

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, 20 May 2014

The **PRESIDENT** (Hon. R.P. Wortley) took the chair at 14:17 and read prayers.

The PRESIDENT: We acknowledge this land we meet on today is the traditional lands for the Kaurna people and that we respect their spiritual relationship with their country. We also acknowledge the Kaurna people as the custodians of the Adelaide region and that their cultural and heritage beliefs are still as important to the living Kaurna people today.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: Before we start I would like to acknowledge the friends and family of Henry Jones, who join us today in the chamber. I welcome Henry's wife, Gloria, daughters Christine and Julie, son-in-law Brenton, granddaughter Gemma and family friend Di. I am sure all members will join me in acknowledging the important contribution that Henry made to the campaign for the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, which ensures the health of the basin for future generations. Welcome.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Board of the Australian Crime Commission—Report, 2012-13

Report by Alexandrina Council on the Port Elliot West Community Policy Area
Development Plan Amendment

Response to the Natural Resources Committee Report (90)—Bushfire Preparedness of
Properties in Bushfire Risk Areas, dated 20 January 2014

Response to the Natural Resources Committee Report (90)—Bushfire Preparedness of
Properties in Bushfire Risk Areas, dated 1 May 2014

By the Minister for Business Services and Consumers (Hon. G.E. Gago)—

Regulations under the following Act—

Gaming Machines Act 1992—Voluntary Pre-Commitment Code

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

Reports, 2012-13—

Activities associated with the Administration of the Retirement Villages Act 1987

Office for the Ageing

South Australian Public Health Council

Response to the Report of the Select Committee on a Review of the Retirement Villages
Act 1987

South Australian Citrus Industry Development Board—Winding Up Report

Regulations under the following Act—

National Gas (South Australia) Act 2008—Civil Penalties—Conduct Provisions

Rules under Acts—

Motor Vehicle Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme) Act 2013—Lifetime Support
Scheme Rules

*Ministerial Statement***FEDERAL BUDGET**

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 table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the federal budget made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Premier.

NYRSTAR

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 table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Nyrstar Port Pirie Smelter Transformation Financing Committee made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Premier.

JONES, MR HENRY

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:20): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement regarding the passing of Mr Henry Jones.

Leave granted.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: On behalf of the government, I express our deep regret and sadness at the death of Mr Jones. Henry Jones was a tireless campaigner for the health and prosperity of the River Murray and this state owes him a great deal. Sadly, Mr Jones passed away on 15 April, aged 72.

Mr Jones was the public face of the Fight for the Murray campaign and also the face of *The Advertiser's* I Love Murray campaign. His passionate fight to protect the Murray goes back to 1981 I am told and, since then, he ceaselessly urged all sides of politics to take the matter of the Murray seriously and to understand its importance.

Such was his passion that he travelled to Canberra to speak to decision-makers to remind them that South Australia would not rest until a fair deal was made, and he ultimately succeeded. He was pivotal in securing more water for the Murray-Darling system, which will ultimately benefit all South Australians.

As a commercial fisherman for most of his life, Mr Jones knew better than anyone that a healthy Murray was needed for a productive economy, strong communities and the future of our environment.

He fought tirelessly for almost 30 years to reverse decades of overallocation upstream and to save the ailing system. He constantly advocated for more freshwater flows and highlighted the environmental and economic benefits they would bring. He took prime ministers, ministers, premiers, dignitaries, policy makers, landholders and others out onto his beloved river to show them the importance of truly valuing this important and diverse ecosystem.

His hard work and determination was recognised in 2008 when he received the Pride of Australia Medal and a River Murray Medal awarded by the Murray-Darling Basin Authority. It was the first time the medal had been given to a community member since it was established in 1853. Though these awards came in his later years, they represent a culmination of a lifetime of advocacy—not only fighting for the Lower Lakes, but also his Clayton Bay community, which he proudly served.

Mr Jones' long list of achievements in his local community, most of which was in a volunteer capacity, are a reminder to us all of the importance and value of serving your community. These achievements include, briefly, being appointed president of the Clayton hall committee; 10 years in local government, including a period as deputy chairman and chairman of works; establishing the CFS in Clayton, as captain for 20 years; coaching of the Milang Football Club; board member and chairman of the peak industry fishing body for South Australia; and member of government-appointed fisheries management committees.

While president of the Southern Fishermen's Association he, along with others, developed the world's first environmental management plan for a whole of fishery in the lakes and Coorong as

well as receiving marine stewardship certification for this multispecies fishery. He was a member of the Murray-Darling Basin community reference group, a member of Murray-Darling Basin Native Fish Strategy group, a member of the River Murray advisory board, a member of Dean Brown's drought relief group, a member of Waterkeepers Australia, inaugural spokesperson for the River, Lakes and Coorong Action Group, and a ministerial community-appointed member of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority Basin Community Committee, where he worked on the new basin plan.

Mr Jones cared deeply for his community and the river, but the thing that sets him apart is that he never hesitated to turn his sentiment into meaningful action. He will be deeply missed by his family, of course, but also by his friends and the community, and members from all sides of politics. His passion, commitment, courage, vision and perseverance have been significant in bringing the health of the River Murray and Lower Lakes to where it is today. His life is an encouragement and inspiration to others, and it reminds us all that one person can indeed make a difference.

It is also a reminder to us all here today of the importance of actively listening and considering the views and knowledge of the people whose communities and livelihoods are affected by our ideas, policies and decisions taken in this chamber.

Mr Jones' campaign for the river system was a partnership with his wife, Gloria, and his family, and our thoughts are with them at this very sad time. I, and the rest of South Australia, and I am sure this whole chamber, thank Mr Henry Jones for his legacy to our state.

The PRESIDENT: Those sentiments, I am sure, will be shared by all in this chamber.

Question Time

ADELAIDE VISITOR INFORMATION CENTRE

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Tourism a question about the Adelaide Visitor Information Centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: The Adelaide Visitor Information Centre has had a torrid and turbulent past and is in the process of being relocated. It has gone from King William Street to Grenfell Street to North Terrace and is now going to what will probably be its final resting place in James Place. On radio FIVEaa the tourism minister, Mr Bignell, on 29 April stated that the relocated centre would be taking in-person bookings, although he also went on to say that the facility would be staffed by volunteers. Industry sources have advised me that there will be no booking service at the new James Place Visitor Information Centre, despite the minister's claim on radio. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister confirm exactly what services will be offered to the public at the new James Place Visitor Information Centre?
2. Given the operation will be staffed by volunteers, what training will the South Australian Tourism Commission be providing to those volunteers?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:28): I thank the honourable member for his most excellent questions and I will pass them on to the minister in the other place and seek a response on his behalf.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN AUTHORITY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:28): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Water and the River Murray regarding South Australia's contribution to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: In the 2012 Mid-Year Budget Review the South Australian Labor government announced its intention to halve its contribution to river maintenance and other programs from \$28 million to \$14 million a year. The government has continually stated that this move was in response to New South Wales, which has more than halved its own contribution to the

authority. The New South Wales government has stated that its reduction in contribution to the MDBA is due to a lack of transparency under the former commonwealth Labor government.

In March this year, the New South Wales minister said the state would reconsider the allocated amount, and I understand the minister in this place is on record saying that, if New South Wales funds its share of the authority, South Australia will do the same. My question is: can the minister provide a guarantee that, if New South Wales does return its full contribution to the MDBA, this government will follow suit?

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): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. Let me just say at the outset that I find it odd that the Liberal Party in this place would come to the rescue of the Liberal Party in New South Wales once again, pretending to justify their substantial cuts to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority made unilaterally that reduced their funding to \$8.9 million when they should be paying three times as much.

They should be paying a lot more and here they are saying they have a reason why, because they blame the former Labor government. Let us be quite clear: New South Wales cut the funding to the MDBA because of budget reasons. They made a budget saving. They did not care about South Australia and, clearly, neither does the Liberal Party opposite. They do not care about South Australia either. They have never stood up for the river or for South Australians. They do not stand up to the Liberals. What were they doing when the federal budget came down in recent days?

Where are we now—day 6? What was the overwhelming chorus we heard from the Liberal opposition leader, Mr Marshall? 'Great budget, Mr Abbott.' That is what he said: 'Great budget, Mr Abbott.' He did not give a damn about the cuts to South Australians, and why would the Liberals opposite do that either? They are in here today defending the New South Wales Liberal government cuts to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority. Give me a break! When are they going to stand up for this state?

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN AUTHORITY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:31): Supplementary question: if the New South Wales government restores its funding to the authority, will South Australia do the same?

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): Mr President, let me give them a bit more of the same. The final Murray-Darling Basin Plan represented a significant victory for this state which the Liberal Party in this state did not support. Our demands, as always, were based on best available science and what was needed for the health of the Murray-Darling Basin system—our river. It is particularly significant in light of recent plans by the federal Liberal government to cap buybacks into that system. Our state Liberals remained silent on these River Murray issues as they always do, except when they are standing up for Liberal states—not our state, but Liberal states.

It was clear in the lead-up to the recent state election that they have no water policy whatsoever. They will not stand up to their federal colleagues or the upstream states and will only criticise the significant achievements that have been made by this government. This state government has made it clear in the last few months that we cannot continue to subsidise New South Wales as we have been doing. However, I have also made it plain that, if New South Wales agrees to fund its share of the authority, we will also increase our share to the same level.

If New South Wales would like to bring their share back to their full level, then we will have a look at that, but I do not think the member opposite is even suggesting that New South Wales is going to be pulling its weight. They did indicate recently—and I am not sure if I am allowed to tell you this, Mr President, but perhaps I will speak out of school—that the new minister for New South Wales, Mr Humphries (replacing the old minister Hodgkinson, I think), has indicated that the New South Wales position was impoverished and the New South Wales position was not tenable.

The Hon. G.E. Gago: Even more impoverished now, after the federal budget cuts.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Indeed, and he did indicate that he would try his very best to come back to the basin authority states and say, 'We'll try and do a little better.' But all we get from these

Liberals is not a rousing chorus of 'Come on, you've got to shoulder your fair share of the burden.' That is not what we hear. Here they are saying, 'What's South Australia going to chip in to subsidise New South Wales again?' That is what they are saying: 'What are you going to do to subsidise New South Wales?' These guys have no idea how the Murray system works. All they want to do is get the New South Wales government off the hook with South Australian taxpayers' money. We will not stand for that.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN AUTHORITY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:34): Further supplementary: is the minister saying that he will restore the full \$28 million if New South Wales restores its funding?

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): Let me go through in more detail for the honourable member how the Murray system works. In light of New South Wales' unilateral reduction in funding to about, I think, \$8.9 million, basin states and the authority have committed to further discussions of potential efficiencies.

Unlike other water management utilities across Australia, the Murray-Darling Basin Authority has not been subject to an efficiency review since 2006. Ministerial agreements since that time have ensured that jurisdictional contributions have increased automatically in line with the consumer price index. Therefore it is likely that efficiencies could be identified in the way that assets are managed, for example. A review—

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: What has this got to do with the question?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Well, this is it: they don't understand how the river system works. They have no clue. They should sit down and listen to the answers that they've asked for and they might come away with a better understanding of how we get dumped on by New South Wales all the time. But no, they come in here once again defending their ideological colleagues in New South Wales, even though, at the very same time, they shift the burden onto the South Australian taxpayers. Stay quiet and listen is my advice.

A review of the existing cost-sharing arrangements for the Murray-Darling Basin joint activities is currently being undertaken. A review will be provided to ministers at the ministerial council meeting on 9 May and covers the activities which basin states jointly fund and are administered by the authority. It is being undertaken in the context of the newly-made basin plan. A review of the costs and efficiency of the River Murray operations is also underway to assist in identifying future cost savings for the governments. The review is expected to be completed in early 2015 in time to inform preparation for the 2015-16 MDBA budget.

In the meantime, South Australia is continuing to work with jurisdictions to discuss funding contributions to the Murray-Darling Basin Authority to identify the most efficient and equitable approach to managing the Murray-Darling Basin in 2014. This is more than just politics, and I wish the Liberals opposite would understand this. It always has been, for our state government, more than politics. This is about protecting the Murray-Darling Basin, our water and our river communities. This is about the long-term sustainability of the entire basin. So, we will pay our fair share to protect South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the honourable minister Hunter finish in silence.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Thank you, Mr President, for your protection. We will pay our share to protect South Australia, but we need New South Wales to do the same. The states and the authority must work together to ensure the efficient management of our vital basin infrastructure and ensure that every jurisdiction pulls their weight. Our state takes about 8.5 per cent of extractions of water from the southern connected basin; New South Wales takes 47.2 per cent.

The Hon. G.E. Gago: How much is that?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: 47.2 per cent. But in July 2012, New South Wales announced a 60 per cent reduction in their contribution that is to be followed by a capped contribution of \$8.9 million in 2013-14 and 2014-15. Their previous contribution, at their 'fair share', was \$31.2 million.

Despite the widely expressed concern with the New South Wales decision, it has so far refused to consider increasing its contribution by telling us what it will be. But, as I said, there was movement at the recent ministerial council two weeks ago here in Adelaide. New South Wales owned up to the fact that they have been dragging their contribution right back to unsustainable levels. The minister indicated to the council that he will be doing his level best to get some extra contribution from the New South Wales Treasury, but they have refused to commit to tell the jurisdictions what that might yet be.

