

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 7 May 2014

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Elder, I remind the house that this is the honourable member's maiden speech and I ask members to accord her the customary courtesies. The member for Elder.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:02): I move:

That the following Address in Reply to His Excellency's to opening speech be adopted:

May it please Your Excellency—

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

It gives me great pleasure to move the motion for the Address in Reply. I congratulate His Excellency on his speech and am grateful for his words, which will guide our deliberations in this parliament.

Firstly, I acknowledge and pay tribute to the spirit, history and courage of the Kaurna people, on whose land we meet today. Mr Speaker, I congratulate you on your reappointment to such an important and high office. I look forward to your guidance on all matters parliamentary, and I know that you will defend the privileges and standing orders of this house.

I also congratulate all newly elected members and re-elected members to this 53rd parliament. At this time, may our thoughts and prayers be with the Hon. Dr Bob Such and his family. It was certainly wonderful to see him here yesterday.

It is with both privilege and humility that I speak in this place today. Thank you to all my supporters who have come to witness my speech. To the electors of Elder, thank you. To those who voted for me and supported me, I am very grateful, and to those who did not, I hope that in time you will be heartened by my commitment and presence as your local member. To maintain the electorate of Elder as a Labor seat is indeed a victory. I am proud to continue to fly the flag for the party.

To the former member, Hon. Patrick Conlon, a man of quick wit and sharp mind, I am appreciative of your tireless work and excellence that you performed for this state as local member and minister. I wish you, your wife Tania and your two daughters well in the next chapter of your journey together, for a life hopefully less frantic, less public, and one of precious family time together.

I congratulate the Premier on his re-election to high office, and commend him on his resilience and courage, fortitude and conviction in fighting a fight that many had us lose before we had even begun. Premier, your commitment to the campaign and the outcome was exemplary.

I am grateful for the commitment and faith the Labor Party has bestowed upon me over the years. It is indeed a humbling experience to be supported by and believed in by so many to represent the oldest political party in Australia: a party built on the platform of fairness and a fair go for all Australians, no matter what a person's circumstances; a party that stands firm on the belief we all deserve opportunities in life to be our best. This is motivation enough to work hard for.

Some may deliberately set sail on a planned course to become a member of parliament and seek to attain this privileged post, but for me it was an aspiration that was planted as an idea many years ago. The idea began to form thanks to three people: namely, senator Don Farrell, Nimfa Farrell, and minister Tom Koutsantonis.

Many years elapsed before I committed to accept the challenge, as I saw my daughters through their formative years. To me, this was important, particularly as my eldest daughter was born requiring the constant monitoring and intervention of the world-renowned Adelaide-based Australian Craniofacial Unit, with Professor David David and Dr Michael Nugent. Her journey has shaped not just who she is but also who her two sisters are, and the values they all live by and the pathways they follow today. I am proud of them all, and of their achievements thus far.

In addition to these three people who have supported me on many occasions throughout this campaign, I would also like to thank John and Davina Quirke, Sevi Lividitis, Peter Malinauskas, Reggie Martin, Sonia Romeo, Josh Peak, Amelia Peacock, Nina McEwen, Trian Gonis, Ben Dineen, Ben Rillo, Guy Wilcock, Peter Geytenbeek, Tim Cahalan, Andrew Anson, Tony and Lyn Brooks, Marg Seager and other members of the Elder sub-branch and of course, campaign manager on more than one occasion, Tim Picton. I owe Tim, and probably his family—and brother Chris, here with us today—much gratitude as he worked tirelessly to ensure I was elected. He is representative of so many of our young Labor members; he is energetic, enthusiastic, intelligent, sharp, highly skilled and politically savvy.

There were also so many others who helped along the journey. While I may have been the brand for the seat of Elder, I was nothing without all and everyone who helped and supported me throughout the entire process. I would also like to thank Father Bob Wilkinson and Father James McEvoy for their spiritual guidance.

Core to all of this is my wonderful family, who are constant with their never-ending support. To my husband Greg and my daughters Amelia, Georgina and Emma, you are remarkable, and so inspirational and unconditional, no matter what the highs and lows of this journey. I never once felt I was alone as you were always there with me along the path, every step of the way. To my parents-in-law, Peter and Helen, thank you also for all you did. Without Peter, the A-frames and T-frames would never have come into being.

I grew up in the Mid-North of South Australia on a wheat and sheep farm, just north of a small place called Appila. This experience has given me my fundamental respect of land, nature, and value of community. If you were to visit Appila today, sadly you would pass through, as now not even the hotel is open. It is not so dissimilar to many rural towns that flourished in the early 1900s. In its heyday, it was a bustling hub for sheep shales, trotting race meets, the many local sporting and community clubs like CWA, and in its time, the Great Northern Athletic and Cycling Club meet.

My father and mother were hard-working farmers and graziers who only wanted the best for my siblings and me. My dad was a quiet, innovative man who, I think, in a different time, may have chosen to study engineering instead of carrying on the family farm. My mum was a homemaker and community-minded, being involved in many local committees. She was the first female chair of the board of our local hospital in Booleroo Centre. To both my parents I owe many of my tenacious traits and respect of community.

