that the action is supported by states on the basis that such funding is a state and not a federal concern, is the government therefore committing that, should the funding be defeated in the action, it will fund the school chaplaincy program in future, as well as the other additional programs that have been referred to in *The Australian*?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for his questions and will refer them to the Treasurer in another place and bring back a response.

ADAPTIVE FUTURES SA

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation a question about Adaptive Futures SA.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Prior to the 2014 state election, the Weatherill government announced that it would create a new statutory body, called Adaptive Futures SA, to replace the body currently known as Zero Waste SA. After consultation with some stakeholders it is my understanding that the new body will receive only half the funding level of that previously allocated to Zero Waste SA. My questions are:

1. What is the scope of Adaptive Futures SA?
2. How will Adaptive Futures SA support the local government sector in its crucial role in waste management?
3. How will Adaptive Futures SA support the broader waste management sector?
4. Finally, what impact will the creation of Adaptive Futures SA have on the current Waste to Resources Fund, whether it is in contributions received from the levy or in outward expenditure?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:59): I thank the member for his most important questions. Zero Waste SA has established a reputation for delivering innovative, effective and well-targeted programs. Its job has been challenging and the message powerful, reaching across all sectors of our community. Since 2003, it has invested more than \$80 million on programs and projects that have stimulated councils, businesses and the community to reduce, recover, re-use and recycle. This has helped South Australia reduce waste to landfill by nearly 20 per cent from 2002 to 2013 and achieve a resource recovery rate of more than 77 per cent.

Zero Waste SA's work as a leader in waste management and resource recovery continues to attract attention nationally and internationally, but we want to build on that. As part of our environmental protection 2014 election commitments, the South Australian government announced that it would create a new body to advance the next stage of the state's development in waste management. The new authority—at this stage to be called Adaptive Futures SA—will be established from July 2015 to build on the many successes of Zero Waste.

Adaptive Futures SA will assist South Australia to continue leading the nation in waste management and keep South Australia at the forefront of green innovation; encourage innovation and economic growth through green economies; help businesses to find new overseas markets for

their waste management knowledge and skills; help businesses to reduce their costs through more efficient use of raw materials, water and energy; administer grants to local government and industries to explore new technologies; and report against waste to landfill targets.

Adaptive Futures SA will be established as a statutory corporation governed by its own legislation, hopefully operational from 1 July 2015, with the concurrence of this house. The authority will have a board with representatives from state and local government, industry and the environment sector, and a budget of \$4 million each year has been allocated for 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 for Adaptive Futures SA.

ADAPTIVE FUTURES SA

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:02): Supplementary question: will the minister advise how much money is currently in the Waste to Resources Fund?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:02): I do not know the exact figure. I think it is of the order of about \$48 million, but I will come back with the correct answer.

ADAPTIVE FUTURES SA

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:02): A further supplementary: when will the legislation to establish Adaptive Futures SA, as mentioned in the minister's response, be introduced to the parliament?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:02): In relation to the last supplementary question, I can advise that the balance in the Waste to Resources Fund as at 30 June 2013 was \$43.73 million. The balance in the Waste to Resources Fund is estimated to be at \$65.33 million by the end of 2013-14 but, obviously, we will need to revisit that figure at the end of this financial year. In terms of the legislation, it will be coming forward as soon as we can draft it and go through the consultation processes that are normal.

SCIENCE RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (15:03): I seek leave to ask the Minister for Science and Information Economy a question about investment in science research and innovation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA: I know that both of our ministers in this place have a background in the sciences and a strong commitment to advancing this state. Minister, will you outline some of the important initiatives that the government is undertaking to build prosperity and new jobs through increased investment in science research and innovation?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:03): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. Earlier this year the government released a major statement on science research and innovation called Investing in Science. Investing in Science accounts for a total of \$170 million in funding per year to support science research collaboration and STEM skills. It also allocates an additional \$8 million over four years in new funding to support the Premier's Research and Industry Fund.

The implementation of Investing in Science will be a key focus of the new Department of State Development which brings together for the first time industry development, skills, training, science, research and innovation and the research and innovation functions of government. As members would be aware, the government believes that increased investment in science research and innovation, underpinned by a strong science, technology, engineering and maths (STEM) skills base, is fundamental to building the jobs and industries of the future. It is no accident that economies that are currently performing well, such as Germany, are those that have long established and well executed strategies to support scientific research, STEM skills development and innovation.

Innovation is crucial to South Australia if our economy is going to continue to prosper in an ever-changing and increasingly competitive market where firms cannot compete on price alone.

Bringing together industry, our researchers and our universities is crucial to driving innovation, commercialisation and securing jobs for the future.

To assist in building an innovative economy, both nationally and here in South Australia, we have introduced, and will continue to introduce, a range of initiatives to help increase collaboration and co-investment between industry and research institutions. These include:

- establishing a new student entrepreneurial initiative developed in partnership with the University of South Australia to support bright and innovative university students to establish new business ventures and commercialise technologies to assist in local industries;
- investing \$600,000 over four years to establish the Medical Research Commercialisation Fund here in South Australia to help commercialise research coming out of SAHMRI;
- investing \$750,000 over three years to expand Flinders University's Medical Device Partnering Program that looks at developing support for high-tech medical devices;
- investing \$200,000 in establishing the South Australian Renewable Energy Institute, which will provide a focus for collaborative research in areas such as low-cost batteries, solar thermal and fuel transformation;
- increasing the number of South Australian research fellowships on offer, worth up to \$1 million each over four years and designed to attract leading researchers;
- investing \$6 million over four years in a partnership with industry to create a Mining Petroleum Services Centre for Excellence; and
- continuing to support cooperative research centres.

To continue to build our capacity to innovate and grow our advanced manufacturing sector, it is important that South Australia continues to have a rich pool of trained scientists, engineers and technology specialists.

Investing in Science is a bold initiative that will contribute, together with our other policies and programs including Manufacturing Works and Skills for All, to diversify our economic base and revitalise the South Australian economy. I am very proud to be part of a government that recognises the importance of science to our economy. The federal Liberal government abolished the science ministry, and in a climate of change it certainly would not surprise me if those opposite failed to grasp the importance of that change.

The Commission of Audit also has its sights on research and innovation. The report recommends, amongst other things, the abolition of the sector-specific research and development programs and consolidating existing research programs aimed at fostering collaboration. These changes may impact on the way industry and research sectors collaborate and go against what we are trying to do in terms of encouraging the Premier's Research and Industry Fund. South Australians can be assured that this Labor government will continue to focus very hard on this crucial policy area, even when the Liberals look to cut and slash and burn.

FORT LARGS

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:08): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation on the subject of Fort Largs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Fort Largs is one of Adelaide's two pre-federation coastal forts. Built in 1883, Fort Largs still stands in good condition on Lefevre Peninsula. The fort has played a significant part in the heritage of our state, having been used first to defend our coast and variously as a military barracks, to detain enemy aliens during the First World War, as part of the Fort Largs Police Academy, as an exhibition house for the firearms collection of the SA Museum, and as the storage area for items confiscated by Adelaide's police forces.

Architecturally, Fort Largs represents important heritage value. The site is listed on the State Heritage Register with the following citation:

Fort Largs is important because it represents the end of an era of coastal fortification philosophy—in terms of planning, design and construction—spanning over three centuries.

Since the commissioning of the new Police Academy complex in February 2012, the old fort has been transferred to state government hands. Recently, it has been variously reported in the media that the government is considering selling the fort and the surrounding land for development, with the potential for up to 200 or even 250 homes. Renewal SA is reported to have engaged Jones Lang LaSalle to sell the land.

This has been greeted with much dismay by several local groups, such as the Port Adelaide branch of the National Trust, the state branch of the National Trust, the Semaphore and Port Adelaide RSL clubs, Port Adelaide Enfield council, Fort Glanville Historical Society, and the Say NO to Selling Fort Largs Facebook group, which has nearly 1,500 members. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the state government intend to delist Fort Largs or its surrounds from the State Heritage Register?
2. Will the minister confirm whether the government has received any advice from the SA Heritage Council and, if not, will he seek advice before any decision is made on the future of Fort Largs?
3. Will the minister assure the South Australian public that Fort Largs as a state heritage-listed icon will not be sold to developers or allowed to be degraded?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for his most important set of questions. He is quite right: a recent article in the *Portside Messenger* on 30 April stated that a Save Fort Largs group had been formed. I understand that this group was formed in response to fears that Fort Largs would be demolished by potential developers. I understand the Fort Largs Police Academy (which includes Fort Largs and rifled muzzle-loading and breech-loading guns) at Taperoo is entered into the South Australian Heritage Register as a state heritage place and currently in state government ownership.

Fort Largs was built in 1883 and is of state heritage significance because it was an integral part of South Australia's early defence planning. It is architecturally important because it represents the end of an era for coastal defence fortifications and probably an end to the Russian war. The integrity of Fort Largs may have been diminished due to constant upgrading and other alterations relating to its continuous role as a military or paramilitary complex over time; however, most of the building's 19th century fabric, I am told, remains intact.

Since the early 1960s, Fort Largs has been used by South Australia Police, until the recent construction and opening of the new Fort Largs Police Academy. Following the opening of the new academy, the state government resolved to sell Fort Largs, having determined that it was surplus to the government's requirements. Renewal SA recently called for expressions of interest for Fort Largs, I am advised. The state heritage listing does not prevent an owner of a property, whether in a—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Well, it's not a public utility, Mr Lucas, but that shows your ignorance in these matters, I suppose. Renewal SA recently called for expressions of interest. The state heritage listing does not prevent an owner of a property, whether in a public or private ownership, selling that property at any time.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Fort Largs is a state heritage place. Any development proposals of Fort Largs will be the subject of a development application to the relevant planning authority. Those applications must also be referred to me, in my capacity as minister responsible for the Heritage Places Act 1993, for advice as to any impact on the heritage values of Fort Largs.

COMMISSIONER FOR PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:13): My questions are directed to the minister representing the Minister for the Public Sector:

1. Has the minister or any of her ministerial officers had any discussions with the Premier or any of his ministerial officers about the appointment of Ms Erma Ranieri to replace Mr Warren McCann as the Commissioner for Public Employment? If so, what were the dates of those discussions and what was the nature of those discussions?

2. Has the minister or any of her ministerial officers had discussions with Ms Erma Ranieri about the appointment of Ms Ranieri to replace Mr McCann as the Commissioner for Public Employment? If so, what were the dates of those discussions and what was the nature of those discussions?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for his questions and will refer them to the Minister for the Public Sector in another place and bring back a response.

STOJAN, MR J.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:15): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, representing the Attorney-General, questions regarding a constituent of mine, Mr Jim Stojan.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: Questions about Mr Stojan's matter were first raised in this parliament by Nick Xenophon in 2005. These questions still remain unanswered, despite repeated requests from me since my coming to this place. Over the past 18 months, my office has made contact with the Attorney's office on some 18 occasions requesting feedback in relation to Mr Stojan's matter. The silent response has been deafening. Worse still, no reason for ignoring these requests has been provided; in fact, nothing has been provided at all. My questions are:

1. Does the Attorney consider it appropriate for these questions to remain unanswered for almost nine years?
2. Why is the Attorney ignoring me on this issue?
3. When can I expect a response to my letters on this issue?
4. When can Mr Stojan expect a response to the questions originally asked by Nick Xenophon in 2005?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:15): I thank the honourable member for his most important questions. I will refer those questions to the Attorney-General in another place and bring back a response.

CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION SHOWCASE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Will the minister update the house about the recent Climate Change Adaptation Showcase?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:16): I thank the honourable member for his most excellent question. In February this year, I had the great pleasure of opening the South Australian Climate Change Adaptation Showcase. One of my first acts as the minister responsible for climate change in the Weatherill government was to open the first ever showcase in March 2013. It brought together people from right across the state and beyond to talk about the latest in climate change science and the on-the-ground works occurring in the cities and regions of South Australia.

Since that first showcase, much has happened within our state on the climate change front. I point out to the Hon. Mr Maher that I don't believe in climate change: I accept the facts of climate change—there is a big difference. The believers or otherwise are on the other side, but over here we accept the facts of science.

In the State of Environment Report, released in September last year, we found that our state's per capita greenhouse gas emissions have been declining, and there has been continued growth in the generation of renewable energy.

We also secured our state's water supply with the completion of the Adelaide Desalination Plant. As of today, I am pleased to announce that the plant has now produced over 89 billion litres of water for the people of Adelaide. This has, of course, reduced our reliance on the River Murray which, following decades of overallocation and the millennium drought, was on the brink of environmental catastrophe. Yet last year we were also able to kickstart the river's slow regeneration from a potential environmental catastrophe with the passage of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

We also held the very successful Greenhouse 2013 Conference, a conference where a number of world leaders in climate science converged on Adelaide to address the next steps for Australia and the world and also to learn from our experiences here in Adelaide and share them with the world.

This government is not in denial about climate change. We do not fear the hard but critical actions that are required, as presented to us by the science. Far from putting our head in the sand, like some other politicians and pundits are inclined to do, South Australia has led the nation in combating climate change and attempting to mitigate its impacts and adapt to the inevitable changes.