As I said in this place before, we have been contributing more than 24 per cent of funding for the Murray-Darling Basin Authority, which is our fair share. We have been contributing I think up to about 29 per cent since New South Wales dropped its contributions. We announced that if New South Wales did not agree to pay their way, we would not maintain our level of funding, which would effectively see us subsidising the New South Wales government, because after the New South Wales cuts, New South Wales will be contributing 13.8 per cent and our share would be 29.3 per cent. New South Wales' contribution is 13.8 per cent, but remember they take 47.2 per cent out of the southern connected basin. There is some disparity there, I would suggest.

So, anyone can see (for all the world I would have thought, but not this lot here) New South Wales is not pulling its weight. Our decision to reduce funding to 2014-15 was not made lightly. It was done to force New South Wales to consider the overall impact of their decision, to acknowledge that they have a responsibility to pay their fair share to protect our most precious resource, but so far New South Wales has refused to come to the table and tell us what their contribution will be. Even though every other state has indicated to the authority what theirs will be, New South Wales refuse and expect this state, other states and the commonwealth to subsidise them. That cannot continue.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN AUTHORITY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:39): I have a supplementary question arising from the minister's answer. Is he saying, therefore, that South Australia is refusing to 'pay its fair share'?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:39): These guys just don't get it. South Australia has been paying more than its fair share, and what we will not do is subsidise New South Wales. That's what the Liberals here want us to do—use South Australian taxpayers' money, to shovel it over the border to New South Wales. We will not do it!

CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:40): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Business Services and Consumers a question relating to regional services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: At the end of the 2013 financial year, the Weatherill Labor government closed the office of business and consumer affairs in Berri, reportedly to save \$101,489. Following the closure, the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs, Mr White, told the ABC that the government could not justify spending more than \$100,000 a year to keep the office open when it was receiving so few inquiries. He is reported as saying:

Clearly the evidence is that simply it doesn't stand up to the facts when you talk about one staff member there five days a week waiting for a service to be provided. It just wasn't occurring.

A freedom of information request has revealed that from July 2009 to December 2011 the Berri office dealt with almost 4,000 consumers by phone and in person, including 2,822 face-to-face consultations. Even more astoundingly, I am advised that the documents obtained under FOI reveal no records were kept of how many consultations were conducted between 1 January 2012 and 30 June 2012. My questions to the minister are:

1. Given the lack of data available for the immediate period prior to June 2013, how can the government claim that its decision to close the Berri office was based on the low volume of inquiries?

2. Were additional resources provided to the Adelaide-based business and consumer affairs office following the closure of the Berri office?

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) (14:42): I am advised in relation to the closure of the Berri regional office that the closure has generated ongoing savings in excess of \$100,000 a year. The closure of the Berri office has not affected the high level of service that CBS provides to those country customers. CBS has received no complaints, I am advised—no complaints—to date about this office closure and only an occasional phone call inquiring where to go for in-person services.

CBS customers residing in Berri and surrounding areas continue to have access to services in person through Service SA. All in-person services at Berri are currently being managed locally by Service SA, and other work is being carried out in the CBS Adelaide office, including compliance and consumer advice and assistance with resolving disputes. All Service SA regional offices, as well as the metropolitan offices, undertake a range of services on behalf of CBS and involve things like births, deaths and marriages, occupational licensing, residential tenancy bonds, incorporated associations and such like.

Over recent years, inquiries to the Berri office had dropped off substantially, so I am advised, with the highest inquiry type continuing to be referrals to appropriate agencies or specialised areas of CBS. The CBS found that there was not enough work to maintain an office and in fact regularly sent down files from the head office to be followed up by the office in the Riverland.

CBS continues to regularly visit the Riverland, and if an investigation is required it can have a team of investigators up there the same day, if need be. It is about having operatives on the ground where and when they are needed. They may also wish to take advantage of the CBS online service—and more and more members of the public do that. More and more people have online facilities and are confident in dealing for services and advice online or apply for the online website, or they could contact the office by phone (the 131 number is the cost of a local call).

CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:45): By way of supplementary question, given that the government clearly was considering closing the Berri office, why did the government stop collecting data on customer usage of the very office 18 months before the closure occurred? In relation to the minister's assertion that customer usage had been tailing off over some years, will the minister take on notice data that supports that claim?

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 am not aware, as a fairly new minister, that data ceased being collected, as the honourable member asserts. I am happy to look into that.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: We know that the opposition come into this place all the time, making up facts and figures. We know they never do any research. We know that they are a lazy, dozy lot of opposition, so I refuse to accept any assertion the opposition make, because we have known time and again that they just make up things because they are too lazy to check their facts or to do any research. They have shuffled back into opposition after losing the unlosable election. They have shuffled back into opposition, pulled their opposition chairs over in front of their cosy fire, put on their slippers and they are busily dozing off in the chamber opposite us.

I will look at that, but I do not accept on face value that that is necessarily so. In relation to some of the statistics I do have, I have been advised that, in relation to total phone calls and counter inquires, throughout December for the Berri office it was 96 in 2009, it was 53 in 2010 and 48 in 2011.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:47): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women a question about the federal budget.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Labor has a strong history of committing to gender equity—

The Hon. S.G. Wade: That is comment.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: I beg your pardon? I will start again. Labor has a proud and strong history of committing to gender equity and working to lift the participation of women in social and economic spheres of life. Will the minister tell the chamber the impact of the federal government budget on women and their families?

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) (14:48): I thank the honourable member for his most important question and his concern for these very important impacts that the federal government has had here in South Australia, particularly on women. These budget cuts will have a huge impact on not only all South Australians but particularly women, because of the particular responsibilities they bear. Women have been one of the hardest hit in this brutal federal budget. There have been significant hits in several key sectors and, quite frankly, I think women will face the brunt of most of these proposed changes. That is why Labor is rejecting this budget and fighting for a fair go.

This budget does nothing to improve the lives of women and their children. It proposes to make life more difficult for women. What do we hear from the opposite side of the chamber? What do we hear from them about budget cuts to women? Do we hear the opposition trying to stick up for South Australians and the vital services that will be cut and slashed?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The honourable minister. Please be quiet.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Now, the Hon. Mr Ridgway—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Ridgway! Now, listen: when a member is on their feet and they are giving an explanation, I think it is only respectful that we listen to what they have to say. The honourable minister.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Thank you, Mr President. Did the man who calls himself 'Prime Minister for women' not consider the impact of the fee that's been placed on medical care and the impact that that would have on households?

Did the same person think about the fact that he has cut \$2.2 million from a national partnership program for single and teen parents from 1 July this year? It is not, as the Prime Minister is claiming, many years away, but this year—1 July this year. It is a program that provides skills to single and teen parents so that they can support their young families. He has also ripped funds out of the training subsidies to teen parents—important funds to assist them to continue training whilst they are parenting at such a young age.

What sort of future are these people going to have? What sort of a future are these teen parents going to have without that support? Where are they going to end up? That's what I ask you, Mr President. What's more, I ask: what are the members opposite doing to challenge the Abbott government in its decisions on this budget? What are they doing to stand up for South Australians and the really essential services that are being torn apart by this budget?

They should be out there fighting to secure funds for our domestic violence services. Some of these services face significant uncertainty after 2014-15 when it looks like the funding will be cut from the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness. There is nothing there in the forward estimates, so what will happen in terms of the funding needed to support accommodation for these women at extremely high risk and their children? Where are they going to go? Where will they end up? Out on the street?

What's the opposition doing about this? What are they saying? How are they lobbying and voicing their concern for these vulnerable South Australians? This federal budget will deeply impact on the cost of living for Australian women and their families in particular.

There are many key sectors that this budget affects and, disproportionately, women, who are often low-income earners and carers. Of course, we know, on average, they live longer as well, so will be significantly disadvantaged by changes to the pension, the increase in working age, the cuts to concessions and the rest—the list goes on. Female pensioners, as I said, will be disproportionately affected by changes to the pension age, low-income superannuation contribution and loss of the seniors supplement.

From September 2017, the carer payment will have its indexation arrangements cut—a broken promise by the federal government who, prior to the election, promised there would be no change to the carers' pension. Mr Abbott stood there, faced the Australian public and just told barefaced lies. He lied to us.

Changes to higher education payments mean that women will be forced to take on further debts to pay for their university and training fees, leaving less for their own families or they will be forced to make choices about whether they can engage in study or not—a less than desirable outcome. The GP tax and the fuel tax, in particular, will deeply impact on women helping to raise and support families, and then a single parent on the parenting payment will have their budget hit by more than \$3,400 per year.

Labor has always been committed to providing opportunity and work to increase women's participation in all areas of life, but the Abbott government seems intent on destroying these opportunities. This can be evidenced through the decision to cut \$1.6 million from the national Office for Women's leadership and development strategy over the next four years.

What the Prime Minister has shown with this budget is his disregard for gender equality—a dismissiveness that will disadvantage business and the Australian economy generally.

We condemn this budget. This Labor government condemns this budget because of its adverse impact on South Australians, and women in particular. We will fight to ensure a fairer budget that provides a positive future for everyone, including women.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:55): A supplementary question. Where was the minister's outrage when her own government decided to axe the Women's Health Statewide service, which has been heavily criticised by the CEO of the National Council for Single Mothers and their Children?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Let the minister answer the question.

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) (14:55): Thank you, Mr President. The honourable member raises the issue of women's health services, but I have provided information to this chamber before. There have been changes to services, and so there should be. We need to keep restructuring and refashioning our services to be able to meet as many women's needs as possible, far and wide.

SA Health has recently released its new model for delivering assessment and care to women. This new model will be based on a hub and spoke model, with outreach services available across metropolitan South Australia. Women's service hubs—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Can the honourable members on my left please listen to the minister's reply?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: —will be located in Port Adelaide, Elizabeth and Noarlunga, with outreach services in North Adelaide. These changes will affect the way women access services; however, they have been specifically developed to focus on ensuring that vulnerable women can access appropriate health care. Healthcare initiatives support the government's strategic priority based on safe communities and healthy neighbourhoods.

So there has been change, but the services do continue. This government is very committed to continuing to provide good quality health services to the women of South Australia, unlike those sitting opposite. They are happy to sit there and watch the federal government rip apart our

healthcare contributions, which will have a significant impact on our hospital services, on beds, and will really cut to the very heart of our public health system, which is about access to health for everyone, not just those who can afford it.

DRIVING OFFENCES

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:57): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, representing the Minister for Road Safety, a question regarding driving offences and associated fines in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: A Family First survey of commonly incurred driving offence penalties—such as speeding, failing to wear a seatbelt, running a red light, etc.—revealed that South Australian motorists pay some of the highest fines for exactly the same offence anywhere in the country. Indeed, in most cases it was the highest fine. For offences between 10 and 29 km/h over the speed limit, our drivers pay the highest fine in the country. For instance, driving between 20 and 24 km/h over the speed limit costs South Australian drivers \$620 but just \$150 in Tasmania. The fine for running a red light is the highest in the nation as well, at \$416 compared to \$140 in Tasmania and \$150 in Western Australia.

Another significant finding from the survey we conducted was that if the government's proposed change to driving unregistered to a \$1,000 penalty and driving uninsured to \$1,500 goes ahead, we will have by far the highest penalties for those offences as well. The combined \$2,500 penalty for the two offences stands in stark contrast to the \$400 penalty in Tasmania and \$560 in Queensland for exactly the same offence.

The state government's proposed increase in penalties for these offences has an unclear status, with the government planning to go ahead late last year but then, after driver protest and media attention in the shadow of the election in March, the government declared that this increase was under review. My questions are:

1. What road safety research does the government possess to confirm that having the highest penalties in the nation for these offences actually saves lives and improves road safety? Why should we pay more for the same offences than interstate, when clearly those states are also focused on road safety?
2. Is there any correlation between the fact that the offences I have listed are all the offences that can be picked up by camera in an automatic setting rather than by resource-demanding active policing—that is, a police officer pulling over a driver?
3. Importantly, can the minister confirm for the motoring public the official government position on the status of the offence of driving unregistered and uninsured, given that the review that was promised should be completed by now?

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) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his most important question and will refer it to the appropriate minister in another place and bring back a response.

APY LANDS, MUNICIPAL AND ESSENTIAL SERVICES FUNDING

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (15:00): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs a question about funding essential services in Aboriginal communities.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA: I did not even need leave. Minister, will you inform the chamber about the importance of the Municipal and Essential Services funding in Aboriginal communities and homelands?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his most important question. The commonwealth's

Municipal and Essential Services program contributed about \$9.6 million in funding to South Australian communities in 2013-14—programs designed to deliver a range of essential and municipal services to all of South Australia's Aboriginal communities and homelands, and their organisations and service providers.

These include basic services that we would all expect, including roads and rubbish collection, dust management, and dog management. The funding also provides for the running, maintenance and replacement of minor infrastructure. It contributes to community governance in many communities and is a generator of much needed local employment opportunities. The MES program also funds services that are vitally important to ensuring the survival of our remote communities, such as maintaining airstrips on the APY lands and ensuring water and power supplies to Aboriginal homelands. All these services are now under threat from the Abbott Liberal government.

The commonwealth government has advised the South Australian government of their intention to cease this funding program and transition their responsibility to the state from June 2015. Where will these cuts end? The withdrawal of the MES funding will have far-reaching and dire consequences for Aboriginal communities across our state. It is estimated that this decision will impact on more than 4,000 Aboriginal residents in around 60 locations, from the Coorong to places west of Ceduna, from Oodnadatta to the Flinders Ranges, and small homelands on the APY lands.

It puts at risk the infrastructure, as well as the delivery of services such as power, water and rubbish collection, roads and a whole range of other municipal services. Not only that, these cuts could impact infrastructure that will potentially create health and safety risks for communities. For example, if landing strips are not maintained, the Royal Flying Doctor Service will have serious problems landing their planes for emergencies. Let me illustrate what these cuts could mean to some local communities. Koonibba is a community on the Far West Coast—

An honourable member: Koonibba.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Well you say Koonibba and the locals say Koon-i-bba, I am told. It is a community on the Far West Coast around 40 kilometres from Ceduna. It has a population of over 100 people. Koonibba relies on \$238,000 in funding to pay staff—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Could honourable members allow the minister to answer the question in silence?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: —who deal with administrative, financial and operational matters. A cut to this funding will have serious implications for local jobs. The community in Koonibba also uses the funding to pay for services such as rubbish collection, roads, dust and dog control, as I mentioned. Not only are these basic services that we would all expect in our normal council services, but removing access to them would create a health and safety risk. For many of these communities, MES is their only source of funding for such services. Many Aboriginal organisations will be severely impacted by these cuts.

The Regional Anangu Services Aboriginal Corporation (RASAC) is an Aboriginal organisation that delivers a range of vital services across the APY lands and to more than 2,000 people across to the bigger communities and the homelands. RASAC employs local Aboriginal people on the lands to respond to unique problems on-site. They assist traditional owners to visit or live on their traditional lands, providing electricity and water to groups with children and elderly people. RASAC will be at risk of closure should this funding stream cease.

Essential infrastructure such as bores and generators across the state will also be put in jeopardy. We must not forget that the commonwealth has been funding this infrastructure and other services in Aboriginal communities on the homelands and in remote areas for over 50 years. The decision to cut funding for essential services has the potential to set Aboriginal communities back decades and may spell the closure of some Aboriginal homelands.

In recent times, this place has seen rare but important bipartisan support for initiatives aimed to support Aboriginal prosperity. So I invite all members of the chamber, of all persuasions, to stand up for South Australia's Aboriginal communities against a federal government determined to slash and cut their future; to stand up to a government that has already cut funding to the National Congress of Australia's First Peoples, axed the position of coordinator general for remote Indigenous

services and slashed Aboriginal Legal Aid budgets; to stand up to a government that has made cuts that were not even foreshadowed by the Commission of Audit, including more than half a billion dollars over five years from Indigenous programs across the country and the \$7 GP co-payment policy, which will absolutely widen the gap between Indigenous and non-Indigenous health, no matter which way you look at it, and raising the pension age to 70 by 2053 when we know that Indigenous people have an average life expectancy of at least 10 years less than other Australians.

The proposed cuts to the MES funding will not only jeopardise essential services in Aboriginal communities but will put people's health and livelihoods at stake. They also have the capacity to set us back decades in the advancements we have made in closing the gap and empowering Aboriginal people seeking self-determination. I urge members in this place to stand up for the future of Aboriginal peoples in South Australia and help us by making sure that the commonwealth maintains its longstanding responsibility to remote Aboriginal communities.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:06): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation questions about the Environment Protection Authority and Nyrstar.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Over the last several years the government has struggled to deal with ongoing issues of lead toxicity in the Port Pirie environs as the result of both historic and ongoing particulate pollution from the lead smelter operated by Nyrstar. More recently, a deal has been concluded that the government will underwrite \$291 million of a half billion dollar smelter upgrade which we are told will decrease the contemporary pollution going forward but not the residual contamination.

Associate Professor Mark Taylor of Macquarie University is reported in Saturday's *Advertiser*, following his publication in the peer reviewed journal *Aeolian Research* of serious allegations about pollution and health monitoring in Port Pirie. According to *The Advertiser*, Professor Taylor is critical of the EPA and accuses the agency of misleading the public by cherry-picking data, misrepresenting the science and not adequately regulating chemicals other than lead. The criticism is that the EPA is either deliberately or negligently playing down the health repercussions of industrial pollution in Port Pirie.

In response the EPA has indicated that 'We are not interested in engaging in a public debate on Mark Taylor's views.' In essence, the professor and his colleagues are drawing attention to the fact that South Australia's pollution control regime is focused on licensing companies to pollute but does not adequately protect citizens from resultant systematic poisoning. Professor Taylor summarises his findings on Port Pirie as follows:

Despite chronic childhood blood lead exposures there is a history of denial and downplaying of the sources and impact of the contamination.

My questions are:

1. Does the minister accept all or any of the criticisms levelled at the EPA's handling of industrial pollution in Port Pirie from Professor Taylor and his colleagues?
2. Will the government provide reassurance to the people of Port Pirie by committing to a regime of full transparency by making all raw monitoring data and health data and all scientific methods publicly available?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:08): Let me say at the outset that it is somewhat disappointing that, when presented with certain scientific advice and information, *The Advertiser* in its article decided not to print it and run with some alarmist claims without any supporting advice from the chief scientist, which I will get to in a moment.

However, I can say this: I am advised that the EPA is currently performing air modelling in order to assist it to set limits that are reasonable and practicable assuming industry best standards and globally available technology. The EPA requires Nyrstar to submit lead and air monitoring results monthly. The EPA monitors for lead at a number of points throughout the town and also monitors

sulphur dioxide at its Oliver Street monitoring station. Monitoring results undertaken by the EPA at all four of its Port Pirie monitoring stations, including the station at the smelter facility boundary, are published regularly on its website, I am advised.

The EPA uses the two monitoring stations that are most representative of the community and most affected by lead emissions: the Pirie West and Oliver Street stations. When analysing and reporting data for the purposes of the national environment protection measure (NEPM), the EPA collects and analyses data in accordance with the NEPM standards. As such, it uses the two monitoring sites furthest from the facility. The EPA uses rolling averages to measure against licence conditions as there is currently no standard for spikes.

The national environment protection measure, which sets the standard, requires averaging over a 12-month period, I am advised. Averaging is representative of the impact on blood lead levels as it relates to the total emissions of the plant. Comparing daily averages or spikes to standards for annual averages is inappropriate and shows a lack of understanding of how lead is regulated and its health impacts in the body.

Whilst the main focus of environmental regulation in the Nyrstar smelter is on a reduction in lead emissions, the transformation will also result in a reduction of other emissions including arsenic, cadmium and sulphur dioxide. That is because the technology associated with the reduction in lead levels will also lead to reduction in other pollutants. I am advised that the health risk of potential impacts from lead exposure on the community of Port Pirie is higher than that from cadmium and arsenic.

I understand that this assessment is based on the National Pollutant Inventory methodology for risk ranking, taking into account emission quantities and impact. This is why the EPA licenses and places limits on lead, knowing both that this is a crucial substance to control and that, in reducing emissions of this, there is a corresponding reduction in cadmium and arsenic. In fact, as far back as 1994, I am advised, the South Australian government has acknowledged that contemporary emissions were the main source of lead exposure and not legacy issues.

Control of contemporary emissions has always been the prime focus of the EPA's regulatory approach, I am advised. In addition to the EPA requiring Nyrstar to work to reduce current emissions, the efforts of the community of Port Pirie include controlling the risk from historically-deposited dust as part of its lead abatement program. I understand that SA Health is confident that the statistical methods used in the Port Pirie blood level reports provide the most accurate analysis of the blood lead level trends for the purposes of public health protection.

In fact, given the current transformation proposal, I understand the EPA is confident that, once complete, it will dramatically lower many pollutants coming from Nyrstar's smelter including not just lead but also sulphur dioxide, arsenic and cadmium. Nyrstar undertakes sulphur dioxide monitoring in the tall stack and monitors the level of a range of metals including lead, arsenic and cadmium at monitoring locations throughout Port Pirie. Post transformation, the EPA will continue to work with Nyrstar to seek ongoing improvements to reduce lead and other pollutants from areas of the facility through the development and implementation of the EPA-approved environment improvement plan. As is the current case, compliance with the environment improvement plan will remain a condition of Nyrstar's licence.

It is important to understand that the EPA is not a public health authority. It is not competent to talk about issues related to lead in blood levels. That is the responsibility of the Department for Health. The two agencies work very closely together, but the EPA is always very careful not to stray outside its remit, its area of professionalism. The EPA has been undertaking a detailed review, of course, of lead levels in Port Pirie. It is also disappointing, as I alluded to earlier, that when *The Advertiser* in preparing this article were offered—and accepted, I understand—briefing from the chief scientist, they seem to have chosen to ignore that advice and information that was given to them and printed their one-sided article that the honourable member refers to in his question.

The chief scientific adviser on the Nyrstar project undertook an interview with *The Advertiser*, is my advice, providing advice regarding the justification for current monitoring by the EPA in line with the national environment protection measures and SA Health in terms of blood lead level testing. I have the utmost confidence in the regulatory role of the EPA and it will remain the government spokesperson on environmental protection. The Department for Health will remain the government spokesperson on health matters.

The PRESIDENT: Is this your first question, the Hon. Mr McLachlan? Congratulations. The Hon. Mr McLachlan.

FURTHER EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (15:14): I seek leave to give a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question regarding maintaining the proportion of women within the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN: Minister, I note that one of the key performance measures is to increase employee diversity within the department by maintaining the proportion of women within the executive level of the department at 50 per cent or more. My question is: what policy initiatives have been implemented to ensure that the department meets the target of maintaining a proportion of 50 per cent of women at executive level in the department?

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) (15:14): I thank the honourable member for his most important question and his first question in this place, and I am delighted to see that his question is in relation to women. It is a very important policy area, and of course it is an area where this government has worked extremely hard and has an extremely impressive track record.

We know that this government has set itself a number of performance targets in relation to women. I have talked about those many times in this place before. We know that, for instance, we have set ourselves targets to reach 50 per cent women on our government boards and also 50 per cent women chairing those boards. We have done extremely well in that place. I was just trying to put my hand on our latest figures; I think they are about 47 point something per cent. I think the last figure that I saw was something like 47.2 per cent women represented on our government boards, but I will double-check that.

Of course, that has been a significant increase since the Liberal opposition were in government. In the former government, the number of women represented on government boards and committees was extremely low, but we set ourselves this target. It is a transparent target that we are publicly accountable for, and it is not surprising that we have increased the representation of women significantly. Although we have not quite reached our 50 per cent goal, we are well on the way to achieving that and we continue our efforts. So too with our chairs, our figures aren't quite as impressive, but nevertheless since setting the target we have significantly increased the number of women in chair positions on our government boards and committees.

We have also set ourselves targets in relation to women in the executive, and again we have some very impressive figures in that area. There are a number of programs that were put in place throughout the public sector to try to ensure that we improve women's representation in leadership throughout our public sector. Women currently comprise two-thirds of the entire public sector but just over one-third of executive level positions, and this target seeks to redress the imbalance—we have again set another 50 per cent target—to ensure that the South Australian public sector has a high-performing, flexible and responsive executive group.

The percentage of women in executive positions has increased from 29.4 per cent when the target was set in 2004 to 43.8 per cent now. That is the figure I am advised as of June 2013. There are a number of strategies we have put in place to help us achieve these impressive figures, and I must say that, although we still haven't achieved 50 per cent, and I acknowledge that, nevertheless South Australia is one of the leading jurisdictions in relation to these very impressive results. We have one of the highest levels of women represented in the executive throughout the nation.

The Office of Public Employment did a review and it developed a number of strategies to help us in this space—things like:

- targeted marketing to attract increased applications from women for executive positions;
- improvement of executive capabilities amongst women in executive feeder groups;

- ensuring that chief executives, HR directors and divisional heads demonstrate a commitment to employing women at executive levels; and of course
- making the South Australian government women's choice of employer for work-life balance initiatives.

I would also like to mention that this government has done things like enshrine in our Public Sector Act 2009 the right for public sector workers to access flexible working arrangements.

We have a policy position in place. They are the sorts of on-the-ground workplace provisions that make it possible for women and men to be able to manage child rearing and other family caring responsibilities. The responsibility still largely rests with women, but nevertheless these arrangements are available to men as well. This government has put in place a number of different initiatives and we continue to strive to encourage women, to develop them in leadership positions and to try to ensure that the workplace is as family friendly as possible to enable women to succeed and be the very best they can.

FURTHER EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY DEPARTMENT

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:20): I have a supplementary question arising from the answer. How many public sector employees are young women, how many have disabilities, and, given that the government is currently also not meeting its own target in regard to employing people with disabilities, what strategies are in place in this regard and will they actually be enforced?

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) (15:21): We have worked hard to try to ensure a diverse workplace. I have some figures for women with disability in our public sector, but I do not seem to be able to put my hand on them. Nevertheless, we do monitor that space very carefully. We encourage diversity in our workplace, not only employees with disabilities but also people from different ethnic backgrounds and different cultures. I will agree to bring back those figures in relation to ages and also disability status.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:22): I need to bring to the attention of Hansard that I referred in my last answer to the chief scientific adviser on the Nyrstar project and towards the end I called him the chief scientist. That is an error. It should be the chief scientific adviser on the Nyrstar project. I will not use that shorthand again.