I cannot stress enough to the chamber how seriously we as a state and as a nation need to take the science behind our changing climate. The climate is changing. This is clearly shown in the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's reports released earlier this year: each of the last three decades has been successively warmer at the earth's surface than any preceding decade since 1850.

While sometimes it feels like South Australia is alone in Australia in taking climate change seriously, on a global scale this ever-present danger is causing world leaders to consider the impacts on their people, their industry and their economy. President Obama recently said, when releasing America's National Climate Assessment:

This is not some distant problem of the future. This is a problem that is affecting Americans right now. Whether it means increased flooding, greater vulnerability to drought, more severe wildfires—all of these things are having an impact on Americans as we speak.

These words are as applicable to Australia and the rest of the world as they are to the US.

The release of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's working groups 1, 2 and 3 reports further reinforces the risks posed by climate change and the need for immediate action to limit temperature rise to 2° Celsius.

The key messages of the most recent working group 3 report are that greenhouse gas emissions are growing globally at an increasing rate. Economic and population growth are the most important drivers of emissions and have outpaced efficiencies. Mitigation requires major technological and institutional changes, including the upscaling of low and zero carbon energy to meet energy demands.

Estimates for mitigation costs vary widely; however, mitigation can result in large co-benefits for human health and other goals. The institutional challenges of mitigation are huge and need international cooperation and, without additional mitigation measures, global mean surface temperature might increase by 3.7° to 4.8° over the 21st century.

The strength of the conclusions in the Fifth Assessment Report, as well as existing research by leading Australian research organisations, including the Bureau of Meteorology and the CSIRO, highlights the high risks that climate change brings for South Australia. We need to take action now, not at some distant date in the future when it is too late.

In 2007 we established the frameworks for rising to the challenge by enacting Australia's first dedicated climate change legislation, releasing a strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions in South Australia and beginning a climate change awareness raising campaign. This enabled the South Australian government to support those desiring a better and cleaner future for South Australia and the world.

Entering into agreements with willing members of industry and the community promoted climate change awareness, prepared the community for a potential carbon price and prepared for a change in climate. South Australia then moved to policies such as legislation for energy efficient roofing and establishing a framework for low emissions vehicles in the community and the government vehicle fleet.

In 2010-11, South Australia's emissions were almost 9 per cent lower than 1990 levels, and this was in spite of growth in the state's population and economy. The 2013 State of Environment Report has shown that South Australian emissions per person and per unit of gross state product have decreased. There has actually been a 42 per cent reduction in the greenhouse gas intensity of the South Australian economy. In addition, over 25 per cent of South Australia's electricity generation now comes from over \$2 billion worth of privately funded wind farms. An additional 2 per cent comes from solar panels, I am advised.

South Australia has and will continue to encourage renewable energies, building on our status as a national leader in the uptake of wind energy and rooftop solar. In less than 10 years installed capacity in South Australia has grown from zero in 2003 to more than 1,200 megawatts in wind and 400 megawatts in rooftop solar.

We are committed to assisting the community to adapt to a changing climate. This is why in 2012 we launched a framework for adapting to the changing climate using local knowledge and priorities. South Australia's progress is in spite of changing policy priorities in the federal sphere. There has been a clear downgrading of climate change concerns at a federal level, one that is of great concern to this government and should be of great concern to everyone in South Australia.

The Abbott government has outlined a direct action plan to address climate change and to repeal the national carbon pricing mechanism. I am advised that the Coalition had originally indicated a budget of \$3.2 billion for the various elements of the direct action plan but, with the release of the Coalition's budget costings, it was revealed that this has been reduced to \$2.88 billion over the first four years.

The Coalition has indicated that it will not increase its budget commitment to meet the stated 5 per cent target needed. To achieve this aim, I am advised that the Coalition's direct action plan will use a reverse auction as its primary mechanism through a \$2.55 billion emissions reduction fund to cut emissions.

The South Australian government made a submission on the design of the fund, reaffirming that we need measures that will provide a smooth transition to a low carbon economy. On 24 April 2014, the commonwealth government released the Emissions Reduction Fund White Paper. We now need to consider the emerging design of the fund and its implications for both existing South Australian government programs and the potential for participation by South Australian organisations.

We need to ensure that the fund provides opportunities for South Australia, including small to medium businesses, and that our state is not disadvantaged by the emissions reduction progress which has already been achieved. To be effective, the Australian government's targeted measures will need a long-term horizon for abatement efforts and a particular focus on early action. Such a transition is crucial to achieve Australia's greenhouse gas emission commitments and is in line with the latest science on climate change.

I call on those opposite to ensure for once that they tell their federal colleagues that we in South Australia won't accept anything less than action on climate change that will have a real impact. The federal government has commenced a review of Australia's Renewable Energy Target. I understand the federal government has framed this as a policy designed to ensure that at least 20 per cent of Australia's electricity comes from renewable sources.

It consists of two main schemes: the Large-scale Renewable Energy Target, which creates a financial incentive for renewable energy power stations, and a Small-scale Renewable Energy Scheme, which encourages owners to install small-scale renewable energy systems such as rooftop solar. I understand that concerns are being expressed from within the renewable energy industry that this review will lead to reduced investment in renewable energy technologies, not more investment. We can't let that happen. South Australia's emission reduction success has been partly due to the growth of renewable energy technology in South Australia.

Our Strategic Plan sets a target of 33 per cent renewable electricity by 2020, however, it is possible that we will reach that target this coming financial year. In around 10 years, installed capacity has grown from zero in 2003 to more than 1,200 megawatts in wind and 400 megawatts in rooftop solar, as I said earlier. The South Australian government has also announced a new investment target of \$10 billion in low carbon generation by 2025. We will continue to monitor developments very closely, consider the implications of the federal plan for our state. I would ask those opposite to do the same: instead of caving in to the Abbott government, stand up for this state for once.

Members

MEMBER'S LEAVE

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:25): I seek leave to move the motion standing in my name in an amended form.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I move:

That six weeks' leave of absence from 20 May 2014 be granted to the Hon. Robert Brokenshire on account of illness.

Motion carried.

Bills

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

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:26): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Administration and Probate Act 1919. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:27): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill amends the Administration and Probate Act 1919 to implement the first set of reforms based upon the recommendations of the South Australian Law Reform Institute in the Final Report 2: Sureties' Guarantees for Letters of Administration.

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

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

An issues paper, released by the institute in 2013, explored the concerns about the requirement for sureties' guarantees. Submissions on the issues paper overwhelmingly supported the removal of this redundant requirement for sureties' guarantees because of the unnecessary cost and time involved, the difficulty in obtaining a surety, the fact there is only infrequent recourse to sureties, the degree of protection afforded, and the fact that they are required only when an administrator is appointed and not when there is an executor.

Laws requiring a form of security against maladministration in South Australia were first enacted in the Administration and Probate Act 1919, which required every applicant to provide an administration bond.

The act was amended in 1978, following a recommendation by the South Australian Law Reform Committee, and further amended in 2003 to replace the requirement for an administration bond with the requirement for a guarantee. The 2003 amendment also permitted the Supreme Court to dispense with the requirement for a surety guarantee where satisfied that it is 'beneficial or expedient to do so' and requires a further or additional guarantee or a reduction in the amount guaranteed. That has remained the current law.

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

Although there are convincing arguments for doing more than simply removing the requirements for sureties' guarantees, the institute recommends that, in the interests of effective administration of deceased estates, this reform should not wait upon the preparation of other amendments for reform which are more complex and will need careful attention to detail. I commend the bill to members and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

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

4—Repeal of section 18

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

5—Repeal of section 31

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

6—Amendment of section 58—Proceedings to compel account

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

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

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

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

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

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. G.A. Kandelaars.

SUCCESSION TO THE CROWN (REQUEST) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:31): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to request the parliament of the commonwealth to enact under section 51 (xxxviii) of the Constitution of the Commonwealth an act to change the law relating to royal succession and royal marriages; to amend the Treason Act 1351 passed by the Parliament of England; and for related purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill will allow the passage of commonwealth legislation to reform and modernise the rules of royal succession. It will ensure that males are no longer given precedence over females in the line of succession. It will remove the current bar on those in line of succession from marrying a person of the Roman Catholic faith.

The bill will also allow the commonwealth to legislate to repeal the Royal Marriages Act 1772. That act provides that a marriage of a descendant of King George II that was not made with the monarch's permission is void.

Passage of the commonwealth legislation is an important constitutional amendment as it will change the law relating to the effect of gender and marriage on royal succession consistent with changes made to the law in the United Kingdom and ensure that the sovereign of Australia is the same person as the sovereign of the United Kingdom. The changes will be retrospective. For example, the amendment in relation to succession to the Crown based on gender takes effect for any person born after 28 October 2011.

The bill provides the mechanism for the South Australian parliament to request and consent to the commonwealth parliament's enactment of legislation to change the rules of royal succession throughout Australia. Section 51(xxxviii) of the Australian Constitution gives the commonwealth the power to pass legislation at the request of, or with the concurrence, of the parliaments of all the states directly concerned.

The original proposal for these amendments arose at the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting in Perth on 28 October 2011, where the leaders of the 16 realms who have Her Majesty the Queen as sovereign (including Australia) agreed to apply uniform changes to the rules of succession in each of their jurisdictions.

After the Perth decision, the matter was put to a meeting of the Council of Australian Governments. The council agreed to introduce the reforms by a request and consent scheme, relying on section 51(xxxviii) of the Australian Constitution.

A request and consent bill such as this does not allow the commonwealth to change the rules of succession for Australia's sovereign in the future without further consultation. The commonwealth bill includes a provision, a proposed section 12, to the effect that the act can only be expressly or impliedly repealed or amended by an act passed at the request or with the concurrence of the parliaments of all of the states.

The draft commonwealth bill is included in schedule 1 of the South Australian bill. The bill also makes consequential amendments to the Treason Act 1351, passed by the parliament of England, as this applies in South Australia, to remove references to the 'eldest son and heir' and replace them with references to the 'oldest child and their heir'.

This is a significant reform, as it will modernise the rules of royal succession and bring them more into line with the views of modern society. I commend the bill to honourable members and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Name of Act

This clause establishes the short title of the proposed Act.

2—Commencement

This clause sets out the commencement of the Bill. Commencement occurs on the day of assent subject to the commencement of clauses 6, 7 and proposed Schedule 2. Clause 6 and proposed Schedule 2 come into operation

on the day and time that section 6 of the Commonwealth Act commences and clause 7 comes into operation on the day and time that section 10 of the Commonwealth Act commences.

3—Object of this Act

This clause sets out the object of the measure. The main object of the Bill is to facilitate the law relating to the effect of gender and marriage on royal succession being changed uniformly across Australia and consistently with changes made to that law in the United Kingdom. This is to ensure that the Sovereign of Australia is the same person as the Sovereign of the United Kingdom.

4—Relationship with Sovereign not affected

Proposed section 4 makes it clear that it is not the intention of the Bill to affect the relationship between the Sovereign and the State as existing immediately before its enactment or that the relationship be in any way affected by the enactment by the Parliament of the Commonwealth of the Act requested by proposed section 5.

Part 2—Request for Commonwealth legislation

5—Request for Commonwealth legislation

This clause states that the Parliament of the State requests the enactment by the Parliament of the Commonwealth of an Act in the terms, or substantially in the terms, set out in proposed Schedule 1.

Part 3—General

6—Consequential amendment

This clause states that on the coming into operation of proposed Schedule 2, the Act specified in the heading to clause 1 of that Schedule is amended as set out in that clause.

7—References to Bill of Rights and Act of Settlement

Clause 7 provides that references in any law that is part of the law of the State, to the provisions of the Bill of Rights or the Act of Settlement relating to the succession to, or possession of, the Crown are to be read as including references to the provisions of this Act and of the Commonwealth Act the enactment of which is requested by section 5.

Schedule 1—Requested Commonwealth Act

Proposed Schedule 1 sets out the *Succession to the Crown Act 2014* of the Commonwealth as requested by this Bill.

The Commonwealth Act makes various changes to the law relating to the effect of gender and marriage on royal succession.

Schedule 2—Consequential amendment

1—Amendment of *Treason Act 1351* passed by the Parliament of England

Proposed Schedule 2 makes a consequential change to the *Treason Act 1351* passed by the Parliament of England (and this Act still forms part of the law of South Australia—see section 10 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*).

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

PASTORAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION (RENEWABLE ENERGY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:37): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:37): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill that the government is introducing today will provide renewable energy investors with access to 40 per cent of South Australia 's land that is crown land subject to pastoral lease. This government has ensured that South Australia is at the forefront of renewable energy and climate change policy action. South Australia has already reached its target of achieving 20 per cent renewable energy

production by 2014 and committed to achieving 33 per cent electricity generation for renewable sources by 2020.

In October 2013, South Australia committed to an investment target of \$10 billion in low carbon generation by 2025 in recognition of the economic development potential of this industry. Since 2003, there has been \$5.5 billion in investment in renewable energy, with some \$2 billion or 40 per cent of this investment occurring in regional areas.