The PRESIDENT: Keep mistakes to a minimum, minister. The Hon. Mr Maher.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (15:22): My question is to the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills. Can the minister advise the chamber about the impacts of the Liberal government's budget on funding for apprenticeships, vocational training and higher education in South Australia?

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) (15:22): The federal Liberal government's budget has certainly ripped the heart out of ordinary South Australians. With this budget, these cuts will have severe and immediate negative effects. Not only have we seen unprecedented cuts to education and health funding, we have also seen the federal government rip out around \$400 million over four years for apprenticeships, vocational training and higher education—\$400 million over four years for apprentices, vocational training and higher education. This includes a more than \$145 million, or roundabout, reduction in VET services in South Australia.

This is an astonishing and unbelievable cut—astonishing and unbelievable when you consider how integral vocational education and training are to the South Australian economy. These reductions in vocational education programs would mean around 20,000 fewer places for training—

roundabout 20,000 fewer training places throughout South Australia. That is what these cuts mean and also they obviously thrust greater economic pressure on our families and individuals.

Our regions will also suffer a shocking blow. Approximately 5,000 of those vocational training positions may be lost to regional areas, so that is about 5,000 out of that 20,000. Not only are the Liberals intent on cutting vocational education programs but they are also imposing a cruel impost of debt on people looking to further their skills. From 1 July young apprentices, who have previously been given a grant to help purchase their tools of trade—we are talking about apprentices' tools of trade here—will now be incurring a debt. So, if they want to purchase their tools they will have to take out a loan, a debt to the commonwealth.

I was speaking to a young 19 year old in his third year of a plumbing apprenticeship, and when he was asked about the impact of the tool allowance being ripped away, he said, 'I already have a mortgage. I have had to take out a mortgage for a car because I need a car to be able to get to my work. I've already got a mortgage; I can't afford to take out further mortgages.' He was a third-year apprentice. What are they expected to do in future—take out loans?

Many of these students are trying to balance other work-related costs, such as a car loan to enable them to travel to work. Scrapping the Tools For Your Trade payment will place an unnecessary burden on our young apprentices. It does not stop there. The federal Liberal government is ceasing support to numerous other programs that support apprentices and their employers, such as no new applications to the Accelerated Australian Apprenticeship Program, the Australian Apprenticeships Mentoring Program, the Alternative Pathway Program, the Australian Apprenticeship Access Program, and the Apprenticeship to Business Owner Program—they will all have the guts ripped out of them.

It is clear from these cuts that the Abbott government has forgotten that the apprenticeship and training programs are key to opening opportunities and job prospects for many South Australian young adults. The government's budget will force South Australian young adults into debt to pay for their training and education. It is not only young people, but a lot of older South Australians who have been retrenched or redeployed and want to retrain or upskill come back and use these courses to try to find new employment and re-employment. They are gone—10 skill and training programs are gone—\$400 million across four years, \$145 million just from the VET sector.

As I said, it is forcing debt on to people who often cannot afford it, and it would be a burden that is just too great for many individuals to take on. Many will not pursue that option of paying through debt. This is unacceptable to the state Labor government, and we will campaign against this. We will stand up for apprentices and trainees. We will stand up for those South Australians who have been redeployed or retrenched and want to retrain, reskill and find employment. This Jay Weatherill government will stand up for these South Australians. We do not accept this budget.

We warned South Australians about what would happen. We warned them earlier this year. We warned them that this was the real agenda of a Liberal government, federal or state. This is the real sort of agenda. We will not stand by and let a federal government withdraw funding to vital services and expect the South Australian government to pick up the pieces. We do not accept this federal government, and we will fight it.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 8 May 2014.)

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:29): I rise to speak to the Address in Reply 2014. At the outset, I join others in thanking His Excellency the Governor for his speech as well as the Chief Justice and other judges for overseeing the swearing-in of members. I would also like to make special mention of the member for Fisher and extend my best wishes to him and his family. I think we all agree it was quite warming that he was able to attend the first sitting day of parliament. I would also like to extend my congratulations to Andrew McLachlan and Tung Ngo—our two most newly elected members of the Legislative Council.

The government has recommitted to focusing on its seven strategic priorities, as outlined in 2012: an affordable place to live; creating a vibrant city; every chance for every child; safe

communities, healthy neighbourhoods; growing advanced manufacturing; realising the benefits of the mining boom for all; and premium food and wine from our clean environment. I have to say I am a little underwhelmed by the government's agenda—not because the policies do not have merit but because, so often, many of the decisions this government makes seem to fly in the face of the very outcomes they claim they are trying to achieve. There is also a lot of emphasis on what the government claims it has achieved, not what it will achieve. I am not going to dwell too much on all of the priorities, but I will make a few brief comments on some areas.

The first and most obvious disappointment from this government's agenda has to be the recent sacking of Rod Hook—a decision that took most people by surprise. As we know, the Premier announced some 10 days ago that Rod Hook had been sacked, effective immediately. The only explanation I have heard through the media about Mr Hook's sacking was that the government wanted to rejuvenate its departments with some form of long-term commitment.

By all accounts, Mr Hook has been regarded as one of our finest public servants. He is held in high regard not only by members from all sides of politics but by so many members of our community who have rallied behind him, especially since his dismissal. There is no underestimating what Mr Hook has managed to achieve in terms of this state's development. You have to wonder what on earth the Premier was thinking, if anything, when he made his decision 10 days ago. Was this really the way to thank Mr Hook for his commitment to South Australia's vision?

On a personal note, in all my dealings with him, Rod has always been a very approachable, fair and reasonable man. I for one wish him all the very best in his future endeavours and thank him for his tremendous contribution to our state. I am certain he will continue to play a pivotal role in future developments.

My second disappointment: we all know the importance of making South Australia an affordable place to live, especially in today's economic climate. People are struggling. Families are struggling to make ends meet. The government claims to understand the economic difficulties our communities are experiencing. It claims to understand that economic problems and human problems go hand-in-hand. Why is it then that absolutely nothing has been done to ease the cost of living pressures?

I for one am at a loss to understand how increasing water rates, increasing electricity costs, refusing to consider alternatives involved in the calculation of sewer rates on valuation, calculating water rates for commercial and industrial properties based on valuation in addition to consumption, calculating emergency service levy rates for commercial and industrial properties on valuation and then applying a penalty differential rate and, finally, how introducing a car parking tax in the CBD can possibly enhance the government's affordable living objective.

We all know about the importance of creating a vibrant city. Indeed, during the last session, as a parliament, we managed to make some positive changes around licensing requirements for small venue businesses that have contributed to the CBD's vibrancy—that was a positive move and I commended the government for it at the time. More recently, however, I was alarmed to hear the Minister for Tourism not only criticise some restaurants, cafes and bars in the CBD for making the decision not to open on football days but also go as far as to suggest they may not receive ongoing support from the government if they do not open—a comment made without having any regard whatsoever to the viability of the businesses.

On the issue of food, the government is always quick to take credit for and boast about our premium food and wine industry, yet so little is being done to support our farmers. Increasing the cost of water for stock and irrigation purposes, offering little in the way of drought assistance, and imposing unrealistic obligations on farms and farmers through the efforts of some land resources management board staff is not conducive to good farming practices. In Port Lincoln the concerns of farmers about the impacts of mining exploration are being completely ignored. The very people who produce our premium foods and our premium wines, and earn South Australia its reputation as a food capital, simply do not get the support they need from government.

I have been rather disappointed with the attitude of some departments, in particular, on the issue of jobs. As an example, I recently requested a meeting with the Minister for Recreation and Sport on behalf of some constituents to discuss employment in the racing industry, bearing in mind this used to be the second largest employer in the state and has now dropped to fifth place. I did not

get to meet with the minister; in fact, I did not even get to meet with the executive director of the department. The meeting I did have was a complete and utter waste of time.

This is just a snapshot of concerns. It is by no means complete. That said, I will endeavour to end on a more positive note. The establishment of the Department of State Development is a move in the right direction as long as it focuses on, among other things, the removal of unnecessary red tape. The board has been given responsibility for the job accelerator fund, and will need to focus on training courses for real jobs required for now and in the future, not increasing the number of training courses that lead to little or no prospect of employment.

It will also be essential for the government to focus on the number of public sector jobs and embark on an operational audit of each and every agency in the department of government, something for which I have advocated strongly. An operational audit is the only way to ensure that public servants are involved in essential activities and, importantly, are focusing on essential front-line services. In addition to improving the collaboration between business, government and academia, we also need to ensure that government agencies act on a whole-of-government approach as espoused by the Public Sector Act. There are so many examples of duplication within government departments which could be remedied if government departments adopted a more cooperative approach.

In closing, South Australia is going through an extremely difficult time, and I agree that there is a sense of anxiety that we have not experienced in a very long time. The impending closure of Holden has created unprecedented angst, especially for our northern suburbs. The release of the most recent federal budget has only served to magnify those concerns.

The issue has to be: how do we address the problems that confront us? My focus will continue to be on issues that affect our communities, issues such as training and employment, cost of living pressures, assistance for our primary producers and small businesses, housing affordability, WorkCover, Public Service reforms, gambling reforms, online predators and electoral reforms. I look forward to working cooperatively with the government, the opposition and crossbenchers to achieve meaningful reforms in these areas, amongst others.

At the risk of repeating what I have already said I have to end, once again, by placing on the record my complete and utter dismay with the Labor Party's and the unions' dirty and desperate tactics during the election. During the campaign we saw how far the Labor Party was willing to go to mislead voters. I certainly hope this is not something we can expect to see more of during its reign as government.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:38): I rise to support the Address in Reply. I will begin by thanking Uncle Lewis O'Brien for welcoming us all to Kaurua land. This is a task he always undertakes in a spirit of reconciliation, and I am pleased that the welcome to country is now a fixture in the opening of parliament.

I would also like to thank His Excellency Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce for his address on the opening of the 53rd parliament, and for the ongoing work that he and Mrs Scarce do for the people of South Australia. Whether one is a monarchist or a republican there is, in my mind, no doubt of the benefit of having a person and an institution to represent us all in acknowledging and thanking the efforts of our community organisations, thanking our volunteers, and congratulating those who do well in various endeavours, such as study or community service.

These are tasks that the Governor fulfils admirably. These are views that I have long held but it is a happy coincidence that, in a few hours' time, His Excellency, as Patron of the Royal Geographical Society of South Australia, will be presenting university students with academic achievement awards and that I will be playing the role of proud parent on the sidelines for a change.

If you had asked South Australians last year whose agenda they thought the Governor would be outlining at the opening of the 53rd parliament, I doubt that many would have thought that we would see a fourth Labor government. But that is the situation. It is a result of the electoral system that we have and now for all of us it is back to business.

The Governor outlined a few new initiatives for the government but all in all, amongst the gnashing of teeth and the tearing of sack cloth, there is not a lot of vision to be seen. In fact, it looks pretty much like business as usual but with a few tweaks here and there to try to accommodate external factors such as the pending closure of Holden's or the failure of BHP's Olympic Dam

expansion—in both cases, I would add, despite generous and, in BHP's case, extraordinary concessions being granted over many years. The test for the South Australian government is whether they really do have their eye on the future or whether they will continue to repeat past behaviour and hope against all logic for a different outcome.

I have to say that the outlook for a visionary rethink of our economic and social direction is not very promising. There will be infrastructure projects to create short-term jobs but will they be projects that make our society more resilient to future shocks or will they be business as usual? In the case of transport, a classic example is that the government still does not understand the transport pressures of the future in a carbon-constrained world with peak oil and rising fuel prices. The government's overemphasis on freeways and lack of attention to public transport, walking and cycling will not put us in good shape for the future.

It is a truth bordering on a law of physics that traffic expands to fill the available space which is why the hugely expensive road projects being prosecuted by both the federal Liberal government and the state Labor government will ultimately be seen to be poor value. The government points always to the partial electrification of the rail network, as to their seriousness in dealing with public transport, but the sad reality is that the trains are no more frequent and, in the case of the new Seaford line, in fact they are slower than before with the axing of express services.

Similarly, in relation to a sustainable energy future, the government is hell-bent on fracking for unconventional gas, not just in the outback, but also in our prime farming areas such as in the South-East. The government is locking in a fossil fuel based, climate changing policy that future generations will not thank us for.

Because I am an agreeable fellow, I tried to find something I could agree with in the Governor's speech, and I have settled on the following:

The growing tendency to separate economic policy from social outcomes has diminished the power and value of political discourse. We need to remove any distance that currently separates economic growth and social benefit.

However, what we need to appreciate is that social benefit is not just the re-election of the government in four years' time but the social, natural and economic environment for generations to come. That is why long-term thinking is so important and why it is so disappointing that it is in short supply in many areas of government policy. If the government really was thinking about the future, it would not be sacrificing South Australia's natural environment by gutting the department, slashing staff, de-funding programs and generally behaving as if a clean, healthy and biologically diverse planet is some optional extra rather than the thing that ultimately sustains us all.

The Greens are back in state parliament and we appreciate the support we have been given by the people of South Australia to continue our role of keeping the government to account and advancing 'A better way for SA'. Over the coming four years we will be working, hopefully alongside other members, on cost of living pressures. Much has been said about the rising cost of energy and the Greens firmly believe that these costs can and must be brought under control. We will be focusing on a range of initiatives, including demand management and we reject the victimisation of renewable energy which, in fact, is driving the price of energy down.

Those who followed the debate on Australia's energy future would realise that there has been a gross overinvestment in infrastructure in poles and wires. The companies have overinvested and they want their money back, and they want their money back from us. I have no doubt that the pressure that will come from the energy utilities to the government to readjust pricing policy to make sure they can get money back on their assets will be immense.

I note that Oxford University, for example, has already established a school of stranded assets because they can see what is happening around the world. When you see in the scientific literature and even in the newspapers that within the next few years households will be encouraged to disconnect from the grid and to become self-sufficient with a combination of solar energy and battery storage, that must send shivers down the spines of electricity companies if they can see people disconnecting. I would be very surprised if they do not come crying to government saying that all South Australians need to contribute to paying back their billions of dollars of overinvestment.

When it comes to health the Greens believe that our current system is inadequately described. In fact, it is not a health system it is an 'illth' system. The focus is on people being ill not

on people staying healthy. We know that prevention is better than cure; we also know that it is cheaper than cure. The Greens, like all members, are very concerned at the prospect of the health budget consuming the entirety of the state budget within just a few short decades if we do not turn around the approach.

The Greens will also be working in this term of parliament to protect our farmers and protect our farmland from urban sprawl, from fracking for unconventional gas and also protecting valuable cropping land from open-cut mining such as that proposed on Yorke Peninsula.

We will continue with our program to clean up and improve South Australia's democracy. I will be reintroducing an optional preferential voting bill that failed by just one vote at the end of the last parliament and I am given some heart by the fact that at the federal level the wisdom of that approach has now been seen and it is likely to be the model that is adopted for Senate voting in the future.

The Greens are not giving up on some of the social policies that we have championed over many years, including policies in relation to marriage equality. In conclusion, the Greens are grateful to the people of South Australia for giving us a further opportunity to represent these issues in state parliament. We look forward to the next four years and we look forward to working constructively with members on all sides.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:47): I take the floor to support the adoption of the Address in Reply to the Governor's speech and thank His Excellency for his ongoing service to the state of South Australia. I also thank Uncle Lewis O'Brien for his very passionate Kaurna welcome. I have been very privileged to enjoy that on a number of occasions and certainly am always very happy to see Uncle Lewis.

In his speech the Governor reiterated seven primary areas where we will see the government's action focused with some updates given the impending closure of Holden and a decision by BHP not to proceed with the Olympic Dam expansion. On behalf of Dignity for Disability I welcome the government's statement that it must lead by example in developing stronger innovation in South Australia and look forward to what we hope will be the state government supporting industries that Dignity for Disability believes South Australia can develop through natural advantage.

The corporate welfare that the government had been offering large multinationals such as Holden was not fair. What we need is fair opportunities to be given to small and medium enterprises (or SMEs) in this state. This includes supporting SMEs that seek to make Adelaide and this state more accessible to residents and tourists with disabilities, older tourists and residents who use mobility aids, through retrofitting and pop-up accessibility concepts and design.

We also need to continue to push to make Adelaide and the entire state amiable to bikes and their riders. This is also a niche tourist market we could target on the back of the continuing success of the Tour Down Under. To me, wheel-friendly and disability access go hand in hand. We want our streets to be a welcoming environment for people, not cars. It is people who are the lifeblood of our communities, not the petrol engine.

As I have said before, I would love for all footpaths and corridors around the city to accommodate all wheelchairs and mobility aids properly. Making Adelaide more wheel-accessible is something I am, for good reason, very passionate about, because it is not just for those of us who use mobility aids or have some other mobility impairment right now: it is for those of us who will acquire them in the future and it is also for people using prams as well as walking-frames and crutches, too, for that matter.

There is no doubt that having a city that feels available to all who use mobility aids, people on bikes and families with children and prams and so on will help to make Adelaide a truly international city—not only because Lonely Planet says it is so, but because we know it to be so and it is deserving of that title. But engines and cars are needed in modern day Australia and I wonder if SA might not become a national leader in modifying cars to suit a range of disabilities, for example, given that we have the oldest population on mainland Australia in particular.

Looking at the issue of employment, I would urge the government to look in its own backyard. Given that the state government's own public sector continues not to meet its own targets for employing people with disabilities, as I mentioned in question time just this afternoon, I look forward to the Premier and his ministers ensuring that their own government departments are developing

more inclusive attitudes, as well as physical infrastructure, towards employing people with disabilities, so that we do not face the highest unemployment rate of any group within the community.

Still on the topic of employment, I would like to strongly recommend that the state government supports the commonwealth government's phasing out of Australian disability enterprises in their current form and more particularly the wage tool that the High Court found to be unfair and to be a breach of human rights, and indeed any other tool that may amount to this. We need to pay people with disabilities a fair wage for fair work and, where we do not have the capacity to work, to provide basic community options, including comprehensive respite for families. It is time to end the skill apartheid that says that, because you were born a certain way, you are suited to one particular job, whether or not that job necessarily caters to your abilities or indeed your aspirations. It is time that the employment opportunities of people with disabilities were dictated by our aspirations and our abilities and our life goals, not the limited imaginations of other people.

Considering action No. 5—safe and active neighbourhoods—where have we come in the past two years? Well, I am sure we people with disabilities would love to feel safe and able to be out and about in our communities, and in some cases this may well already be true, but the opportunities are often limited. For a start, not all people with disability can rely on buses and trains being accessible or even arriving on time, and the failings of the Department of Transport and Infrastructure to provide a reliable public transport service in this state has been a continuous and ongoing problem for the past two years, leaving commuters stranded all over Adelaide.

I hope we will be moving past this situation soon because, again, if we are truly going to deserve that spot in the Lonely Planet booklet not just now but in the future, this is something we must fix. The problems with the SATSS voucher schemes continue to exist: a lack of them and inflexible rules still create barriers to accessing social, education and employment opportunities.

But being safe in your own neighbourhood is more fundamental than just being able to safely get around. It is about knowing that there is a decent police, courts and corrections system in place that is fair and that is just. To get to this point we must fully implement the disability justice plan (or DJP) in its entirety, including resourcing and legislative change.

I have been impressed to see the constructive cross-departmental teamwork with stakeholders on the DJP, but until we see the current draft become reality, we must continue with a bipartisan approach to reform our justice system. Indeed, it is my hope that that bipartisan, constructive cross-departmental approach will continue in other departments as well, not just on what you might call 'special occasions', because that is how we achieve real and effective outcomes for the people of South Australia.

Dignity for Disability, like all parties and individuals in this parliament I am sure, never want to see the situations we have recently seen in South Australia occur again. People who sexually abuse vulnerable children with disabilities, or any child, should feel the full force of the law and know that society does not tolerate this behaviour. Instead of justice being served, however, we have seen lawyers in the department of public prosecutions forced to drop their cases because witnesses with disabilities are considered unreliable, often because of a lack of support for them in court to tell their story.

I am reminded of a recent case where a young woman with disabilities was indecently assaulted while using an access cab in Adelaide. When interviewed about this case, the young woman's father (who was speaking on her behalf because she is non-verbal) was asked whether there really had been an effect on the victim because there was no way that she could communicate whether or not this was the case. Again, this is treating people with disabilities as a different class of person. The fact is it is wrong to abuse any person, whether or not they have a disability, and so reforming the justice system must also be about not only the supports readily available to people who need to use that system but also people's attitudes towards the people who go through the system.

People with disabilities are also, of course, offenders sometimes, and it is essential, particularly when those offenders have cognitive disabilities, that they understand their rights and can access protections and equal rights in the same way as the rest of the population. Moving back for a moment to the issue of victims or alleged victims of crime: in recent days and months we have seen some tragic cases of domestic violence against women, resulting ultimately in the murder or alleged murder of these women. What I would remind this chamber of is that women with disabilities

are at a higher risk of experiencing domestic violence than their non-disabled peers and are often in situations of financial dependence or personal support needs that make it incredibly difficult to leave that situation.

Still on the topic of women, I noticed with some dismay during the state election that Dignity for Disability had the highest proportion of female candidates of parties that stood 10 or more candidates in that election.

The Hon. S.G. Wade: You're the only party with 100 per cent of women in the parliament.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: That's right. As the Hon. Mr Wade rightly points out, we are also currently the only party with 100 per cent female parliamentary representation. I look forward to making that 200 per cent in the near future—and that is why I did not become a maths teacher, but you know what I mean. I am much safer in here.

The Hon. S.G. Wade interjecting:

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: This is actually a very serious topic, if you don't mind, Mr Wade—

The Hon. S.G. Wade: Is that about child protection—protecting children from your maths?

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: Protecting children from my maths, yes. It is a vital child protection issue that this state faces at this time; let us all remember that. But I would also expect us to provide leadership, Mr Wade, in running candidates for election who have disabilities—but to have to lead us in the area of female representation is not a mantle I was expecting to take.

Even more concerning is the fact that we have fewer women in parliament that we did before 15 March this year. I think this is a timely reminder for all of us, including other political parties, to look at our candidate selection process. Instead of saying it is difficult to have female candidates if they do not put themselves forward, perhaps those parties should be asking themselves what those barriers are presented to women that inhibit them from coming forward and how they can help to get rid of them.

The South Australian population is now represented by women in only 17 of the 69 positions in parliament. I might not be a maths teacher, but I do know that that is less than 25 per cent, and this is, to put it lightly, not good enough. Women make up more than 50 per cent of the South Australian population and so should be duly represented in the state legislature in the same numbers. This is not the case and the old parties, Labor and Liberal, need to take a good hard look at themselves and at the opportunities they offer, or fail to offer, women in the political realm.

Moving on to affordable living, or action area No. 6, I have said on countless occasions before, and I will say it again: living with a disability in this state is currently a full-time job, but I am going to have to do it until something actually changes. There is not affordable living for people with disabilities in this state while we still have an ever-growing unmet needs list. There is an accommodation crisis for people with disabilities in this state. There is not adequate affordable housing to meet demand, including in the private rental sector.

We are not talking about a few people either. Back in my 2012 Address in Reply, nearly 1,200 people were awaiting accommodation support, and more than 1,700 were awaiting community support, access and respite. Now, in 2014, incredibly there are even more. In particular, the area of category 1—critical need—continues to grow.

So I say to the government: on your agenda of reform, keep it up, but you are still failing those people on the unmet needs list who need help now. They cannot wait for the NDIS to happen, so if you actually care about individuals with disabilities, you will help them with an immediate injection of funding. This also includes funding to address some of the stereotypes and misconceptions around people with disabilities wanting to enter the private rental market.

Finally, regarding area No. 7, early childhood, South Australia's commitment to implementing the NDIS for young people is to some extent commendable, but not enough. Until we arrest the situation within the Department for Education and Child Development that sees future South Australians damaged, it is not good enough.

I will continue on behalf of Dignity for Disability to work with the government, opposition and crossbenchers, and indeed whomever we have to, to improve the lives of all South Australians, but hope to see much more rapid action in the areas of disability and social disadvantage. Dignity for

Disability certainly remains committed to those areas in particular and will continue to lobby to make sure that the government and other parties are as well.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (16:03): I rise to make some remarks in relation to the Address in Reply. At the outset, I would like to commend the Governor and Mrs Scarce for the work that they do in serving our communities and the friendly manner in which they welcome all people both to their residence and when they are moving about in the public domain. I would like to congratulate the Governor on the delivery of his speech on 6 May for the opening of parliament.

I would also like to welcome our two new members to this chamber, Mr Andrew McLachlan and Mr Tung Ngo. I congratulate them on their maiden speeches. I will not go through all the names in the House of Assembly, but I would like to congratulate the new Liberal MPs, Mr David Speirs, Mr Corey Wingard, Mr Stephan Knoll, Mr Vincent Tarzia and Mr Troy Bell. I had the pleasure of hearing Mr Bell's maiden speech this morning.

I also congratulate our new President, the Hon. Russell Wortley. However, it was disappointing the manner in which he was selected and the unseemly behaviour of the Australian Labor Party in government, having just won—or I think the correct term would be that they formed government again, to their own surprise as much as to anyone else's—very quickly went back to business as usual, dividing over the spoils.

I also join with a number of members who have made comments in relation to the Governor's speech in that it certainly lacked an agenda. At the outset we had the repetition of the seven points which the Premier, when he first came to that position, had developed. Not a lot is new in the address, and there are a couple of things I would like to remark on in that there is a fairly tokenistic reference to protecting the pristine environment from which our premium food is sourced—there is no reference as to how—and also references to regional South Australia.

Yes, wake up South Australian government: regional South Australia accounts for 20 per cent of the state's population but contributes more than half of our overseas exports. That is the sort of thing members of the Liberal Party have been saying for many years, and it will be interesting to see whether or not this government takes a different approach, but it has certainly neglected and, in many cases, abused regional South Australia in its cynical focus on metropolitan South Australia, in the knowledge that it only ever has the chance of winning one seat outside metropolitan South Australia.

I was also bemused at the comment in the speech that our economy depends heavily on our capacity to retain our brightest minds, and that is true and they need a job. There is a jobs crisis in South Australia—it has been going on for quite some time. I do not see that this government has any agenda to address that, and we have seen Business SA come out just this week commenting on that issue, that there is a distinct lack of appetite from this government to reduce any of its taxation measures. It certainly seems like it is business as usual.