As of March 2013, per person we have 725 watts of installed wind power, compared with a national average of 163, and 205 watts of installed solar photovoltaic power per person, compared with just 98 nationally. This performance puts us in the international best space for comparison. The state has proved an attractive destination for wind farm developments.

According to the Clean Energy Council, almost \$3 billion has been invested into wind farms in South Australia, with 1,203 megawatts of capacity or 559 turbines installed to date. This represents 38 per cent of Australia's total wind power generating capacity. Much of the state's solar investment has been achieved through individual household rooftop applications, and solar now makes up more than 3.8 per cent of the state's electricity capacity. The largest installation to date is the one megawatt plant on the Adelaide Showground roof.

When the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act was originally drafted, renewable energy development was not envisaged. This amendment bill makes it possible for a wind farm developer to apply for a licence to build and operate a wind farm on pastoral lease land. A wind farm development can coexist with pastoral activities in the same way as occurs on freehold farming land. The bill also expedites access to pastoral land for solar energy projects.

To date, all wind farm development in South Australia has occurred on freehold farming land, but we also have an excellent wind resource in some areas of our pastoral lease land. The solar resource in the north of our state is world class. This bill, if passed, will be the first of its type in Australia that specifically allows for the coexistence of wind farm development and the activities of pastoralism and resource exploration on crown land. No other legislation of this type exists in Australia, I am told.

The wind farm licence authorises a wind farm developer to build access roads and infrastructure associated with a wind farm. The licence will allow a developer to fence off areas, such as a substation, where it is considered necessary to do so. A wind farm developer will make information available on an ongoing basis regarding planned activities on the land and the location of access roads and infrastructure, and a pastoral lessee will be able to make reasonable use of access roads built by a wind farm developer. The wind farm licence conditions will be negotiated on a case-by-case basis in recognition of the varying nature of pastoral lease land and the great variation in the scope of wind farm projects.

A pastoral lessee stands to benefit financially from a wind farm licence. The South Australian government will charge a licence fee for use of pastoral lease land that is commensurate with that paid by wind farm developers to owners of freehold land. This fee will take account of the extra costs associated with development in remote areas, and 95 per cent of this fee will be distributed to a pastoral lessee and any other party with an interest in the land, such as, for example, native title holders. An initial amount will be paid during the exploration and construction phases of the project and then an annual amount once the wind farm is operating.

A wind farm licence will be granted for at least 25 years, with the option to renew for another term of 25 years. Prior to the granting of a licence, a wind farm developer will be able to gain access to pastoral land upon approval by the minister responsible for the act. The wind farm developer will need to give 14 days' notice, and access can be granted, for example, for conducting investigations or tests, the temporary installation of devices, the taking of samples, or for any other purpose as agreed by the minister.

During this period, no other wind farm developer will be given approval for access to the same portion of a pastoral lease for a period of up to 5½ years in order to protect the developer's investment in the exploration phase. During this investigation period, a developer must satisfy the minister after a period of 2½ years that they have developed a plan for a wind farm on the land and are able to fund the completion of that plan. If the minister is satisfied, a further three years for investigations will be granted.

Once a wind farm licence is granted, the developer must reach two critical milestones. Within three years, a developer needs to demonstrate that they have financing and have executed contracts for the construction of the major components of the wind farm. Within five years, the wind turbines must be erected and commissioning tests completed. It is recognised that there are times when general economic and market conditions are uncertain for wind farm development, and the minister may choose to vary the milestone times mentioned, provided genuine progress is shown by the wind farm developer.

It may also be important for an additional option to licence agreement to be negotiated with a wind farm developer on a case-by-case basis. This would allow for risk-based investment decisions to occur. Sometimes, in the development of a wind farm, there is a requirement for more than one owner. For instance, one party may own the wind farm and another the connection line easement. In this case, the bill makes allowance for more than one licence to be issued. In issuing a licence, there will be obligations on the licence holder to decommission and rehabilitate the wind farm area on completion of the operation period or on lapse of the wind farm licence.

Before a wind farm licence is granted, the responsible minister will consult with the pastoral lessee and any other persons who have an interest in the land. If an application for a wind farm licence relates to pastoral land over which a mining tenement under the Mining Act 1971, or a petroleum or geothermal tenement under the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000, is held, a wind farm licence will not be issued until the applicant has entered into a land access agreement with the holder of the resources tenement. It is recognised that resource exploration can coexist with a wind farm development, and it may be possible also for resource production to coexist.

It is expected that a wind farm developer will provide to interested parties ongoing information pertinent to the development during each of the investigation, the construction and the operational phases of the project. In the case of solar energy development, pastoralism and commercial scale solar energy production cannot coexist. In this case it is necessary for the land to be excised from a pastoral lease.

Currently, there is provision in the act for land to be removed from a pastoral lease. A developer will need to agree commercial terms with the pastoral lessee. Land can then be surrendered upon ministerial approval. In this case, a decision will be given within a one-month period. Once the land is surrendered, it reverts to unalienated crown land and is dealt with under the Crown Land Management Act and a miscellaneous lease can be issued under this act.

In circumstances where agreement cannot be reached, there is a mechanism in the act for resumption of land. The time for resumption in the act is at least six months. The amendment will reduce this time to two months. Pastoral lessees are entitled to compensation if a portion of a leasehold is resumed. The government is reducing the resumption time in order to give some certainty to investors in processes over which it has jurisdiction. In cases where warranted, the government will offer a lease to a solar energy developer for a minimal rent in recognition of the costs associated with large-scale solar energy production.

In the case of wind developers accessing pastoral lease land through the excision of part of a pastoral leasehold, a wind farm lease will be offered at a rent commensurate with that paid by wind farm developers to owners of freehold land. This rent will take account of the extra costs associated with development in remote areas.

If the construction of a solar energy facility has not been substantially completed within five years of the date that resumption takes effect, the minister may choose to restore the excised area back to the pastoral leasehold. According to Defence SA, the Woomera protected area is not suitable for wind and solar development due to interference with defence equipment. For this reason, we will not be issuing licences or leases over this area for wind or solar developments.

No wind or solar energy development will occur on land subject to a mining lease, unless associated with the mining tenement. It should be noted that the intent of this amendment relates only to the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act and does not seek to alter any processes under any other act. Developers will need to be cognisant of the requirements of all other relevant acts. In regard to the issue of native title, a wind farm licence will not be granted on pastoral lease land, nor land excised from a pastoral lease, until any native title issues have been adequately addressed as per the Native Title Act.

In summary, this amendment is designed not only to attract renewable energy investment to the state but to enable people with an interest in pastoral lease land, particularly in near proximity to transmission lines, to gain financially from this form of development. It should be noted that South Australia's success in attracting investment not only stimulates growth in the clean energy industries of the future but it provides employment and economic opportunities for many in regional communities. I commend the bill to members.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:48): I bring up the following report of the committee appointed to prepare a draft Address in Reply to His Excellency the Governor's speech:

1. We, the members of the Legislative Council, thank Your Excellency for the speech with which you have been pleased to open parliament.
2. We assure Your Excellency that we will give our best attention to all matters placed before us.
3. We earnestly join in Your Excellency's desire for our deliberations to serve the advancement of the welfare of South Australia and of its people.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:49): I move:

That the Address in Reply as read be adopted.

I thank the Governor for his opening address. I, too, join with the Governor in passing on my condolences on the death of a former governor and seven former members of this parliament since the opening of the 52nd Parliament. Mr President, I take this opportunity to congratulate you on your election as President. I trust I will benefit from your advice and guidance as I learn the ropes in this place. To new and continuing members of the Legislative Council, I extend my congratulations on your election. I look forward to working with all of you in the next few years. I hope we can have a professional working relationship in and outside this place.

I am Ngo The Tung; I was born in Da Nang, Vietnam. I arrived in South Australia in August 1982 with my sister and her family. I was 10 years old and had just spent 1½ years in a refugee camp in the Philippines. It is a great honour for me to stand in this parliament as a boat refugee from Vietnam. Thirty-two years ago I did not have a country or a home. The people of South Australia opened their doors to me. Thirty-two years later those very people have elected me to be their voice and representative in parliament. I am deeply honoured and truly grateful.

My journey to Australia was difficult and dangerous. I left Vietnam as a nine year old on a small fishing boat with 31 other Vietnamese people. We were attacked by pirates, who took all our valuables, including the boat's engine, and we were left to die. After a few hours of drifting, the boat was taking in water due to the damage done when the engine was removed. We all prayed to our own God that we could make it through. Many were calling for Buddha to save us. Others were praying for Jesus Christ. I remember the last words of advice that my parents gave me the night they said goodbye to me: they told me to pray to the Virgin Mary whenever I felt the need to and to recite the Virgin Mary's Lourdes prayer three times. I prayed to her.

While everyone was beginning to accept that the end was near, somebody started shouting that they could see a ship. They were waving their hands and screaming. Because of the last ocean wave, I did not see a ship until a good five minutes later when it got closer to us. The ship was called *Cap Annamur*, and we were very fortunate that it did not abandon us. It saved us all from a certain death. The *Cap Annamur* took us to a refugee camp in the Philippines, where we stayed for 1½ years, before being accepted and settled in South Australia.

The reason I have taken the political path is a commitment I made when I first landed here in Adelaide. This commitment was not about being a member of parliament or getting rich and famous. The commitment I made was to repay the generosity this country has shown to me and my family. I found out that one way I could repay this country was to get involved in the wider community, working as a link between Vietnamese migrants and other Australians. I wanted to help the new

emerging community that I was part of come together with the wider community that had been so good to me. I wanted to promote harmony so that Australians had an opportunity to gain a positive perspective about migrants and refugees, and see more than just the negative stories I have read in the paper, even to this day.

In high school I played cricket and Aussie Rules. I also got involved in less popular activities that other kids had no interest in: for example, it was unpopular then to join the student representative council (SRC). We had to miss out on having fun at lunchtime to attend those meetings. I was voted by the school committee to become school prefect in my final year of high school. In later years, I was encouraged to run for local council. I was told that I could do a lot to help ethnic communities and the wider Australian community as well. In 1995, I became the first Vietnamese-born person to be elected to local government in South Australia. I served on the Port Adelaide Enfield council for nearly 19 years, until I resigned recently due to my election to this house.

I take this opportunity to thank all the staff and elected members from the council for helping me with my role as councillor and, most importantly, for helping to make a difference in the lives of the many people they represent. During high school, I landed a job at KFC, and when I was at university, I worked as a pizza delivery driver for Pizza Hut. Those were the real jobs that I cherish because they gave me my first opportunity to enter the outside world. Working for these fast-food outlets led to my involvement with the Shop Distributive and Allied Employees' Association (SDA).

In 1995, I was offered a part-time job as a youth casual recruitment officer. Working at the SDA really taught me how to deal with conflict, advocating and compromising. It also taught me that there were people in Australia who were not in a position to defend themselves. What I liked most about working for the SDA was its relationship with the workers and employers. All three interested parties worked together for the benefit of everybody. I cannot remember the last time the union went out on strike. Most matters were resolved on the shop floor.

I thank the SDA for the opportunity to represent them and their members in my seven years as an organiser. I also thank the secretary, Mr Peter Malinauskas assistant secretary, Sonia Romeo and the SDA community members for their support through my long journey to this house. Without their support, I would not be here today. Like my previous role at the SDA, I will continue advocating for retail workers, as well as working for the employers, for the betterment of this state.

I also thank the former secretary of the SDA and now senator Don Farrell. I have known Don and his wife Nimfa since 1995, when he offered me a part-time job at the SDA. I have seen the media portray Don as a faceless man, somebody who is uncaring and ruthless. In reality, he is the complete opposite. I have not met one person in public life, such as a politician or business person, who has worked with him and had one bad thing to say about him.

I know personally that he cares very much about the wellbeing of this state and this country. He has continued to fight for the underprivileged, such as young workers, women and ethnic communities. Don and Nimfa once said to me that, if I was able to make it to high places one day, I needed to do what I could to assist the wider ethnic community. This country is strong because of its diversity and its people.

Don travelled overseas and to remote areas when he was young, and I have heard him speak about the experience he gained meeting with different cultures. It is important for there to be diverse views in this house to provide the best result for our diverse community. Don knew this, and he made sure of this when he was advocating for Mr Tom Koutsantonis, the member for West Torrens, to become the first Greek MP in South Australia. I am the only Vietnamese born member of parliament in Australia, and I thank Don and his wife for their leadership and their foresight in giving someone like me the voice for the communities I will be representing.

I take this opportunity to thank all those people who have been so important in getting me elected. I thank the Labor Party members who preselected me to be the party's candidate and all the ALP voters and supporters for electing me and other Labor members in this parliament. Thank you for the trust you placed in us. I also acknowledge all the volunteers for their work and for the countless hours they put into helping the ALP. I thank the unions and their secretaries who supported and encouraged me to put up my hand for parliament: Mr Ray Wyatt from the TWU, John Camillo from the AMWU, Ms Debbie Black from the FSU, and Mr Bob Donnelly from the CEPU.

I thank the many members of parliament who have been such good friends to me for several years and who have always gone out of their way to help the many communities I have referred them to: Michael Atkinson, Tom Kenyon, Tom Koutsantonis, John Rau, Nick Champion, Kate Ellis, Gerry Kandelaars, Dana and Russell Wortley, Lisa Vlahos, Zoe Bettison, Amanda Rishworth, Senator Gallacher and former senator, Annette Hurley.

I also thank the many friends of mine like Sonia and Daniel Romeo, Paul Sykes, Rosie Falco, Nimfa Farrell, Chad Buchanan, Reggie Martin, Peter Louca, Bob Korbel, Mary Karsperski, Corey Harriss, Paul Marcuccitti, Sam Runnel, Aemon Bourke, Michael Brown, Young Yin and Chinh Ho for always standing up and defending me. I want to acknowledge a former member of this house Carmel Zollo who recently retired. I wish Lou and her all the best for the future as they enjoy their retirement.

I thank my good friend Jack Snelling, who has been instrumental in my political career. Jack was the first person who signed me up to the ALP back in 1994. In 2002, he offered me a position in his electorate office and from 2010 I became his ministerial adviser. I thank him for giving me the opportunity to be part of the decision-making process in the ALP and for taking me under his wing and teaching me so much about the political system. I thank my staff, Michael and James, and I look forward to working with them in the coming years.

As I said earlier, the jobs I had in my youth helped get me where I am today. Unemployment in youth and ethnic communities is still far too high. Many parents have spoken to me about their kids not being able to get part-time jobs. They want their children to be able to go out and take a part-time job in the workforce so that they do not just hang around in the house on computers all day. We need to find ways to create more opportunities for our youth.

Small business is the engine of our state economy. It employs about half of the workforce and represents more than 90 per cent of all businesses in this great state. I believe one way to help small business is to allow small business owners to conduct their business in the most efficient way. Small business owners find the amount of bureaucracy that they have to deal with when opening or maintaining a business particularly problematic. We should remove all unnecessary regulation.

Small business creation is an important source of pride for many migrants. Migrants who have made the difficult decision to leave their homeland for a better life innately hold the value of entrepreneurship within them. First generation migrants often find it hard to find employment. Opening small businesses, often restaurants, helps to promote a migrant's culture, as well as providing all the other benefits that small business creation contributes to our state.

Contrary to some people's belief, migrants do not want to go to Centrelink and take unemployment benefits. I speak from personal experience. Migrants want to work and to contribute to this country that has been so good to so many of us. Local government and state government need to be working together to assist the small local family run businesses. In the next eight years I intend to work closely with the small business community and advocate on their behalf.

To my family, I thank my parents—my dad, Tu, and my mum, May. I cannot imagine how painful it must have been for them to put their young children on a perilous boat, hoping that they could have a better future. They knew that their decision could potentially have sent me to my death. Being a parent myself now, I know how hard and painful that decision would have been for them. I also thank my nine brothers and sisters who are living in the US for their caring advice and support of me throughout these years. I also thank my two other sisters, Phuong and Dung, and their husbands, and my uncle and aunty Chap who pretty much brought me up in Australia. I thank the Bugden family—Brian, Dianna and Jacob—whom I lived with for several years and who taught me many aspects of the Australian way of life.

Finally, I thank my wife, Kim-Phuong, for her support and understanding. Being a politician's partner is not easy. I know you have sacrificed a lot for me to be here. Thank you for your love and sticking with me. I thank her family for their help, especially with babysitting our son, Jayden. As I am sure is the case with all honourable members in this chamber, my children are the most important aspect of my life, and I am in this place so that I can do something positive for our future generations and obviously my children, Renee and Jayden.

I share my election win with the whole Vietnamese community in Australia. This is a proud moment for the community, having the second person in Australia to be elected to parliament. The

fall of Saigon in 1975 saw millions of Vietnamese people dispatched around the world. In Australia, the arrival of the first Vietnamese refugees in the late seventies was the start of the first big wave of non-European migrants and refugees to this country. There are now over 400,000 Vietnamese Australians in various Australian states and territories.

Like any new migrants to this country, we first struggled to adapt to the new society. We had to learn a new language and a new way of life; many had to work two or three jobs to provide for their families. Cultural differences and problems with learning a new language can often lead to isolation and affect the wellbeing of both migrants and the existing community. Multicultural policies set up by various governments, as well as the Australian belief of 'a fair go for all', have enabled the Vietnamese community to integrate into this society. The Vietnamese have also enriched Australia with their own cultural heritage, and Australia is a better country to live in as a result.

The Vietnamese community will always be grateful to Australia and the Australian people, who have embraced all of us in this tolerant and peaceful society. I also want to pay tribute to all Australian service personnel who served during the Vietnam War in which 521 Australians, including 58 South Australians, paid the ultimate sacrifice. For many Vietnamese, you were our heroes and protectors, and you are the reason that many Vietnamese can enjoy the life they do today. To every Vietnam veteran and their families, especially those who lost their sons, on behalf of every Vietnamese person in Australia I want to say thank you—thank you for your courage and sacrifice, and thank you for everything you did.

In closing, my own life experience as a refugee growing up in this country has shown me how tough it can be for those who are unemployed, for those who do not have English as their first language, and for those who are discriminated against. I want to use my new position and this office to work as a link between those disadvantaged people and the wider Australian community. I want to help new Australians feel welcome in this land and show them that they do have a voice in this great country; vice versa, I want to be a link from the wider Australian community to these new settlers. I want to help the new settlers learn the Australian way of life and give them the same Australian values, the same belief in 'a fair go for all', which welcoming Australians showed to me all those years ago.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (16:08): I rise to second the motion supporting Address in Reply. It gives me great pleasure to stand on this side of the chamber on this bench as a member of a fourth term Labor government. First, I wish to congratulate and thank the Governor, His Excellency Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce, for his address on the opening of the 53rd Parliament. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the great work of our Governor and his wife, Liz Scarce. They have certainly endeared themselves to the South Australian community and lent their support to many deserving causes. They have represented this state and its interests with distinction. It is always a pleasure to meet the Governor and his wife. They are remarkably personable and put those who meet them at ease instantly. As we all know, the Governor's term is coming to an end, and I wish him and his wife all the best in the future.

On Tuesday, the Governor outlined a vision of the Weatherill Labor government, a future that is bright. The Labor vision is to keep building South Australia. It is a vision that we on this side are proud of. It is a vision that looks to keep South Australia moving forward, a vision to transform and modernise our economy by ensuring a strong partnership between government, business and the community. The Governor's speech outlined the government's approach to making the most of our opportunities and was underpinned by three clear principles.

First, the government will intensify the level of collaboration between business, government and academia. The second principle underpinning the government's plan is to transform the economy to develop a stronger culture of innovation in South Australia; that is, to constantly search for new and better ways of doing things. The third principle supporting the government's approach to modernise and grow our economy is our commitment to an outward-looking approach. South Australia has gained a reputation as a welcoming, engaging state. South Australia must continue to build this great tradition. It is true that we face challenges ahead, particularly the pending closure of Holden at Elizabeth and, sadly, Australia's vehicle manufacturing industry as a whole.

Late last year we saw the Prime Minister refuse to engage Holden regarding its future here in Australia. We then saw two senior federal government ministers—the Treasurer and the Minister

for Infrastructure and Regional Development, at that point also acting prime minister—dare Holden to leave this country. Surprise, surprise—the next day Holden announced that it would cease its automotive production in Australia from 2017, a decision that will cost thousands of manufacturing jobs in this state and have a profound impact on Adelaide's northern suburbs. Where were the state Liberals when this was taking place? Sadly, they were missing in action. How disgraceful. How appalling.

This state faces another significant challenge in the form of savage cuts from an Abbott federal government based on an artificially contrived budget crisis; savage cuts to health by attacking Medicare with a GP tax; savage cuts to education; savage cuts to the minimum wage; and savage cuts to our ageing population—and the list goes on.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins): I remind the honourable member that this is an address in reply to the Governor's speech. I am not sure where these things the member is mentioning now are in the Governor's speech. I call the Hon. Mr Kandelaars.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: In the face of these challenges, the only way to keep moving forward as a state is to keep building South Australia and to keep standing up to the Abbott Liberal government, which is exactly what we intend to do.

I am particularly proud, of course, because not many people thought I would be making this speech today from the government benches. Certainly those opposite assumed that they would be sitting on this side of the chamber, but, as history shows, they were very wrong. The Liberal Party's failure to form government has been blamed on everybody else but themselves. I think in time history will show that the Liberal Party is arrogant and that any blame for their failure to form government must be attributed to their leader, Steven Marshall, senior Liberal Party strategists and senior members of the Marshall front bench.

The Liberal Party played small target politics. Rightly, the people of South Australia wanted and expected more. In contrast, the Premier set out Labor's extensive policy platform on day one of the campaign—and I have it here. We did this because we had a story to tell: Labor has a vision for South Australia and it is a vision that we are proud of and are prepared to stand by.

Here is an idea for those opposite: perhaps next time sell a vision of your own. It works actually. People want ideas, not slogans. They want a government that will lead from the front, not a government that fails to offer fresh ideas but instead simply agitates for no more than change's sake. They want a leader who will fight for the interests of South Australia, not one who shirks scrutiny and debate by avoiding the media during an election campaign or shuts down press conferences because the questions do not suit him.

Importantly, they do not want a leader who simply worships the federal Abbott government and meekly accepts cruel cuts to South Australia. Those opposite have been whingeing since 15 March. They have been whingeing that the electoral system is not fair. They forget two critical things: first, following the 1989 state election it was the Liberals who lobbied for the electoral system as it exists today. If Labor had received 50 per cent of the statewide two PP vote but lost, do you think it would have cried foul? Of course not.

Secondly, the Liberals forgot the rules. They were clear to everybody. Every party contesting the election knew the equation. There were 47 seats in the House of Assembly and to form government in its own right the party had to win 24 seats. It was always the case that for the Liberals to win government they needed to win six extra seats. On this side, it was equally clear that we had to defend those seats. For the second successive election the Liberal Party has failed to achieve what was required; that is, they can only blame one source—themselves.

The 'mincing poodle', as the then prime minister Julia Gillard referred to him, the federal member for Sturt, outrageously suggested that this Labor government is illegitimate. What nonsense. Did the federal member for Sturt refer to the 1998 Howard government as illegitimate? Certainly not. What hypocrisy—this from the man pulling the factional strings of the South Australian Liberal Party, a man, so rumour says, who has single-handedly taken control of the state Liberal Party campaign review, sidelining the state director, Geoff Greene, in a desperate effort to discover why his hand-picked state leader, the member for Dunstan, is not the premier of South Australia.

Even as recently as yesterday we heard the Liberal Party complain about Labor's so-called dirty tricks. What rubbish, what a cop-out. The easy yet predictable excuse. When complaining about

dirty tricks the Liberal Party lacks credibility. This is the party which for months prior to the election made a political football out of the sexual abuse of a child in a western suburbs school. They perfected the art of smear and fear—a favourite term of those opposite when complaining about the superior campaigning effort of Labor. But, even still, they tried to denigrate the Premier's integrity and honesty which was upheld by the DeBelle report.

No matter, though. In one of the most shameful political stunts that this state has witnessed, the Liberals authorised and funded a radio advertisement on behalf of the Independent in the seat of Lee. That advertisement stated that the Premier knew of a rape of a child, that he chose not to tell the parents, and that the Premier's assertions that he was not informed of the incident at the time were false. Each of these statements was a lie. The advertisement was deceitful. It deliberately contradicted the finding of an independent inquiry with the powers of a royal commission.

Yet the Liberals sought to gain political advantage. What was worse was that they left it to an Independent candidate, who may or may not have known better, to do their dirty work. How disgraceful. How cowardly. The Electoral Commissioner held that each of these statements was misleading and inaccurate to a material extent, in breach of the Electoral Act. The commissioner requested the Liberal Party to withdraw the advertisement and to publish a retraction in the same time, place and form as the original advertisement.

But what did the Liberal Party do? They refused to publish the apology, in defiance of the commissioner's determination. Instead, a week later, they decided to distribute a flyer in the electorate of Adelaide which levelled substantially similar allegations against the Premier. This time the commissioner requested that the Liberals issue a public statement of retraction to the media. Again, the Liberal Party ignored it. These incidents were only two of five in which the Liberal Party electoral advertisements were held to be misleading and inaccurate to a material extent, and for which they were requested by the commissioner to publish a retraction. Each time, they refused.

Another occasion was a television commercial in which the Leader of the Opposition stated that the Labor Party had short-changed the McLaren Vale hospital. This was despite a commitment given by the Minister for Health (Hon. Jack Snelling) to continue funding that hospital for a further three years. The shadow minister for health (Hon. Rob Lucas) knew that before this advertisement was published. He admitted as much on his Twitter account of 12 February, and he admitted that Labor and the Liberals had offered the same level of funding.