Indeed, on the day the Governor delivered his speech, I was quite surprised that the newly re-formed government did not seem to be particularly interested, particularly the Premier. You would almost have thought that a relative of his might have died as he sat there slumped in his chair not looking bemused. I recall when we would have the opening of parliament under his predecessor, the Hon. Mike Rann, that he would always appear jovial and would be commenting to people sitting either side of him—they would be cracking jokes and looking pretty pleased—but I have a sense that this government is not all beer and skittles, which is quite surprising. Looking at the ministers here in question time, one could be forgiven for thinking they had had a breakfast of lemons and three-corner jacks the way they carry on.

Also, the *Notice Paper* is looking noticeably thin, and that is a reflection of the lack of policy substance that the Labor Party took to the election. We have one bill in relation to pastoral lands, which we will debate fairly soon. I note that our colleague in this place, the Hon. Mr Brokenshire, has suggested that there be reviews of the NRM Act and the Native Vegetation Act, and that certainly was contained in the Liberal Party policy and we would wholeheartedly support those reviews and urge the government to get on with it posthaste.

We are also awaiting the reintroduction of the third-party access bill, which is quite critical to providing third-party providers with access to our water assets and being able to provide those at more competitive prices. The bill, which was tabled very late in the piece, did not allow for debate of

it prior to the election and was described to me by people who work within that industry as not worth the paper it was written on. ESCOSA was particularly critical of that bill. We will be waiting with interest to see whether or not this government reintroduces it quickly; that is something that I think is quite critical and should be one of their important commitments.

Just going back to the issue of jobs, we have had net interstate migration within this state of some 33,000. Most of those people, Graeme Hugo will tell you, are of working age. They are younger people and they keep leaving the state in large numbers because the opportunities just are not here, so we certainly need a jobs strategy here.

We need a proper focus on the regions. I am concerned about the committee that has been set up under this current government because I think that it is probably a way of trying to squeeze out the voice of our regional development minister, the Hon. Geoff Brock. We are certainly keen to provide him with as much information as possible from our regional members about the issues that are happening in South Australia.

We have established our own regional affairs committee of the Liberal Party which will be looking at a number of those issues as well. Certainly, we have a very strong history of representing the regions. We have a number of primary producers who have entered the parliament and, certainly, in my roles of having responsibility for the environment, water and the River Murray, they regularly raise those issues. They raise issues to do with natural resource management, native vegetation and marine parks.

I think there has been a very strong disconnect under this government. Decisions which are made in Adelaide, particularly in relation to water allocation plans and the marine parks, are felt very severely by our regional cousins. There are a lot of opportunities to expand production in regional South Australia, but those are hampered by very centralised departments which are not good at listening and taking those issues on board. I think that some of the current policies of this government are going to lead to job losses, loss of production and loss of export income for this state.

In relation to the election policies, I could go through them in great detail, but from our point of view on the Liberal side, we had a very strong emphasis on biodiversity and enhancing the current legislation in seeking to link the areas of natural resource management, native vegetation and national parks and wildlife together because a lot of biodiversity exists on private land as well as in national parks. We think that they should be managed in a much more joined up, cohesive manner, so I was disappointed that the Labor policies did not address any of that. There was a commitment to an international bird sanctuary at the old salt fields, which is to be commended, but, as far as other areas go, there was very, very little.

This government has not been keen to establish trigger points for the use of the desalination plant which is, of course, going to have an impact on our Riverland food and fibre growers. We were also very keen, if we were to be elected, to look at the engineering works, in conjunction with the federal government, which would assist to droughtproof the Murray.

We hear all the time from Labor members in this place that they save the Murray, but that is just such a load of rubbish. This government has played a disgraceful game of politics with the River Murray. When we had the drought and the money was on the table from the Howard Liberal government, in those days, Mike Rann refused to sign up to that agreement. He played a disgraceful game of politics. We have since had the signing of the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement with all the states. This government was quite slow to sign up, and it has now halved its contribution to the Murray-Darling Basin Association. I suspect that was based on its own internal polling which showed that, since the breaking of the drought, the issue of the Murray River environment had slipped off the list of priorities in the South Australian public's mind. So it has really just allowed that to slip.

One of the areas I think it should be commended on is its adoption of Nature Play, which is about reconnecting children, particularly with the natural environment. As we hear and read about regularly, kids are spending far too much time these days in front of screens and not getting out and about exploring their world. However, I do note that is also in contravention of its approach to the remaining life tenure shacks. If you talk to people who spend time in shacks over Christmas, it is a very important way of connecting kids with beaches or rivers, and gaining a love and understanding of the natural world around them. So I think there are a lot of contradictions that come from this government, and we will be holding them to account—as we should, as Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

In closing, I would like to thank the people of South Australia for re-electing my two colleagues the Hon. Rob Lucas and the Hon. John Dawkins, as well as myself, and also a new member, the Hon. Andrew McLachlan. I do note, following on from the Hon. Kelly Vincent's speech, that she referred to the lack of female representation. Unfortunately I was the only woman elected into the Legislative Council out of the 11 candidates on this cycle. Women's representation is something about which I am very passionate. I think we often find that women deselect themselves from the process because they see the argy-bargy and, particularly if they have young children, are not keen to enter the fray.

I would have to say that the treatment of the Liberal candidate for Elder, Ms Carolyn Habib, was one of the most disgraceful lows in the campaign, and this contributes to women not wanting to stand for parliament. They see that sort of behaviour and say, 'That's not for me; I do not want to expose myself or my family to that level of gutter politics.' So while this Labor Party is in government it should reflect upon itself. If the minister is ever to raise any issues about women in the Liberal Party, as long as that stain remains she does not have a leg to stand on.

I note that the people of South Australia overwhelmingly wanted a Liberal government, but did not get one because of the system we have. I think we have to examine our systems and have some fairly rigorous debates in here about what is the best and fairest outcome. There are a lot of angry people in South Australia who were very hopeful there would be a change. If nothing else, the people of Australia and the people of South Australia think that every couple of elections you ought to give the other mob a go; that is the general attitude. Sadly, that was not the outcome.

Those who occupy the Treasury bench have a duty to do a good job, to come up with a fresh agenda and stop squabbling over positions. That is letting down the people of South Australia, who in their majority did not vote for them in any case. With those remarks I endorse the Address in Reply.

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

Bills

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

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 May 2014.)

The Hon. S.G. WADE (16:19): On Thursday 8 May, the Administration and Probate (Removal of Requirement for Surety) Amendment Bill 2014 was introduced in this place. The bill amends the Administration and Probate Act 1919 to implement the first set of reforms from the recommendations of the South Australian Law Reform Institute by removing from the act the requirement for and references to sureties guarantees. The law requiring a form of security against maladministration in South Australia was first enacted in 1919 to require every applicant to provide an administration bond. The act was amended in 2003 to remove the requirement for the administration bond with a requirement for a guarantee, and also to allow the Supreme Court to dispense with the requirement for a surety guarantee where it was satisfied that it was beneficial and expedient to do so, and require a further or additional guarantee or a reduction in the amount guaranteed.

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. One area of reform identified was South Australia's statutory requirement for sureties guarantees to be provided before some intestate estates can be administered and whether that should be retained or modified. Submissions on an issues paper released by the institute in 2013 overwhelmingly supported the removal of this redundant requirement, and the institute I think provides a helpful summary of the issues it saw with the current law in its final report.

I will provide a brief overview of those reasons by way of short quotes. One of the problems that the institute found was that it was not fair in the sense that there was no such remedy when the deceased leaves a valid will. The law has never required executors to provide surety guarantees or bonds. Another concern with the requirement for surety guarantee is the guarantee is made by

private individual, usually a family member or friend of the family without cover by a bank or insurance company because financial institutions are no longer willing to shoulder the risk of default.

Thirdly, people who stand as sureties may not always understand that their guarantee will be strictly enforced whatever hardship that might cause them, and that they cannot recover the money paid out from the guarantee. Fourthly, there was criticism that the requirement is unnecessary because there is no evidence in South Australia that anyone has suffered loss from an administrator acting wrongly or that anyone has enforced a sureties guarantee.

Within the final report the institute recommended that in the interests of effective administration of deceased estates this reform should be implemented expeditiously and that it should not wait upon the preparation of other amendments for reform which are more complex and will need careful consideration. The opposition was advised by the government that the government intends to undertake consultation on the remaining recommendations of the report before progressing to legislation. I indicate that the opposition not only supports the bill before us but looks forward to further consideration of the recommendations of the institute's report, and I thank the institute for its work.

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) (16:23): I understand that there are no further second reading contributions to this bill. It is a fairly straightforward bill and other honourable members have indicated their support for it. I thank the opposition for its second reading contribution and its support for this bill. The bill is quite straightforward. It repeals certain sections of the act and amends some other sections of the act, removing from the act the requirement for, and reference to, securities guarantees.

The South Australian Law Reform Institute was asked to identify areas of succession law that needed review and reform. They identified a number of areas and this was one area. Basically they saw this requirement for surety guarantees to be provided before some interstate estates could be administered. They saw that as being obstructive. With those words, I recommend the bill to you and look forward to the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

Third 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) (16:26): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (16:27): I rise to support this motion and indicate my thanks for the speech with which the Governor opened this parliament. I continue to appreciate the work that the Governor and Mrs Scarce do right around this state. I acknowledge the fact that only recently has he once again been up to an Operation Flinders exercise at Yankaninna and has gone out walking with the young people and slept out with them. I commend him highly for doing that. I have been to Operation Flinders on many occasions and supported them greatly as an ambassador but walking with the kids is not something that I have done. I have done many other activities with the young people up there but I commend the Governor for his capacity and ability to do that.

First, I should offer my congratulations to you, sir, in occupying the position you now hold. I am also pleased to acknowledge the efforts of the previous president, the Hon. Mr John Gazzola. I was always pleased to work with him in his role as president and previously as whip.

I add my welcome to this place to our new members of the Legislative Council: my own colleague, the Hon. Andrew McLachlan, and of course the new whip, the Hon. Tung Ngo, who becomes the fifth Government Whip with whom I have worked. I am enjoying working with Tung. Of those five, he is the second brand-new member of the Legislative Council in a row that I have dealt with, and so far so good. Well done, and I look forward to working with Tung more in the future.

I would particularly like to welcome the new Liberal members in the lower house. Like my colleague the Hon. Michelle Lensink, I had the pleasure of listening to the great majority of the maiden speech this morning by the new member for Mount Gambier, Troy Bell. I had a little bit to do with his campaign and I am very pleased that he is here.

I also welcome the new member for Schubert, Stephan Knoll; the new member for Bright, David Speirs; the new member for Hartley, Vincent Tarzia; and the new member for Mitchell, Corey Wingard. I am pleased to say that for the first time in my parliamentary career, I have Liberal colleagues as the members for Mount Gambier and Mitchell.

Before going on to some of the greater detail in the Governor's speech, I want to refer to one of the former members of parliament who was referred to in that speech. That was the death in November 2013 of Mr Ivon Alfred Wardle, who served as the member for Murray from 1968 to 1977. I am sorry that this council did not get the opportunity to make a condolence motion on Mr Wardle. I think it is a pity that, in recent times, there have been some members of the House of Assembly who have passed away and we have not been given the opportunity to do a condolence motion, so I would like to make some brief remarks about Mr Wardle's service not only to the parliament but to South Australia in this debate.

Mr Wardle was born on 23 March 1919 at Burra. When he was about eight years old, his family moved to Wynarka in the Mallee and they were on a farm there. In the late 1930s, as a young man of only 18, Ivon Wardle felt called to give his life to the ministry of the Methodist Church and he attended theological college. As a relatively young man, he went out ministering in the parishes of Peebinga, Woodville, Wudinna and Mount Gambier during the years 1939 to 1941. He then enlisted in the RAAF and served in Australia and Papua New Guinea with the No. 75 Kittyhawk squadron.

He married Dorothy Briggs in 1941 while ministering at Mount Gambier. After his war service, he was recalled by the Methodist Church and posted to Kulpara. He served as a minister for some time but retired early from that vocation because of the ill-health of his wife. However, in that retirement, he then helped a Pinnaroo farmer in the development of 2,000 acres of scrubland at Coonalpyn. I know that ministers of religion work hard, and I am sure the Hon. Mr Lucas would agree with me, but how the work of clearing 2,000 acres of scrubland was easier work to assist his wife than being a Methodist minister, I am not sure.

Following on from that period, Ivon Wardle actually moved into local government. He became the District Clerk and overseer of works at the District Council of Meningie and in later years he went on to become Deputy Town Clerk at Murray Bridge. He also became extraordinarily involved in the community in Murray Bridge.

In 1968 Ivon was elected to the Parliament of South Australia as the Liberal and Country League member for Murray. He had a very large swing and won the seat from the ALP, allowing Steele Hall to form government. He served on a number of committees in his time in the parliament, and I was interested to note that he was actually granted a three-month scholarship in 1974 to visit 20 countries to study new cities in the anticipation of the creation of a new city, Monarto, in the Murray electorate. Those of us with a strong political history will remember that proposed new city which I think initially was actually called Murray before they decided to use the word Monarto. Unfortunately, of course, it never came to fruition.

Ivon Wardle served four parliamentary terms until the electorate was divided four ways in the redistribution of 1977. While he still wanted to run for the seat of Murray, basically the seat was largely dominated by more of the Hills area of the state rather than the Murraylands section. This, of course, coincided with the time of the amalgamation of the Liberal and Country League with the Liberal Movement.

I was familiar with a similar situation closer to my home where more than one seat had been amalgamated and there was a member from each of the Liberal Movement and the LCL who wanted to run in that area, and so the one that did not win the preselection was allowed to run as an

unendorsed Liberal rather than as an Independent, as described by the Speaker in the lower house. I think it is important to know that Mr Wardle ran as an unendorsed Liberal and not an Independent.

Mr David Wotton, the endorsed Liberal, did win that seat and so Ivon Wardle left parliament, and he actually moved into another phase of his interesting life. After politics, he became the assistant administrator for Resthaven Homes and continued as chairman of the Resthaven board after retiring in 1981. He returned to fill a two-year vacancy at Resthaven and retired for a second time 8½ years later. He was awarded the Medal of the Order of Australia in 1995 for service to parliament, the community, the Uniting Church and aged care.

After the death of his wife Dorothy in 1998, he later married a long-time acquaintance, Fay Bailey of Mount Gambier, in 2004. On behalf of Liberal members, I would like to put on record in this debate not only our sympathy but also our recognition of the work of Ivon Wardle in this parliament and also in a range of other vocations and, as members would have heard, in a range of locations around this state.

I was very pleased that in the Governor's speech there was quite a significant reference to mental health, but particularly to suicide. As you, Mr President, and members well know, suicide prevention is a passion of mine and a portfolio responsibility that I hold. The Governor did say that the rate of suicide in South Australia is unacceptable, and in rural areas the rates are significantly worse than those of metropolitan areas. He goes on to express how disturbing it is to consider the amount of depression, anxiety and other mental illnesses that exists in what I suppose we would normally describe as prosperous, safe communities. The reference in that sentence is specifically referring to young people. I am the first to recognise that there is a significant amount of suicide happening in rural areas and to young people, but as I have said recently it is right across society. I think for us to put it just into rural areas and young people, or older men, as is quite often said, is dangerous. We need to treat this as an all of society issue.

The Governor mentioned the work of the newly flagged Mental Health Commission. I am very hopeful that that commission will work with and assist the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist, which is doing very good work with minimal resources to roll out the government suicide prevention strategy. I think what we need to do is to do more to help a vast array of groups that are out there, largely with little or no funding. I thought it might be helpful to go through a number of the groups that are working either in the area of suicide prevention or with people who are affected by a suicide or an attempted suicide.

The danger of going through and listing some of these groups is that you miss some out. There is a vast number, and I am going to list some of them now. It started off in a geographical sense in the former home town of the Hon. Mr Lucas and went north. I had quite a bit to do with the terrific people at Lifeline South East, who have had a very strong role in the development of the Mount Gambier Suicide Prevention Network, and I commend the Limestone Coast LSA of SAPOL for its strong involvement in that work in the South-East.

I note that Lifeline South East has also been involved in the development of the Naracoorte mental health round table. I met with the mayor of Naracoorte Lucindale last week. There will be a suicide prevention forum in Naracoorte on 12 August, and I will be in attendance at that forum. I was pleased to be involved in the launch of the Murray Bridge Suicide Prevention Network last year. The ongoing work of that group is exceptional, and certainly the Rural City of Murray Bridge is to be commended for its support.

Also at Murray Bridge is a group called Silent Ripples, which specifically deals with the families of people bereaved by suicide, and along with the Rural City of Murray Bridge developed the marvellous memorial garden overlooking the old original bridge over the Murray, where people who have been bereaved by suicide can go to remember those they have lost in this manner.

Last Wednesday evening I was privileged to go to the launch of the Sedan suicide prevention awareness program, held in the small Murraylands town of Sedan, with sponsorship from the Mannum men's watch group, two local ministers and also the Mid Murray Council. One of the groups that presented at that program was the organisation called Ski for Life, which raises money for men's mental health and suicide prevention with an annual skiing event going from Renmark down to, I think, first Murray Bridge, but the second time I think they went as far as Wellington. I have also been heavily involved with the Strathalbyn and Community Suicide Prevention Network, which started off

with assistance from Wesley LifeForce in Sydney. Since then they have developed their own leadership and have been doing some terrific work in that community.

The Community Response to Eliminating Suicide (CORES) group is one I have mentioned in this place many times, and I am proud to say that I have had a lot to do with the establishment of those programs on Eyre Peninsula and in the Riverland. The Riverland chapter is extraordinarily active still. I was only reading something recently about a further suicide prevention program, which will be held in Loxton shortly by that group.

In Port Augusta I have been privileged to work with the Suicide Intervention Life Preservation Action Group (SILPAG), and I know the member for Stuart has given them great support in that community, which is particularly important because of the large Aboriginal population there. We know, unfortunately, that the suicide prevalence in that community is far higher than in the rest of society.

In my own home town I have been pleased to be involved in the launch of the Gawler Suicide Prevention Community Group and continue to attend those monthly meetings as often as I can. A lot of those networks and community groups that have been set up through the work of the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist. Initially they put in a lot of effort developing their own action plan that suits the community they serve. Another that has just been developed is the City of Playford Suicide Prevention Community Network, and that city council has a very strong track record of working in this area, going back a number of years ago when I attended a forum run jointly with Rotary in that city, when 300 people were in attendance.

Also in the northern suburbs we have the Northern Suicide Bereavement Support Group, which does important work. I have also been privileged to speak to a number of groups that are not specifically designed around suicide prevention but are very keen to tap into anybody providing assistance in that area. One of those groups is the Northern Carers Network. I have also been pleased to visit Neami National at Elizabeth and see the work that that organisation is doing with mental health clients, many of whom have come out of facilities such as Glenside, and they are very involved in getting those people back into the community, into employment and into voluntary work as well.

Just going through a number of other groups: the Mental Health Activity and Resource Centre and the One Voice Network. Another I have had an enormous amount of involvement with is Minimisation of Suicide Harm (MOSH), an organisation started by a wonderful lady, Jill Chapman, who lost her son to suicide, and her response has been to do everything she can to make sure any people who suffer a loss from suicide do not have to go through as much of the anguish as she did without support. MOSH is a terrific organisation.

Anglicare is very involved in this space. I think a number of people have heard of the Living Beyond Suicide program. They have also recently launched A Cry for Help, and I went to the launch of that in St Peter's Cathedral recently. A Cry for Help is about helping the people who have attempted suicide and been unsuccessful and, of course, their families, as they all grapple with the results of that.

Obviously, Uniting Communities play a particular role in the area, particularly through Lifeline Adelaide but in other ways as well. I think Lifeline is one of those groups that comes to mind when people are thinking about those who need urgent assistance with mental health or if they are thinking of taking their own life.

Of course, I have supported the Salvation Army Red Shield Appeal for many years, but their work in suicide prevention is probably not as well known even though they have been in the space for over 100 years. Their Hope for Life—Lifekeeper Memory Quilt is a very good reminder of the unfortunate loss that we suffer in this state, and particularly brought home to me a couple of years ago the number of families who have lost more than one member to suicide.

I have also had some involvement with the Mental Illness Fellowship South Australia. I was a speaker at the group Grandparents for Grandchildren. They were very interested to learn about, I suppose, the greater readiness within the community to talk about these issues. Only today, I have had a call from someone I met at that group about assisting someone who they think is under great threat.

The emphasis on young people in the mental health area, and particularly those at risk of suiciding, is often related back to the services that are available in an online fashion. There are three in particular, that are based in South Australia, that I have been involved with. One is In 2 Life. The others are TalkLife and ReachOut.com.

The first two are sort of in a Facebook style, I think, where they allow people to have a conversation with some trained people at the other end about their issues and have that conversation in a way that suits the young people of the day. Many of us in this place would probably prefer face-to-face conversation, but that is the way it is done with a lot of the younger generation. ReachOut.com is another one that has been around for quite a while now and is well regarded.

There are many other organisations that I could mention, but I just thought it was worth putting on the record that those organisations and many others largely operate without any government assistance. There are some that get some small government assistance, but the great majority of them operate on volunteers and on local fundraising, and I think we need to turn our eye towards providing more assistance for those groups. I say that because I have also organised forums on suicide prevention in the electorates of Giles, Florey, Newland, Little Para, Taylor, Napier, Hartley, Fisher, Mitchell and Light, and I think there is great potential for many more of these to be held and for the follow-up to happen.

So I say to the government—and I know I have moved a motion in this house which emphasises some of this as well—that I think it is very important that the terrific work that has been done by the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist be added to, because there is only one person trying to roll-out the government strategy across the whole of South Australia at the moment. That lady, Lynne James, is doing a wonderful job, but we need to provide some help.

In conclusion, there was one other reference in the Governor's speech that I wanted to note. The Governor referred to the fact that regional South Australia accounts for about 20 per cent of the state's population but contributes more than half of South Australia's overseas exports. That is a very accurate reflection of South Australia, and I will always be proud of what regional South Australia does in terms of exports and economic activity. However, I think it is about time that we became realistic about trying to make sure that the population of regional South Australia grows and becomes more than 20 per cent.

I suppose that for many years I have railed against the ongoing development of South Australia as a city state. I drive around this state a lot and I see some terrific communities that have, in some cases, ageing infrastructure but, in many cases, excellent infrastructure upon which population growth could be based. It is something we need to think about, because most of the other states have a quite large number of significant urban centres outside the metropolitan area. In South Australia we have Mount Gambier and Whyalla as cities of over 20,000, and then we have a number of regional centres of between 10,000 and 20,000. We have no significant centres above perhaps that 25,000 figure; however, there are many other medium to small centres that I think we need to focus on, and we have the ability to do that.

I hope that the government, with its renewed focus on the regions as part of its agreement with the member for Frome, will have a serious look at the development of our population in addition to the growth of Adelaide; that we get growth back out into the regions so that we can make the population in our regions more than one-fifth of the total population. With those words I commend the motion on the Address in Reply to the house.

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA (16:58): I also rise to support the motion, and thank Lewis O'Brien for his welcome. I also thank the Governor for his speech of 6 May on the opening of the parliament. Having read his speech, I too wish to note the passing of a former governor and seven former members of parliament.

I also note, from the Governor's speech, that the government will reform the existing WorkCover scheme so that it works effectively for both workers and employers and 'will also protect and enhance the wellbeing of the most seriously injured at work and will hold a clearer focus on recovery, retraining and return to work for those less seriously injured'. Changes to WorkCover will be subject to scrutiny and debate in this place in the not too distant future. I also note in the Governor's speech that:

To govern effectively in a democracy, it is vital that people are confident that decisions are made for the right reasons.

We must therefore act to ensure that political donations are modest, transparent and offer no guarantee of influence on matters of public policy. My government will act so that any perception of impropriety is not hidden in the shadows—and we will deal decisively with those who have sought to benefit personally from corrupt practices. To strengthen our democracy, all political parties must act to ensure that their internal processes are transparent and democratic.

I note in a current survey of ALP members:

One of the main points to take out of the 2014 Vision for Australia Survey of Labor supporters is the importance of substantial engagement with supporters on the issues of policy and representation. Supporters frequently highlighted their desire to engage with Labor in terms of policy discussion, and choosing their elected representatives.

I also wish to acknowledge the contribution of former members of this place: the Hon. Ann Bressington, the Hon. Mr Sneath, and the Hon. Carmel Zollo. I wish to congratulate and welcome the Hon. Andrew McLachlan and the Hon. Tung Ngo on their election to this place. I also wish to congratulate the Hon. Mr Maher on his re-election to this place against all predictions that Labor would not hold a fourth spot. The Hon. Mr Maher came to this place because the then president (the Hon. Mr Sneath) retired, creating a casual vacancy. In his first speech in this place, the Hon. Mr Maher said about me, and I quote:

Firstly, I would like to congratulate you, Mr President, on your recent elevation to the role, replacing the Hon. Bob Sneath in the chair; you have big shoes to fill—literally, as I think his are about five sizes bigger than yours. But, having known you for many years, your fairness, good humour, and virtually unlimited patience will see you preside over this chamber with distinction and wisdom per se.

About six months prior to the election a very dejected Hon. Mr Maher had all but given up hope. Now the Hon. Mr Maher is a parliamentary secretary on his way to a ministry. As a member of the left faction, the Hon. Mr Maher will have to be quite creative in how and with whose support he becomes a minister. I reject the Hon. Rob Lucas' assertion that there has been a major falling out between the honourable member and me. The Hon. Mr Maher is the future and a member of new Labor, whereas I am old Labor which valued loyalty and collectivism.

Almost to the date I have been a member of the Legislative Council for just over 12 years. I have served on many parliamentary standing committees, select committees, acted as whip and, in October 2012, honourable members of the Legislative Council appointed me president. So, in just over 12 years, I started on the back bench as a part of a minority Labor government and now, again, I find myself on the back bench in a minority Labor government.

On 29 April this year, I decided to stand down as the president of the Legislative Council effective close of business 5 May. I did not wish to undermine the stability of the minority Jay Weatherill government. In standing down as president, I acknowledged the pressure that the member for Frome, minister Geoff Brock, was under following the election to form a minority government and I respect his decision to provide stability for South Australia. I also wish to acknowledge the member for Fisher, Dr Bob Such, for his kind words and support and understanding of the situation I was placed in. I, too, wish Dr Such all the best for the future and look forward to his return to parliament.