So the Liberal advertisement that aired during the campaign was one of two things: it was either a deliberate lie, designed to misinform voters, or it was evidence of the Liberal Party's incompetence and shows a clear lack of communication between the shadow minister for health and the opposition campaign spokesman (Hon. Rob Lucas) and the Leader of the Opposition. I very much look forward to hearing the Hon. Mr Lucas clarifying that for us at some stage. Here is what the Electoral Commissioner had to say, in a letter dated 12 March, on the McLaren Vale hospital:

I am of the view that the advertisement is in breach of the act and have requested the Liberal Party to withdraw the advertisement from further publication in any form and publish a retraction and apology on the Liberal Party website.

As with every election, the campaign was hard fought. Yes, it was a battle, but any suggestion by the Liberal Party that it was denied government through dirty tricks is nothing more than a desperate attempt by those opposite to place blame anywhere other than where it ought to be placed. It is a bit rich for the Liberal members to criticise the Labor Party, given their dirty tricks. What hypocrisy. We on this side will not be lectured by those opposite—I stress, we will not be lectured by those opposite. The Liberal Party must take responsibility for its failures. No-one else is to blame—no-one. The Hon. Rob Lucas, the Liberal Party campaign spokesman, will not take responsibility, that is for sure.

Moving on, it is interesting to wonder how many consecutive defeats the Liberal Party will endure before they will actually do something about their side, quite frankly. That is enough of the vanquished. The Labor Party has managed to form government with the agreement of the member for Frome. In the light of this result, there are some people who deserve congratulations. Firstly, Reggie Martin, who, I see, is in the gallery today, the secretary of the Labor Party here in South Australia. He led a wonderful central campaign. He worked tirelessly to ensure that individual campaigns could focus on what they needed to focus on, that is getting out and actively engaging and listening to the people in their electorates.

Labor's parliamentary party has also seen the introduction of new blood. I congratulate those new members, in particular the member for Napier, Jon Gee, who will represent his constituents with the utmost diligence and passion and who is acutely aware of the challenges facing the northern suburbs; the member for Lee, Stephen Mullighan, who recently was appointed to cabinet; the member for Kaurana, Chris Picton; the member for Reynell, Katrine Hildyard; and the member for Gillies—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Giles.

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS: —Giles, sorry—Eddie Hughes. I also wish to particularly applaud the new member for Torrens, Dana Wortley, who campaigned extremely hard and whose hard work has rightly been rewarded.

At this juncture it is necessary to wonder whether the Liberals' view that a couple cannot be employed in the same department of the Public Service means it is improper for a couple to be employed, say, as doctors or nurses in the same hospital or teachers in the same school. It is a crazy notion, but it would appear to be the view that we should return to the 1960s and the marriage bar of that time. For those who do not know what the marriage bar is, it excluded women who were married from having a job in the Public Service.

Why do I raise this? This issue arises because of the campaign material distributed by the Liberal Party in Torrens, which seems to suggest that a woman who is married to another member of this parliament does not deserve to be a member of this parliament. Dana has a right to a career of her own. Again, what hypocrisy, what a shameful line of attack. Just another brilliant decision of the Liberal misogynists—sorry, strategists! Sometimes it is hard to tell the difference.

Moving on, I would also like to congratulate two members of this place: the Hon. Tung Ngo, who has become the first Vietnamese-born member of the South Australian parliament, and, the Hon. Kyam Maher, who has worked tirelessly throughout his time in this place and thoroughly deserves his election. I should also mention you, Mr President, and the Hon. Ian Hunter: you were both re-elected for another term in this place. I offer my heartfelt congratulations to you all.

I want to note the retirement of a number of members, particularly Robyn Geraghty, the former member for Torrens, a person who spent many years in this place and had a real impact here and in her community—a great local member. Very few of us will ever get a chance to serve for nearly 20 years, as Robyn did. She was the longest-serving Labor Government Whip in South Australia's history, a wonderful person to work for (and I worked for her for six years), a wonderful colleague and mentor and, most importantly, a dear friend to my wife and me.

I also mention Lyn Breuer, who served in the seat of Giles with passion for her community. She was the first South Australian female Speaker, a great spokesperson for regional South Australia, and you could always ensure that she would call a spade a spade—a great South Australian. I mention, too, the Hon. Carmel Zollo who, as I have said previously in this place, provided me with a guiding hand and was an enormous help when I first entered this place. She also served for an extraordinarily long period of 15 years, as did Lyn. I wish all three remarkable women the best in the next stage of their life.

Finally, I also thank and congratulate a band of loyal party volunteers who gave up their time—took time away from their own jobs for no financial gain or reward—to stand up for the Labor cause in which they believe dearly. It is people like this who will always represent the defining difference between Labor and others. There is life still in the Labor government. The recent election result has reinvigorated this government. We have a positive agenda for this state, and I am excited to stand part of the government that will always put jobs before cuts, and we will keep building South Australia.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (16:33): It is a pleasure to stand here and speak to the Address in Reply 2014. I thank the Governor for his speech. It is always a very important part of our parliamentary process and our democracy when we have the Chief Justice and the other judges here, members sworn in and the election of the President. It is pomp and ceremony, but a very important part of our tradition, and we should make sure that we always maintain it.

I also extend the opposition's best wishes to the member for Fisher and his family. The Hon. Dr Such has offered a great deal to this parliament and diligently serves his electorate. The

people of his electorate have a great respect and affection for him. I note that the South Australian community and the parliament are hoping for his speeding recovery.

My colleagues and I have looked forward to the return of parliament—perhaps not thrilled about returning to this side of the chamber, as evidenced by our two-party preferred vote of 53 per cent. A majority of South Australians are not thrilled either, but nevertheless we are grateful to be back here in good health, with the ability to continue doing the job of holding this government to account and serving the state we love.

Holding this Labor government to account grows ever more frustrating. It becomes increasingly clear that they do not feel obliged to answer to the opposition or to the South Australian public. As the South Australian Labor Party enters its fourth term of office, the arrogance will only grow.

As members opposite would know, the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, who is not with us in the chamber at the moment, talked about dirty tricks. I think it is appropriate that I talk about some of the tactics that delivered a fourth-term minority government—the tactics that provided you, Mr President, with your plum job, minister Gago with another stint at a lacklustre leadership and, in fact, all the ministers and members opposite. In fact, I suspect that even the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars may have been so embarrassed that, when he welcomed all new members of parliament, he forgot the member for Elder, or as we call her on this side, the 'member for racism'.

As I said throughout question time on Tuesday, our most recent preselections delivered some high-quality candidates from both sides of politics. I had the great pleasure of working closely with a number of them and the not so great pleasure of observing some underhand tactics from others; the case in point is the now Labor member for Elder, Annabel Digance.

It was clear from the outset that Ms Digance was in a desperate bid to follow her two failed attempts at federal parliament with a win at state level. I believe that it was not the desperation born from her love of the electorate or her desire to serve its people but one driven by personal pride and ego. That desperation played out in her behaviour and personal attacks towards the Liberal candidate and, just as seriously, with what I believe was threatening behaviour displayed by her husband towards Ms Habib and her dedicated volunteers.

On Tuesday, the Leader of the Government in this place called my concern 'sour grapes', not racism or personal attacks or dodgy campaign tactics but 'sour grapes'. I have made no secret of the fact that I am disappointed with the outcome of 15 March. We live in a democracy, and with any questions about the effectiveness of the Electoral Act momentarily put aside, this is the parliament we have been delivered.

However, I do have sour grapes when either side of politics acts in an undemocratic way for the advantage of their party. When those actions are pivotal in delivering a particular election result, it demeans the very system that South Australia is so proud to have. It speaks volumes for the current Labor government, its collective character and its values and priorities.

By contrast, I will quickly speak about the admirable character of our Liberal candidate for Elder, Ms Carolyn Habib, a woman who is passionate about her community and about creating opportunities for those who are disadvantaged. There were no devious tactics in Carolyn Habib's campaign; it was focused on hard work, receptivity and respect, even for her opponent. It was clear from Ms Habib's approach that she inherited her good values from a hardworking, honest Australian upbringing.

At a farewell function for an industry chief executive, I was concerned when former minister Conlon, the then member for Elder—of course, he was working for Minter Ellison, so the part-time member for Elder—informed me that Habib's problem was her name. I know that it is out of order to refer to people in the gallery, but they have been referred to before. I suspect that this is something that the Labor Party was planning to do from day one; they thought they had an opportunity. Former minister Conlon said, 'Her name will never fly down there.'

A few days prior to the election—and we are all familiar with it now—the now member for Elder distributed a Labor Party endorsed flyer which embodied a great deal of prejudice, which we in this parliament elected to fight against. In fact, a senior journalist at *The Australian* who rang me about it said that it was printed with what they called 'the international terrorist font'. I did not think that an international terrorist font existed, but there have been a couple of books written by

international terrorists, and the exact same type of font and stylising have been used in those publications. It is extremely sad, but I believe that the voting community of Elder was frightened by it as much as it was offended by it.

As I said on Tuesday, Carolyn Habib—as put by David Penberthy—had 'by dint of her surname become the subject of button pushing smear'. Haydon Manning of Flinders University made the assessment that the flyer had been 'designed to attract the attention of those few voters who might take a dim view of a candidate with a name like Habib'. As I said, I believe it did that.

When the pamphlet was opened up, it made a ridiculous link between Ms Habib's election to the Marion council and a substantial rate increase. It would be like blaming me, having been a member of parliament for the last 12 years and continually begging the government not to force us into debt, for the \$14 billion of state debt we have today. How outrageous it was that this campaign brochure would try to link a council member to higher council rates when, in fact, she voted against substantial rate rises! In fact—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Well, no—as my colleague interjects, it is not the only place to do that. It is a ridiculous assertion that she was responsible for increased council rates. If Ms Habib had not been so busy trying to win an election on merit and good policies, she might have responded to that. Between 2004 and 2010, when Annabel Digance was on the South Australian water board, she attended an average of 1.5 meetings a month while South Australian water bills soared by some 50 per cent, and she pocketed some \$225,000 in board fees while she was there.

The 'Can you trust Habib?' pamphlet was one of the final instalments in a campaign which had been based on lies and scaremongering—for example, the Liberals do not care about sick babies because we are going to scrap the upgrade to the Flinders neonatal units. The pamphlet was a new low in Labor campaigning.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Yes, it was the last roll of the dice for the Digance team. It made national headlines and drew criticism and dismay from all sides of politics and the public. It was truly a step backwards for South Australian democracy and it will be Annabel Digance's legacy to this parliament. As we have said, we often call her 'the member for racism' on our side of the chamber. Of course, it brings into the question how the Premier, when asked about this, said that in his judgement he did not think it was a racist slur on Ms Habib. Now, have we stepped to a new low if it is the Premier's judgement that it is not bad to attack somebody for their race? If somebody is fat or does not look good, if they are ugly or of a non-preferred ethnic background, is it up to the Premier to judge this? Nearly everybody in the nation in politics and in the public saw this as a very low point in this state's history.

I also make mention of the member for Elder's husband. By this point, he was becoming increasingly involved in the campaign, too. His desperation to win was also palpable, and it was completely clear he was prepared to engage in all manner of conduct to get his wife over the line. By contrast, I worked on a polling booth most of the day with what I would call normal ALP volunteers, people who barrack for a different team from me but are decent people, and I know the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars referred to them. They do not engage in intimidating behaviour, they are just happy to have a chat about the weather and the footy and support their team. We have them on our side, and those volunteers from all sides of politics are an important part of our democracy.

However, in this case, this person was going over the line. An article in *The Advertiser* speaks of the harassment of Liberal volunteers at a shopping centre. Mr Digance said that he refuted the claims and that he had been subject to similar behaviour from the Liberals. He later retracted those statements. On the eve of the election, he called the police and reported one of our volunteers for assault while they were setting up the polling booth at Hamilton College—that one of our volunteers had struck one of the Labor volunteers. I think the volunteer may have been his daughter, but I am not 100 per cent certain of that.

We have a copy of the CCTV footage from Hamilton College and I can attest that there is no such behaviour. I remind people that to report a crime that did not exist is actually a crime in itself—a false report to the police. Again, this is evidence of the lengths that this particular campaign would go to in order to get over the line. On polling day, a number of volunteers bore witness to Mr Digance

behaving in a manner which they assessed as being generally intimidating. An article in the *Sunday Mail* gave an account of one such incident at the Edwardstown Primary School polling booth. His intimidation included invading the personal space of Liberal candidate Carolyn Habib, when she arrived, and continually taking photos. In fact, he followed her around with his iPhone filming her.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: My colleague the Hon. Terry Stephens says 'stalking her' from the moment she arrived. I am also reminded that the young Liberal who allegedly assaulted the young Labor volunteer was also intimidated when he was working on another booth. He was told, 'We are going to get you. We have that stuff on you from last night.' So again there was intimidation when that assault did not happen. At another booth, three Liberal volunteers had to report a Labor volunteer to the returning officer for sexual and verbal harassment. One of the volunteers had her bra strap twanged by a Labor volunteer handing out how-to-vote cards. She had her bra strap pulled and twanged by a Labor volunteer on this campaign.

Another one of the volunteers was asked—and this is slightly unparliamentary, Mr President, but I think I need to put it on the record—by another Labor volunteer to come out, and go behind the shed for a root and a beer. In the polling booth line up! So, this man over there talks about our dirty tactics, this was intimidation like we have never seen before, in the line-up at a polling booth. I also point to the tactics around the Habib poster for polling day. I know we are not allowed to use props, so I will just look at it. I will not hold it up for members, but members would remember—oh, he's gone now, Reggie Martin has left the chamber—the lengths he would go to stretch the truth.

We had a Steven Marshall poster—a big, long, black one with a not particularly flattering photograph of our leader with 'cut deeply', a cross; 'cut jobs', a cross; and 'slow the economy, the Liberals say no'. I was told by a Labor volunteer on the night before the election that the whole Habib thing and the racist stuff really had not gone that well for them, and that they had to cut a poster off. All we saw on election day was a cross saying 'doesn't have the experience, the Liberals say no' in the same style and same black font. I suspect there was a very nasty extension to that which was guillotined off because, again, they knew they had overstepped the line and they had gone to a new low, and they were not game to put up that poster because they knew that it would potentially have disastrous impacts for them.

Also the returning officer, Mr Geoff Lang, was somewhat concerned about this behaviour. He raised it with me, and I suspect that, if Mr Digance had turned up at the pre-poll and postal vote counting after the election, he would have been excluded from that process simply because of the way in which he had conducted himself on election day. While I touch on this, I would also like to congratulate Geoff Lang, the returning officer, for his work and his team. I think they conducted themselves very well.

I was involved as a scrutineer in the pre-poll and postal vote count. Although the one point I will make, and I did promise Mr Lang I would do this, is that I think the person who bought the envelopes that the postal votes went in—and the machine would not open them—needs to explain why you would buy a set of envelopes that are used on polling day that do not actually work. I have photographs on my iPhone of polling booth officers using pairs of scissors to cut open postal votes instead of going through the automatic machine. It seems hard to believe that we would not have tested that before election day.

I believe the public deserves an account of the Elder campaign, endorsed by the Labor Party and the Labor member for Elder, and I believe they deserve to know the kind of tactics which have returned this government to office so you, Mr Wortley, can enjoy the spoils of your new position and so we can have the same government leader returned who has absolutely no accountability to this council. In fact, all the ministers, whether it is Premier Weatherill, Treasurer Koutsantonis, all the members are here on the back of a racial attack on a young South Australian woman.

Mr President, I know you will not be surprised that I need to turn my attention to you. Incidentally, you were a former minister for industrial relations and you worked your way up from being an employee of the Federated Gas Employees Industrial Union. I congratulate you on your new position. I have a serious question about the integrity of this member. In parliament at the end of 2011, I moved a motion that this council notes the credible allegations of serious malfeasance in the South Australian branch of the FGEIU. Our President was the subject of that motion and, Mr President, you never took the opportunity to come into this place and refute those allegations.

I put on the record that last time I tabled a statutory declaration to that effect, and now our new President has been accused by former employees of SAGASCO of being pivotal in receiving payments made to the union from then SAGASCO employees in return for negotiating better redundancy payments. These are serious allegations and I note the Royal Commission into Trade Union Governance and Corruption is in the throes of investigating exactly this type of behaviour.

In summary, I am very concerned about the direction of our state because some of our most senior Labor government figures appear to have entered parliament on the back of dubious union activity and dodgy campaign tactics. It makes me very nervous for South Australia's future. Mr President, you have now survived three days and you have one day to go to break your record of not having a no-confidence motion moved against you as happened when you were a minister, so I wish you all the best for the next week as President.

Just quickly, I will touch on the regions. Yesterday, our shadow treasurer used his Address in Reply to give a very detailed account of the problems of the state's electoral system and my colleague in this place, the shadow attorney-general, followed that with a motion prompting the parliament to investigate the need for electoral reform. I second the comments and will anticipate the findings of a select committee. Instead of electoral reform, therefore, I wish to focus briefly on the deal the regions will get from the outcome of the recent election.

I think the best way of assessing that is to consider what has happened in the past. In 2002, former Labor premier Mike Rann appointed Independent member for Mount Gambier, Rory McEwen, as minister for regional development. Mr Rann was excited about the move, trumpeting the benefits that this state would see from having a regional minister for the regions. He said:

Having been involved for many years in local government, and being a passionate supporter of our state's regions, (Mr McEwen) has a vital interest in his new portfolio responsibilities...We are prepared to be inclusive, to bring regional and country South Australians to the cabinet table. We are prepared to put the state's interests before party interests.

We heard just recently from Premier Weatherill. In the years that followed—nothing new really—under Labor's governance, Mr McEwen was to hold various portfolios of vital concern to the regions—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: He had regional development twice.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Yes—agriculture, food, fisheries and forests. The year 2002 was to begin one of the darkest periods for the South Australian regions that this state has seen for a long time. As my colleague the Hon. John Dawkins interjected, he was the minister for regional development twice.

Almost immediately, Labor reduced funding for the maintenance and repair of local regional roads. The arterial roads and regional roads programs introduced by the former Liberal government were axed; \$1 million was cut from the outback roads maintenance gangs. Under previous Liberal governments there had been \$77 million and a 10-year plan for sealing major unsealed rural arterial roads and it was cut to just \$2.8 million in 2003.

Also in 2003 came the decision to reduce country road speed limits to 100 km/h. Labor recognised the deteriorating and dangerous conditions of South Australia's rural roads but was not prepared to commit extra funding to improve them. For the first five months in 2003, there were 34 fatalities in country areas compared with 27 in the metropolitan area.

Shared Services was introduced and the regional impact assessment statement in December 2007 found that, under the reform, 500 regional jobs would be lost. These job losses were to cost regional drought-stricken communities some \$150 million. The Murray Mallee LGA estimated the total cost of axing 111 jobs in the region would be \$32.6 million. All the while regional hospitals were being slashed and burned to manage cost blowouts in major Adelaide hospitals. In 2006, \$10 million extra was allocated to regional hospitals to operate, compared with \$85 million extra allocated for metropolitan health.

In 2008, Labor's secret plan to close 25 country hospitals following the abolition of country hospital boards became known. There were already \$100 million worth of procedures being performed on country patients in city hospitals, but the closures would place increased burden on city hospitals.

In 2010, it was bad news again. Labor's budget funding cuts threatened Moonta, Ardrossan and Keith District hospitals. Perhaps the nail in the coffin—and we are really only beginning to understand the ramifications—was the sale of the forests. In the lead-up to the 2006 election, Mr Ewen actually said, 'The worst thing that could possibly happen to Mount Gambier would be to privatise our forests.' However, when the Treasurer approached him, asking if he would be okay with looking at other ways of using the revenue stream of ForestrySA, Mr McEwen supported the inquiry. I believe that he knew the path that the state was going down with that inquiry and I believe he sold out the South-East through blatant arrogance, or ignorance, at best.

The case I am building here is that Mr McEwen, simply by virtue of being a rural (and Independent) minister for regions, in no way increased his capacity to deliver for the regions or his own electorate. Indeed, his own electorate probably did the worst during his time in cabinet. In March, just after signing the agreement with Mr Brock, the Premier echoed the sentiment that Mr Rann had in 2002:

The inclusion of Mr Brock in our cabinet will allow us to add a strong voice for regional South Australia.

I know that Mr Brock has good intentions and that he is a hard worker, but he is up against an arrogant, stale and tired Labor cabinet. We have read the agreement that he and the Premier have made, and there is no doubt that if every project promised in Frome were to be delivered, the electorate would be all the better off, but the agreement is not worth the paper it is written on. Who will hold this government to account for honouring its commitments? Moreover, what about the rest of the regions of South Australia as a whole?

The agreement only discusses projects for Frome. There is no commitment by the Premier to maintain all of his pre-election commitments to the rest of the state. In fact, the 'Brockument', as we call it, makes no reference to Labor's other election promises. So, Mr President, this deal to form government does not bind Premier Weatherill and this lacklustre lot and yourself to deliver the promises that you went to the election with. You can break your promise at the stroke of a pen and there is nothing in the deal that holds your government to it. Mr Brock can walk away from it.

Quickly turning to the Governor's speech—something I note the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars did not do—and touching on my portfolios, in 2012, and again this year, he referred to one of Labor's so-called seven strategic priorities: premium food and wine from our clean environment. Just yesterday, food industry leaders gathered at a CEDA forum to discuss exactly this matter. They told the forum that it was not enough to be a clean green commodity producer and that Australian agribusiness was falling behind competitors due to the lack of investment in the sector. Yesterday, a CEDA forum in Adelaide heard that South Australia's agriculture sector risked missing out on the dining boom and agribusiness opportunities in Asia unless it could invest more in agriculture and add value to its exports.

Labor has focused for too long on the smaller producers and the boutique manufacturers. Why? Because it is fashionable and popular. This is all about PR and nothing to do with economic strategy. They have forgotten our large-scale commodity groups which drive the economy—the grains, the livestock, the horticulture that contribute billions to our economy, yet their needs and wants are dismissed by an arrogant government that believes it knows the very best way forward for this industry. They do not, and the industry feels completely let down and ignored.

Despite everything this government proclaims about how much they do for the sector, they do very little and refuse to face the difficult issues the industry is presented with by this government—look at land tax, payroll tax, production costs and red tape which are strangling the industry while commodity prices remain stubbornly low. Across the state, farmers are walking off the land. Our honest and hardworking farmers, the people who produce the vast bulk of what the Labor Party calls our 'premium food and wine', are going to the wall because of the cost of doing business, the cost of production, and this is unsustainable in South Australia.

We have a supermarket duopoly squeezing every last drop out of our farmers, coupled with a state government that is basically doing the same. Business is becoming unviable for our farmers. For years now, the Labor government has refused to listen, and its continual neglect of issues has destroyed the livelihood of families in our regions. The marine park sanctuary zones have driven many fishermen out of the industry and those remaining see a bleak future ahead for them.

Our exports have also stagnated. The value of horticultural exports, for example, stands at \$139 million—only a 2 per cent increase since 2001-02. Our overall exports have increased by an embarrassing 1 per cent in that same period—that is 1 per cent over a decade. In comparison, Victoria and New South Wales exports have increased by 25 per cent in just five years. Our bulk commodities have been neglected by a lazy, dismissive government.

Grain exports have increased by only 1 per cent in the past decade; in comparison, the grain industry in Victoria has increased its exports by a staggering 250 per cent in the last five years alone. Bulk meat exports only increased by 3 per cent in South Australia last year, while they increased by 12 per cent in Victoria over the same period. Put simply, the government's support and plan to grow our premium food and wine is an expensive sham, and it has done very little for the producers who are at the starting block of premium food and wine.

The Governor gave no details yesterday about Labor's plan for the future of primary industries. The future will start with strong research and development, on which Labor's track record is terrible, and it is continually stripping SARDI of vital funding in successive budgets. At the same CEDA forum I referred to earlier, Food SA chief executive officer Catherine Barnett said that while best practice German food manufacturing companies spend 8 per cent of their turnover on R&D, 6 per cent on staff development, and 6 per cent on plant upgrade, Australian companies spend less than 1 per cent on R&D, 3 per cent on staff development, and 3.5 per cent on plant upgrade.

Labor has started this term by flagging the closure of the Lenswood Research Facility, a critical soils and science research centre that has contributed immensely to our primary industries sector. Incidentally, that is a bit of a strange one: in the same breath they have been trumpeting plans to protect the vital agricultural land of the Adelaide Hills, yet they want to close a research station that could actually build the economy there.

SARDI has been on shaky ground for years, with confidence at an all-time low. The employees are leaving due to the uncertain nature of funding and rolling contracts, and R&D has been in dire need of more government investment. Every industry group has highlighted the lack of R&D as a critical issue for their sector and one that needs to be fixed quickly. Crucial R&D allows our farmers to access state-of-the-art breakthrough plant science, breeding, new seeding and farming techniques, yield increases, frost, drought and salt tolerance crops, and countless other advantages. However, we did not see any mention of that in the Governor's speech on Tuesday.

Piece by piece, Labor is stripping the infrastructure that builds the future for our primary industries. We need this innovation to survive and remain competitive in a modern world, and our failure in the export market show that the cracks are already starting.

The Governor also spoke on Tuesday about our tourism sector. Again, the government has failed to grow it. Events SA now manages only three events: the Tour Down Under, Tasting Australia and the Credit Union Christmas Pageant. Two of these were created by a Liberal government, although I remind members that, at the opening of Tasting Australia, all the regional tents were closed. They were closed for the first four days because they could not afford to open. How bizarre! Only a Labor government would say, 'We'll bear the cost of assembling these marquees,' and then charge people on a per day basis. When they could not afford to come, they just closed them. Who loses out? The regions again—our regional communities are the ones who lose out.