I read in the media that to replace me as the president was part of a complex factional deal. I am still awaiting some explanation about why I had to stand down other than the right's dominant numbers within the party. Neither I, nor members of the left faction have had any explanation or consultation about this alleged complex factional deal. This is of some concern to members of the faction and many members of the ALP as they wait to see the details of the deal with the right and how it may impact on MPs' careers and possible future preselections.

In my situation there was no consultation, no discussion, no negotiation and no ham and pineapple pizza. I did enjoy my short time as the president and standing up for the independence and sovereignty of the Legislative Council. I was certainly humbled by the support from honourable members present and past of all sides of politics, both publicly and privately, over the last six weeks. I wish to seek leave to table a copy of my letter of resignation to the Clerk dated 5 May 2014.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M. GAZZOLA: In that letter I thank the Clerk and her staff for their support and professionalism in the way that they assist members to maintain the dignity, integrity, protocols and

practices of the Legislative Council. I wish to contrast that against the actions and advice of the Clerk in the other place.

Much will be said over the next 12 months about the 15 March 2014 election. Indeed, there is a motion to form a select committee which will examine the conduct of the election. The opposition will make the claims of being robbed once again and suffering from a dirty tricks campaign. I especially wish to pay tribute to the Hon. Steph Key, member for Ashford, and her campaign team and volunteers who defied all predictions and the odds on a stunning victory. My local member, the Hon. Paul Caica, member for Colton, ran an impressive and hard-fought campaign and won. Had it not been for these two—to state the obvious—we would not have formed a minority government.

I wish to thank the rank and file ALP members for their support and acknowledge the hard work in securing an election result that has defied all the predictions. I have been a member of the Labor Party for the last 28 years and I am excited to hear of the reform and modernisation of the party. I could not be a part of the reform if I maintained the president's position in the Legislative Council which would have led to my expulsion from the party.

Sir, normally I would congratulate you on becoming the President of the Legislative Council. Given the circumstances and by the mere fact that you became the President through a secret factional deal it is difficult for me to wish you well in your role. I have been asked by members to assist you and advise you in your new role. The only advice I will be offering you in public is that you stand up for the independence and sovereignty of the Legislative Council.

I also look forward to your response in this place to the Hon. David Ridgway's allegations, raised in his speech of 2011, and to assist you in your response I also ask that you research the speech made by the Hon. Angus Redford in July 1995 on your activities in your role as a union official where he stated:

In particular, I draw members' attention to the fact that Mr Dan Moriarty and Mr Russell Wortley, on every occasion that their duty to their own self interest and their duty to anybody else for whom they are expected and trusted to act conflicted, have erred on the side of self-interest.

Sir, I have known you for many years and whilst I may not completely agree with the Hon. Mr Redford's and the Hon. Ridgway's assertions, over time I have formed my own view that you are a parasite and an embarrassment to the labour movement. The final advice, given your record as a minister, would be that you should resign as President of the Legislative Council.

Finally, let there be no doubt that the Jay Weatherill minority government is united in that the right's dominance over policy and positions and a substantially weakened, almost to the point of irrelevant progressive left, gives the right almost free rein over the government's agenda. I commend the motion to you.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:07): I rise to support the adoption of the Address in Reply given by His Excellency the Governor to open the First Session of the Fifty-Third Parliament on 6 May 2014. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate His Excellency and express my gratitude to the Governor and Mrs Scarce on their upcoming seventh year of commitment to the South Australian community. I see them regularly at many functions and community events. They have conducted an outstanding service and demonstrate a high level of respect and courtesy to the people of this state.

I am delighted to also welcome two new members to this chamber. Congratulations to the Hon. Andrew McLachlan, who is a great addition to the Liberal team, and I also welcome the Hon. Tung Ngo MLC who has already been elevated to become Government Whip. Congratulations to both of you on your successful election. In addition, I would also like to acknowledge all my colleagues who were re-elected to this chamber, especially the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Rob Lucas and the Hon. John Dawkins. I offer my congratulations to Russell Wortley as the new President. I particularly want to express my gratitude and thanks to the Hon. John Gazzola for his excellent leadership as the former president of this chamber.

We all worked extremely hard leading up to the state election of 15 March 2014. The Liberal Party had some exceptional candidates and I thank all of them for their commitment to the campaign and their strong interest in serving the people of South Australia. Some other honourable members have already mentioned the use of dirty tricks in the campaign and I just want to quickly mention my endorsement for Caroline Habib because I feel that her campaign was definitely undermined by racist

tactics, and I do not believe that any form of racism should be tolerated by the parliament or by the people of South Australia.

The Hon. T.A. Franks: Or bigotry. It is not racism, necessarily; I think it is bigotry.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Well, to endorse that one, too, the Hon. Tammy Franks. While the election did not deliver the results we expected, I am incredibly proud of the overwhelming support of the whole electorate. I am delighted to welcome the following Liberal members in the House of Assembly. They are Mr David Speirs (member for Bright), Mr Vincent Tarzia (member for Hartley), Mr Corey Wingard (member for Mitchell), Mr Troy Bell (member for Mount Gambier) and Mr Stephan Knoll (member for Schubert) who took over the reins from the ever-so-colourful retired member, Mr Ivan Venning. These wonderful new members all come from different backgrounds with a wealth of experience. They will be excellent representatives for their electorates and I am confident that they will be great contributors to parliament and our state.

The opening of parliament was an important ceremonial event. As we know, the office of the Governor is non-political and is quite distinct from that of the head of the elected government. Especially, the Governor's role is to safeguard the South Australian constitution by securing the orderly transition from one government to the next and facilitating the work of the parliament and the work of the state.

The Governor, in his opening speech, outlined the government's agenda by reading a document carefully prepared in advance by the Premier and the Weatherill Labor government. My comments in replying to the Governor's address are not a reflection on the Governor but an assessment of the government. I congratulate the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Steven Marshall, in the other place on his most insightful Address in Reply speech.

I agree with the state Liberal leader that we were keen to get back to parliament after the March election. We were ready to listen to the Governor's speech with the hope of a bold vision to be outlined by the Labor government. Unfortunately, the government's agenda contained much of the same as was delivered at the last session of the 52nd parliament. It repeated the seven Labor priorities again with not much on offer to the people of South Australia.

After 12 years of Labor, the state is now set for another four years of a tired and deeply divided government with no new ideas and no bold vision to fix the economy, to create jobs or to address important issues faced by our community. The Governor said:

My government has started to build a stronger South Australia. The physical changes evident in our city of Adelaide have inspired a fresh sense of optimism.

A fresh sense of optimism, Mr President, really? No doubt we can see many physical changes happening in the city. The question is: who helped Premier Weatherill to build the city and deliver these projects. You would think that the person will be rewarded by doing a great job. Guess what? What a shock to us all! The Premier's way of showing his appreciation is to put the head of his chief executive Rod Hook on the chopping block.

By giving Mr Hook just 24 hours to pack his things, how on earth did Premier Weatherill inject any sense of optimism for Mr Hook, his department or the South Australian community? In a detailed interview with the *Sunday Mail*, Rod Hook explained Labor's big build agenda re-election campaign that was centred on the transport and infrastructure department's work. Mr Hook said:

I reckon they got re-elected because of so many of the things we did well on including the footy and taking people home (from games). If those things weren't working there might have been a few people who voted another way.

The Governor's speech also outlined that citizens are not convinced that the policy is designed with their best interest in mind. This suggests an urgent need to reform our democracy. Yes, we must definitely address the issues on electoral reform. The South Australian election delivered an unbelievable and unexpected result for South Australia. This is despite 53 per cent of South Australian people voting for the Liberal Party, which is equivalent to approximately 92,000 more people wanting a Liberal government. Political commentators and journalists have reported that there is nowhere else in the country where a 53 per cent two-party preferred vote would not translate into a clear victory.

The Liberal Party has an action plan to put South Australia back on track, but our current electoral system has failed to deliver a new government, even when a majority of people voted for change. Any reasonable person would be questioning whether or not there is something wrong with our electoral system. How can we have an electoral system where South Australians keep voting for the Liberal Party to form government and are not getting the result they want?

South Australia is an amazing state with much to offer, but in comparison with the other mainland states South Australia has the lowest rate of business start-up. Businesses are finding it too difficult to cover the costs of higher taxes to meet the increasing rate take and excess charges under Labor. Australia comprises six states and two territories, which combine to make up the world's sixth largest country by total area. As the shadow parliamentary secretary for small business and trade, I am fully aware that businesspeople are keeping a close watch on how our state is performing compared to the other states and territories.

Most of us would know that each quarter CommSec analyse eight key indicators, including economic growth, retail spending, equipment investment, unemployment, construction work done, population growth, housing finance and dwelling commencements, to find out how each state and territory is performing. The result of CommSec's quarterly State of the States report released in April 2014 was a very sad story for South Australia. Believe it or not, South Australia is ranked not two, three, four or five—it is at number seven. The report has ranked South Australia behind all other mainland states, adding that the outlook remains challenging for the local economy. This further demonstrates why South Australia needs a government with a bold vision.

Confidence is essential for everything. Businesses with confidence will invest and create jobs; people with confidence will spend money and keep the economy going strong. Sadly, under Premier Weatherill and Labor, South Australia is suffering under the worst business conditions and confidence in the nation. Premier Weatherill needs to explain why South Australia is falling behind the rest of the country after 12 years of his Labor government.

Furthermore, the joint Property Council and ANZ Property Industry survey (released also in April 2014) shows that South Australia recorded the largest fall in property industry confidence in the nation. The survey shows that all respondents recorded the worst perception about the South Australian economy in the previous quarter and the worst expectations about the future of the economy over the next 12 months. In a further blow to Premier Weatherill and his Labor government, respondents reported that compared with other states of Australia, the South Australian Labor government was doing the worst job of managing growth. In the opening speech, the Weatherill government mentioned:

Our economy depends heavily on our capacity to retain our brightest minds and attract talented professionals from interstate and overseas. But they need more than a great place to live—they need a great job.

Well, hello—yes, of course people need jobs. Unfortunately, after 12 years of Labor, South Australia is in the midst of a jobs crisis. Unemployment in South Australia has hit its highest level since 2001.

As the shadow parliamentary secretary for multicultural affairs, I know there are multiple reasons why people leave their home countries and migrate to South Australia. Having a financially secure future is one of them. When people can see a clear picture from an economics point of view, people migrate to gain financial stability and better future prospects. But from February to March the unemployment rate jumped almost half a per cent to 7.1 per cent and trails only Tasmania across the country. On some measures, South Australian unemployment even exceeds Tasmania's, threatening to make Adelaide the nation's unemployment capital. It is not something we are proud of.

The Governor's speech stated that the government would reduce red tape, keep business costs as low as possible and improve access to self-help information tools. I certainly hope that they are serious about this. So far, the Labor government has failed to create a regulatory and economic environment that allows new or existing businesses to grow and prosper. Under Labor, businesses are being strangled by red tape. There is far too much government bureaucracy and regulation that serves as cost on business. It has not been easy or cost-effective for the private sector to start new ventures, grow new business or employ more people.

More than ever, South Australia needs a government with vision and bold ideas to improve our economic productivity. Regardless of where you look, the economic report card is horrendous

for the state Labor government. South Australia's economic future is looking bleak. These figures and statements are clear examples of a tired and lazy government. South Australia needs strong economic reform urgently.

I hope the government will implement our regional development policy by working together with the member for Frome. I also hope the government will adopt our expanded focus on trade. During the election, the Premier said that he would adopt the Liberals' trade strategy with a special focus on South-East Asia. Disappointingly, the Premier did not follow through with this strategy, although our policy was very well received by a broad base of stakeholders and business owners.

We want to grow our exports, which is why we established a trade policy that focused on seven identified regions, unlike the government, which has a limited focus on exports. Investing more into our exporting industry will benefit South Australia and our business owners in the long term. We know that if we sell goods and services interstate and overseas we are generating a new income stream and bringing extra money back into our economy.

The Labor Party has luckily formed a minority government with the support of the member for Frome, but with only one seat holding the government in power. Opposition members of parliament have a duty to our voters to play the role of an alternative government. One of the final remarks from the Governor was that the government will govern for all South Australians and restore their sense of financial and physical security, their aspirations and their wellbeing. I hope these aspirations will be honoured and delivered.

I know that the Liberal Party stands ready and will do everything we have in our power to ensure South Australians are protected and given the opportunities they rightly deserve. After 12 years of Labor mismanagement, sadly South Australians will have to suffer another four years under a wasteful, incompetent and divided Labor government. South Australian families and businesses are suffering under the pressure of the nation's highest taxes and highest utility prices, falling business confidence and rising unemployment.

Please allow me to use a Chinese proverb which says, 'Failure is the mother of success'. In simple terms, it means that every failure you experience is a chance to learn and find success. Knowing what does not work is just as important as finding out what does work. The Labor government really needs to have a long hard look at its poor performance. The united Liberal opposition will put the Labor government under the microscope. We will continue to expose failures and mismanagement under the Labor government. With those remarks, I commend the motion to the chamber and look forward to serving the South Australian community.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. R.I. Lucas.

At 17:24 the council adjourned until Wednesday 21 May 2014 at 14:15.