They have failed also to sustain funding to regional tourism. They have stripped money out of regional tourism. They have starved the 11 regions of resources. They are always happy to put another \$8 million or \$9 million or \$10 million into the Clipsal each year, but they have starved the regions. They have failed to achieve an increase in visitor expenditure to \$5 billion by 2008. They have failed their own target, and they will fail to achieve the strategic target of an \$8 billion industry by 2020. They will also fail to achieve sufficient annual growth to meet the 2014 milestone target of a \$6 billion industry. In relation to the strategic target, the audit committee rated the government's achievability as unlikely.

The state Labor government is squandering that potential that the Governor spoke of. In my time within my current portfolios, I have visited the regions and spoken to the small and large tourism operators, as well as seen a great deal of South Australia's natural beauty, and I can attest that under this current Labor government those assets are being wasted. I feel a little disappointed for the Governor because of course he reads the speech. It is his speech and it is his name on it, but he does not write it. He has to just read what is given to him, and I suspect a lot of people think that,

sadly, it was one of the most lacklustre and uninspiring speeches we have heard. It is no reflection on the Governor: it is a reflection on the people opposite.

The Hon. G.E. Gago: Are you saying he is a puppet?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: We know who writes it, and he reads his Address in Reply. I will have a chat to him when we go over and present it to him. We know who writes it. We know that it is this lacklustre lot here who prepared the speech. In closing, I am fearful for the future of South Australia as we enter this fourth term of Labor government.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Continue, the Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I am almost finished. You would think they could hold themselves together. My colleagues and I will continue to hold this government to account despite their arrogance and resistance. I am hopeful that this term will bring about electoral reform so that, at the next election, the government that South Australians truly want will be delivered.

The PRESIDENT: It is good to see that sometimes these speeches act like a little bit of therapy and people feel much better after them. The honourable and gallant Mr McLachlan.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (17:02): Thank you, Mr President. I am pleased to support the motion for adoption of the Address in Reply, and I thank His Excellency the Governor of South Australia for his speech with which he opened this 53rd Parliament of South Australia.

I offer my congratulations to the other new member of the Legislative Council, the Hon. Tung Ngo, and wish him a fulfilling career in this chamber. I also wish to acknowledge the service to this council and to the state of those members who have left this place—the Hon. Carmel Zollo and Ms Ann Bressington. I thank the former president, the Hon. John Gazzola, and the staff of the Legislative Council for their welcome and the assistance they have provided me. I congratulate the President on his election and wish him well in his leadership of the council.

I am also grateful for the welcome from honourable members from both sides of the council and the consideration they have shown me upon my election. In particular, I appreciate the care and attention my colleagues have taken to ensure that I begin to learn the ways of this place. They have been generous with their time and in sharing their experiences. The government must be congratulated on its re-election. I will work diligently to hold it to account in order to fulfil my obligation to all South Australians as a member of the opposition.

I come to this place as a strong advocate of Liberal values. It is my belief that it is these values, which respect individual freedom and encourage free enterprise as well as the preservation of the environment, that are the best foundation for ensuring a strong, confident and compassionate society in this state. I have always been attracted to the Liberal belief in encouraging initiative and the taking of personal responsibility. In many ways, it could be said that these values underpin the experience of my family in these lands.

The first of my line to come to South Australia was Colin McLachlan, as a young boy with his mother, Catherine, and his stepfather. They came to this state on the ship *Macedon*, seeking opportunities they were unable to find on the west coast of Scotland. He spent the remainder of his youth on Kangaroo Island, as his stepfather had found work manning the lighthouse at Cape Willoughby. I suspect that life on Kangaroo Island at that time would not have been much different from crofting on the west coast of Scotland.

Demonstrating initiative and learning, he became the commander of coastal ships in the state and settled on Lefevre Peninsula and in Port Adelaide. He married Mary, the daughter of Captain Hugh Quin. Captain Quin was a local identity at the time, being the harbourmaster. He has the distinction of forming one of the party that witnessed the proclamation of the colony and can be seen in Charles Hill's painting of the occasion.

Their son, Colin Graham McLachlan, purchased a custom and shipping agent business which was a successful house until recent times, when the business was merged with another firm. This enterprise sustained an extended family for four generations. National competition, driven by technology, forced consolidation of the marketplace. Geographic location was no longer the key to success, and business flowed to the east.

While saddened by the closure of this business in the port, I do not mourn the passing of this trade in the state. Over its 100 years of existence, it was a contributor to the economy of the port and to the wellbeing of its community. Its time had come and new industries had to be explored. The great-grandson of Colin had to seek other endeavours to pursue. However, I have not drifted that far, even as a member of this chamber, as I row with the Port Adelaide Rowing Club, the same club Colin Graham rowed for in 1892, on the same narrow waters where his father navigated his ships to berth.

When plying those waters you can see that the port was once a thriving gateway for our industrial and trading people. Today, these waters are increasingly being used for leisure pursuits. It could be argued that this is a physical representation of the decline in our economic confidence and the turning away from exploring trade to the singular pursuit of lifestyle for its own sake. As much as I am encouraged by the efforts to renew the district, the only true foundation for a prosperous and healthy community is sustainable and competitive enterprises that deliver real opportunities for employment and advancement as well as leisure.

My parents and grandparents believed education was the key to advancement. Much was sacrificed to ensure that I received the education that would allow me to study at university. I chose to read law at the University of Adelaide, and to this day I continue to apply the knowledge that was taught to me and enjoy the friendships that I made. The commitment to pursuing education that I was taught in my youth did not abate at the end of my undergraduate years. I subsequently pursued degrees of other universities, including the University of Edinburgh in the country of my blood.

At an early age I was imbued with the notion that my education was to be used for the service of others. In keeping with this belief, I have endeavoured to apply my legal skills for the benefit of the community. I joined a law firm with a strong commitment to social justice and spent my time in my formative years as a young lawyer serving the community in Port Augusta and the surrounding districts.

In my time working in the Mid North, I came to appreciate life in the regions and its challenges. I am proud that my party has such an abiding commitment to the regions of the state and its communities. The regions are where the natural wealth of this state lies and are the source of much of our economy. It is important that we build vibrant communities across our state and that they have every opportunity to develop and grow. I do not find appealing the thought of an empty state with all its peoples in one city.

When I was living in Port Augusta, the city was experiencing tough times. The stresses of a declining economy were played out in criminal and family courts. From my experience as a young advocate, I learnt important lessons in life. We must not seek to judge others; rather, we must do all that we can to assist those experiencing hardship and help them find a better road to travel. Further, a strong and healthy society is dependent upon, at the very least, a modicum of material prosperity. Perhaps these experiences were my first steps towards becoming an active member of the Liberal Party.

During this time, I also worked as a junior on certain matters for the advancement of Aboriginal communities. It was then that I formed the firm belief that it is the responsibility of all of us to assist in the development of sustainable and strong Indigenous communities throughout this state. From these formative experiences, I fell into the world of banking and securities law. After a time studying overseas, I returned at the height of the recession and took the first offer of employment.

After a spell in a commercial law firm I joined a financial services house and enjoyed a career in law and management that lasted over a decade. During my time in financial services I witnessed the flight of employment in commerce to the east coast. It reinforced in me the necessity of a strong economy to ensure the future and vibrancy of this state. Our brightest and best should have an opportunity to pursue their dreams in the place of their birth, for they will be the drivers of our state's growth and the guardians of our future.

Immediately prior to my election to this chamber I worked at the University of Adelaide at its International Centre for Financial Services. It was a delight to return to the institution that had nurtured me so many years before. The centre was established to foster excellence and thought leadership in financial services. I commend the university for its research into financial services and its advocacy for the growth of the sector in this state, for there are significant employment opportunities in the wealth management and international education sectors in South Australia.

A career in financial services should not just be the preserve of a chosen few who reside on the shores of Sydney Harbour. We should aspire to build, nurture and retain the talent of the young of this state in all fields of endeavour. Lord Haldane said that it is in universities that the soul of the people is mirrored. We are fortunate to have such universities in the state that conduct important and significant research. I believe that it is in these institutions we will find the ideas that will drive creation of new sustainable industries. We must ensure that our universities are at the centre of our debates concerning our state's future. It is important that they capture the imagination of the public and are cherished.

The structure of our economy is increasingly being challenged by national and international forces. Our survival as a prosperous and self-reliant community is under threat, and we must discover new opportunities for growth. We must create an environment for small and medium businesses to flourish, innovate and trade internationally. Critical to creating this environment will be the role our universities play in the development of new technologies and fuelling innovation that drives commerce.

The role of government is to create the environment which encourages enterprise in its citizens who actively take risks to pursue prosperity. Governments by their very nature are unable to take the place of those in our community who run businesses and generate growth, which in turn drives employment opportunities. Further, there is increasing evidence that government fiscal stimulus does not necessarily produce economic value and assist recovery. Rather, governments should seek to restrain public debt, as it is this debt that ultimately can have a negative impact on growth. When debt is incurred it should be invested in those things that will produce an economic dividend.

This parliament must do all it can to assist South Australians to rediscover the same skills and innovation enterprise which drove our economy since its founding as a colony and which has sustained us as a state. Many valuable lessons can be learnt from the experience of cities and regions in the Midwest of the United States. These cities have discovered the road to growth and secured the survival of their communities.

A consistent thread through all these endeavours has been strong leadership, not just from government but from all sectors of the community. Like them, we must find a collective will that drives change and seeks new paths to invest in an energetic and dynamic future. We can no longer simply see, as the only solution to our ills, the demand for more funds from the commonwealth.

We must seek to carve out our own place as a trading state in the Asia Pacific region. We must resist the temptation to look across our immediate borders for comparison or even inspiration. Our gaze must be to our far north, with the ambition to build relations with other trading states far beyond the borders of the federation. Only this will deliver us the prize of self-reliance from the federal treasury.

Where a government has responsibility for both raising revenue and expending the same, it will be clear to its citizens the priorities it has set. But this is not the present situation in our federation. Unfortunately, our federation has delivered a significant level of fiscal imbalance, which undermines the ability of our governments to take real accountability. The financial arrangements between states and the commonwealth are in need of recasting, together with their respective taxation regimes.

The ideal for any functioning federation must be the accommodation of the desires and needs of all of the many regions that make up our nation. This can only be truly achieved by vibrant, energised and prosperous states.

A particular challenge that is facing all states but more so South Australia is our ageing population. Our demography is working against us. We face the prospect of a declining participation in the workforce and increasing demands placed on our government for the delivery of services. This makes a drive for greater productivity in our economy not a choice but an imperative.

History instructs us that all great societies have an energy that drives them. Societal vigour and vitality derive from many sources. In essence, it is the people's confident belief in their community, its values and the capability of its citizens. History also demonstrates that however permanent and sophisticated society appears, it is fragile and can quickly fall into decline. We must not be like the fallen communities that have come before us and make an enemy of change. We

must not let our past prosperity and comfortable lives undermine our confidence to reproduce and grow our population.

My own experience of the fragility of states came relatively recently when observing life in an extremely challenged country. With ANZAC Day just past, I reflect on my experiences in Afghanistan. I have always been an engaged citizen. I have sought to make a contribution through service in the Army Reserve. When joining, I never imagined that I would experience operational duty. At the time I enlisted, the world was enjoying a reasonable period of stability, yet things change and, after almost 20 years of service, I was asked to deploy.

The Afghan people know only too well the fragility of a civil society. My time there reminded me of how grateful we should all be for our democratic institutions and that we all have a responsibility to use them for the best effect for our own people. We should never be so arrogant as to take institutions such as this chamber for granted. My time there renewed my desire to pursue public office and to aspire to a seat in this place.

I also acknowledge the service of the young men and women who have served their country in Afghanistan. The profession of arms remains unique in that it asks every member to be prepared to make the ultimate sacrifice. In the places that I was required to live and work, I was often one of the oldest by many years. It was a privilege to carry out my own tasks alongside them and to witness them carrying out their dangerous duties with diligence and youthful good humour.

I am a proud volunteer for St John Ambulance in this state. I acknowledge the efforts of its volunteers, who work tirelessly to keep South Australians safe by training them in the skills of first aid and watching over their community events. Much of the social fabric of this state is woven by the work of volunteers, like these men and women, who selflessly give their time to St John. Their diligence should remind us all in this place that we must endeavour to assist our fellow citizens to create an environment where contribution to the life of the state is not only encouraged but expected, valued and recognised.

I thank everyone who has assisted me in my journey to this place and the confidence they have placed in me. I congratulate those of my Liberal brethren who have taken seats in the other place. I acknowledge the hard work and dedication of all our candidates who did not prove successful at the election. I make mention of two who I had the privilege of working alongside in the campaign: Mr Joe Barry and His Worship the Mayor of Playford, Glenn Docherty. Both are good friends and were strong candidates who fought valiantly for their party. I wish them every success for their future.

I make special mention of my parents, my wife Marcia and my sons Hamish, William and Alasdair, and I thank them for their unswerving support for my endeavours. I acknowledge the privilege of having the opportunity to represent all South Australians, and I look forward to serving them in this chamber to the best of my ability. I commend the motion.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (17:19): I take this opportunity to thank His Excellency for delivering an inspiring speech, and most significantly for setting the positive tone to this 53rd session of parliament which I hope will continue. The Governor remarked that he has recently felt a new-found confidence, a belief that irrespective of the challenges we may face South Australia can and will shape its own destiny. To me, this sums up what I am also feeling out in the community. There is a fresh sense of confidence in what we as a state have achieved and what we can do into the future.

I do not mean to imply that we are ignoring challenges we face or failing to see the difficulties that await us, quite the contrary. I think all South Australians understand the challenges posed by a changing economic environment. They understand that we will have to work together to find solutions. They understand that we face a federal Liberal government that opposes action on climate change, a government that is pushing for increased privatisation and threatening to cut essential government services.

I think what South Australia also understands is that we can stand up and fight for what we believe in and we can ultimately shape our own destiny. If we take a look at all we have achieved for the past 12 years of this Labor government, we have every reason to be proud and hopeful for the

future. There has never been a more environmentally active state government in South Australia than this current Labor government.

We are committed to ensuring the protection of our environment and the sustainable use of our natural resources because we know that a healthy environment is essential for a healthy community and healthy economy. South Australia is leading the nation in addressing climate change, renewable energy investment and production, waste management and water security. We enacted Australia's first dedicated climate change legislation, released a strategy to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and began a climate change awareness campaign, and today emissions are lower than 1990 levels in spite of our economic and population growth.

South Australia also leads the nation in the uptake of alternative energy sources. Since coming to government in 2002, we have seen the amount of electricity generated from renewable energy increase from 0.8 per cent to about 31.7 per cent. This state is recognised as a leader in recycling and resource management. Labor ensured that South Australia was the first place in Australia to ban plastic shopping bags from supermarket checkouts in 2009, and I congratulate my leader for her leadership in this very important role.

This has already prevented about 30 million bags per month from being dumped into landfill and waterways. We are also reducing litter, having less litter by number of items and overall volume than the national averages. South Australia has less beverage litter than any other state due to our innovative, and unfortunately still unique among the states, container deposit legislation, although I hear that could be changing soon.

In 2013, 594 million containers representing 43,213 tonnes were returned for recycling and diverted from landfill. This is a fantastic result and one that we are keen to build on. In fact, our policies have resulted in world-leading rates of recycling and waste reduction that prompt international jurisdictions to come to our state to seek our advice. Since coming to office the state Labor government has established a network of 19 marine parks, has given wilderness protection to almost 1.8 million hectares of land compared to just 70,000 hectares in 2002 and has added over 60 additional national parks.

We have also seen outstanding progress for Aboriginal people. Our policies have resulted in the lowest Indigenous perinatal death rate in the country at five deaths per 1,000 births. For the first time all Aboriginal children in the year before full-time school who are living in remote communities will have access to an early childhood education program. We lead the nation in education, doubling retention rates for years 8 to 12 Aboriginal students in government schools from 33.1 per cent in 2002 to 66.9 per cent in 2011.

Native title holders now comanage over 32 parks and reserves around our state. These arrangements cover 13.5 million hectares, representing 64 per cent of the total protected area system. Our state constitution, our most important rule book, now recognises Aboriginal custodianship of the land and waters of South Australia. After more than a decade of investment, APY residents now benefit from improved preschool facilities, family wellbeing centres, aerodromes, vocational education, law and order, youth activity centres, allied health providers, electricity improvements, waste management schemes, home living skills and arts centres.

While there is always more to do, it is important to acknowledge just how far we have progressed. This progress was achieved because we are a government that is not afraid to stand up for what we believe is in the best interest of our state. I am incredibly proud of the way we stood up and fought the federal government for the River Murray, and I remind the chamber that we fought a federal Labor government for the River Murray, together with South Australians from all walks of life, pastoralists, traditional owners and citizens from as far away from the river as Ceduna.

As a result, we achieved a final basin plan that will ensure the health of the river with an extra \$450 gegalitres returned to the river together with funding in legislation of \$1.77 billion dollars to deliver it. In addition, we won \$445 million in funding to assist our river communities and undertake environmental works. Since the state government's Water for Good plan was released in 2009, South Australia has become a leader in stormwater harvesting and re-use, and completed the 100-gegalitre Adelaide Desalination Plant.

This has secured a water supply for our growing economy and population without placing an additional burden on our existing resources and allowed the return of water for environmental

purposes. Together with the signing of the Murray Darling Basin Plan last year, it means that we can now ensure the river itself receives the flows of water it needs to remain at a satisfactory level of health.

SA Water provides another example of this government standing up for all South Australians. There is a renewed push on the part of the federal government to incentivise (and that is a great Liberal phrase, isn't it? Remember 'incentivation'?) states to sell off public assets to pay for infrastructure. Well, that suggestion is nothing but a short-term fix to the federal bottom line so that they can pull out of sharing the funding for the state's productive infrastructure, shared funding that all governments of all persuasions in the past have been more than willing to participate in—but not this federal government.

SA Water must remain in public hands. It makes no sense to sell off SA Water or its assets to make a quick buck. This government is much more interested in the longer term picture. Our successes have also been underpinned by our understanding that we need to be innovative, and we need to constantly search for new and better ways of doing things. Water and environmental policies are about more than just politics: there are about science, innovation and partnership.

Last year, we also announced our Water Sensitive Urban Design policy, which promotes urban design principles that will integrate the management of the water cycle into land use and development processes. We are confident that this policy will enable South Australia to maintain its world-leading approach to water management. A further example is the Building Upgrade Finance scheme that will use government resources to unlock development opportunities, enabling economic growth and employment while increasing energy efficiency and reducing our impact on the environment.

We will also ensure that we continue our leadership in securing our water supplies, with our Urban Water Blueprint, which I am expecting to be completed over the next 12 to 18 months. The blueprint will provide a more integrated approach to urban water management, and it will provide an overview of the current urban water environment and identify opportunities and a vision for Adelaide's urban water environment.

A further example of our innovative spirit is Zero Waste SA, which has established a reputation for delivering innovative, effective and well-targeted programs. Since 2003, Zero Waste SA has invested more than \$80 million in programs and projects that have stimulated councils, businesses and the community to reduce, recover, re-use and recycle. This has helped South Australia to reduce waste to landfill by nearly 20 per cent from 2002 to 2013 and achieve a resource recovery rate of more than 77 per cent.

Zero Waste SA's work as a leader in waste management and resource recovery continues to attract attention nationally and internationally. By creating a new body to advance the next stage of the state's development in waste management, we are entering a new and exciting phase in our waste strategy. The new authority called Adaptive Futures SA will be established from July 2015 to build on the successes of Zero Waste SA.

This demonstrates that we are a government that takes partnership with communities and industry very seriously. Our strong history of achievement has only been possible because we understand how fundamentally important it is to work with sector and community groups, other agencies and other governments, as well as businesses and academics, to ensure that we achieve the best outcomes for our state.

We need to work in partnership with industry and community to ensure that what we get from the federal government and other states is the best deal for South Australia. We are at the bottom of the river system when it comes to water, and we need to continually fight for our rights against upstream states.

As the driest state on the driest inhabited continent, South Australians have always had to make the most of our limited water supply. Providing our state with water security has been a strong focus of this government. This has been a very important and difficult period in water policy in this state, and partnerships at local, state, federal, and across community and industry levels were essential in helping the state government steer South Australia through these difficult times.

Our partnership approach has also resulted in positive outcomes for the health and wellbeing of Aboriginal people living on the APY lands. In the area of food security on the APY lands, we have

a comprehensive plan that looks at a range of factors from improving freight transport to making sure Anangu have the best consumer protection possible, and we are achieving good results thanks to this partnership approach. The annual store nutrition report, the Market Basket Survey report, released in October 2013 by the Nganampa Health Council, found that prices are lower compared to a few years ago for most healthy foods in Mai Wiru stores on the APY lands, particularly fresh fruit and vegetables.

By bringing business and community together we are building capacity and economic opportunity for generations of Aboriginal South Australians to come. For example, Labor is working with Jawun—an organisation that specialises in establishing partnerships between the corporate sector, government and Aboriginal Australians—to come to South Australia. This will give Aboriginal communities access to our nation's best and brightest to create new opportunities for new generations.

Jawun will select communities to identify projects for support and then, through its partners, find the resources needed to make it happen. In turn, the corporate sector will learn about the values, culture and unique point of view of South Australia's Aboriginal people. This government wants to continue building on these successes in the coming years. I see an enormous potential to use the current momentum to create jobs for South Australians in our new and emerging industries.

The recently announced new state development agency will play an important role. One of its aims will be to identify markets with a strong demand for those goods and services for which South Australia has developed a strong reputation. Importantly, it will also find new opportunities in sectors that are not necessarily considered our traditional strengths. This will complement the work that Adaptive Futures SA will undertake in the coming years, including encouraging innovation and economic growth through the green economy, helping businesses find a new overseas markets for their waste management knowledge and skills, helping businesses to reduce their costs through more efficient use of raw materials, water and energy, and administering grants to local government and industries to explore new technologies.

The work we do in the coming years in the area of climate change will be of vital importance. Few policy areas have created more debate in recent years than climate change. The federal position regarding climate change has changed, and there are those in the federal arena now who deny that climate change even needs to be addressed. We have seen the new Abbott government attempt to dismantle many of the progressive achievements in this area in the very short time since coming to government, from the price on carbon to reversing funding increases to the Environmental Defender's Office. This should be of grave concern to everyone.

If we deny the hard facts of climate change and refuse to have a contingency plan, how can we protect our water for critical human needs, protect our irrigators and our landholders, protect our population and ultimately protect our economy? This government remains committed to tackling climate change. That is why in August 2013 I asked the Premier's Climate Change Council to develop a compelling vision for our state's future in a changing climate.

On 27 February 2014, Mr Bruce Carter, chair of the council, forwarded the council's advice, 'South Australia's climate change vision: pathways to 2050'. The report was informed by an independent review conducted by KPMG of South Australian government climate change policies and commitments undertaken since 2007. It contains eight main recommendations, including:

- continue to show strong leadership on climate change;

That is one of the most important—

- develop bipartisan agreement for an enduring commitment;

We try our best—

- engage our community as partners in tackling climate change;
- reduce emissions by capturing all cost-effective abatement;
- identify adaptation funding sources;
- prioritise support for the most vulnerable members of the communities;
- ensure the land-use planning system supports adaptation and transition; and

- create the settings for an industry-led transition process.

The South Australian government will work with industry, local government, business and the community to respond to the council's advice and develop a new strategic direction for climate change action that will move South Australia further along the path towards a prosperous low carbon future.

We see enormous potential for economic growth and job creation through our innovative policies on climate change. A perfect example of this is the wind industry. Not only has it created thousands of jobs in this state, but it has placed us at the top of the league table in renewable energy.

Now the industry is set to invest \$1.5 billion on Yorke Peninsula to build Australia's largest wind farm, despite some opposition. Because of this the state Labor government will forge ahead with its policies to achieve our targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions within the state by at least 60 per cent of 1990 levels by 2050, increase the proportion of renewable electricity generated so that it comprises at least 20 per cent of electricity generated by 2014, and achieve a \$10 billion economy in low carbon investments by 2025 by working with industry and community.

We have also been working towards reducing our landfill by 35 per cent by 2020. In addition, we have also committed funds to support a feasibility study on the viability of a solar thermal generation plant at the Port Augusta power station. We have also supported the development of Nature Play SA, a non-government organisation that seeks to get more children playing outside again in unstructured play to ensure that future generations of South Australians will continue to care deeply for our environment.

In Aboriginal affairs, we have committed \$3.5 million additional funding over two years to improve forensic child protection services and therapeutic support to a number of communities across the lands. We also recently launched a new purpose-built \$600,000 mobile dialysis truck that will expand the services available on the APY lands and will allow dialysis patients to return to their home communities for longer periods of time.

The Labor government will also introduce legislation to recognise self-governance for the state's Aboriginal communities. The legislation will provide best practice guiding principles for dealings between government and Aboriginal communities. For example, one of the principles might include the responsibility on government to include Aboriginal people as partners in government decision-making. In addition, we are undertaking a limited review of the APY Land Rights Act 1981. The focus is on strengthening the executive's accountability to traditional owners and is also looking at changing the voting structure for elections and some better ways for women to be empowered with a stronger voice.

We want to work together with the Aboriginal communities across the state and particularly on the lands to ensure that the APY act remains as relevant and as supportive of Aboriginal interests today as when it was the first, very innovative groundbreaking piece of legislation that caught the attention of the whole country over three decades ago.

I am not only proud of what this government has achieved over the last 12 years but I also share the Governor's feeling of confidence in the future. We are more committed than ever to ensuring that opportunities for Aboriginal people is not something based on chance but on choice, and we will continue to forge ahead with our policies and investment in environmental protection.

These are policy areas that not only require innovative thinking but a strong ability to collaborate across sectors, including industry and science, academia, as well as all levels of government, community and business. They also require courage and commitment. This government has proven that it can achieve an enormous amount in these important policy areas, and I am excited about what we can achieve in the coming years.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.M. Gazzola.

At 17:38 the council adjourned until Tuesday 20 May 2014 at 14:15.