As events in childhood shape our lives, I believe I began to build my value base from these early days, when to see our local GP could mean many long hours' wait, as he may be called away urgently to attend an accident or deliver a baby, when to travel to school meant nearly an hour on the bus with hard seats, bumping over potholed, unsealed main roads, and to learn that water was critical as, living just below Goyder's line, rain was an intermittent event. I realised that although we may not have had the many luxuries of our city cousins, we really knew the true value and strength of community and associated friendships.

My working life began with training at the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, to gain both my registered nurse and midwifery qualifications. I was so excited. I loved nursing. I was independent, and doing what I loved as well as earning a wage. In my first year of training I earned the grand sum of just over \$8,000. I saw first-hand the value of our universal healthcare system, as those who may not have been able to afford the care they needed were treated with equal priority to those who could.

I went on to gain my certificate in child health nursing through what was then known as the Mothers' and Babies' Health Association. I worked in country and metropolitan areas as well as Torrens House, a brilliant facility. I worked with families and their newborn babies, whether they were at risk with health issues or simply just needed help to start with their new life. I helped to ensure that these babies had a great start in life. I realised the importance of these first five years and the value of the one-on-one intervention and support programs.

To work with parents to support them to nurture, interact, protect and care for their babies was some of the best work I did. I realised the possibilities that this type of early intervention offered, so you will understand that I was pleased to be with the Premier not so long ago as he committed \$117 million for improvements at the Flinders Medical Centre, including the much-needed upgrade of the overcrowded neonatal intensive care facilities. This is recognition of the importance of this unit to the people of the south in providing care for premature and sick babies and their families.

I am also pleased with our state government's commitment to the nursing profession with a decision to support the training of more nurse practitioners. This commitment to education and professionalism will further ensure South Australians have access to quality health care. While working as an academic at the University of South Australia with final year midwives, I would have them examine and explore epidemiology and professionalism.

Also studying alongside South Australian students were students from China, Korea, Malaysia and Japan. The sharing of their home country experiences and stories would so often highlight the high quality of our healthcare system here. I also know this to be true, as my short experience in a Lagos maternity hospital in Nigeria many years ago gave me first-hand witness to one of the highest infant mortality rates in the world. Mothers lost babies due to preventable diseases as well as experiencing long walks during their time of labour—it sometimes took days before they got the hospital—and the lack of availability of life-saving drugs and interventions.

We know that there are many demographic groups that experience poorer health outcomes, groups whose circumstances see them experience social and economic disadvantage, disability and isolation. It is with these people's lives in mind that I am very concerned with the intent of the federal coalition government as it looks to attack Medicare with a GP tax and cuts to the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme. One of the architects of Medicare warned recently that such changes could take Australia back 50 years. I learnt the value of Medicare studying a Masters degree and know we must do everything possible to preserve and protect our universal healthcare system.

Now to the electorate of Elder, a district named after 19th-century businessman, philanthropist, pastoralist and politician Thomas Elder. You may also recognise his name as the Elder Conservatorium at the Adelaide University is named after him. Elder is in the south-west of Adelaide between the city and the southern suburbs. While Elder was created as a marginal Labor electorate in 1991, it was initially won by the opposition; however, this only lasted a term as the Hon. Patrick Conlon won and held it for the next 17 years.

The electorate of Elder is dynamic. It has its challenges and its triumphs. The pending closure on the Australian chapter of the car manufacturing industry brings with it challenges from many businesses in my electorate as employers and employees alike will feel the effect. There is nervousness as people become uncertain. As one business owner says, 'It is not just about my business and my income, it is about the people I have employed for so many years. It is about real people with real bills and real families. It is about South Australia and our future.'

With a small business background, I understand the highs and lows of what it can mean to be in business. It was pleasing to hear the Governor refer to a renewed model of how small business and government will work together to further progress our state's economy. As the local member, I will continue my conversations with businesspeople in my area to ensure that we, in Elder, play our part.

With the changes at the old Mitsubishi site, we witness an incredible example of regeneration and transformation as Tonsley emerges, a site supporting advanced manufacturing, innovation, design and engineering of high-value products. The area already demonstrates the bringing together of education and industry. Today, TAFE tertiary students occupy the site alongside industry which is co-locating in a cluster. A chief executive of a business now on location at this site excitedly told me the other day that this was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity as it gives his business a chance to value-add through the infinite sharing of ideas and expertise. Early next year, Flinders University will welcome its first students to its new campus. The refurbished main assembly plant structure of the old car factory will be used to create the town centre with specialty retail outlets and, towards the end of this year, we expect to see the master plan for the development of about 1,000 homes set among sustainable environments.

Early on Monday morning just passed, I caught one of the first trains with local commuters as the highly anticipated Tonsley train line opened, with weekday services to begin. I am hopeful that

later in the year we will see both weekend services as well as the gradual introduction of electric trains to these tracks. Commuters were very pleased to have what they referred to as 'their train' back.

Disappointingly though, we see a federal coalition government with apparent disregard for South Australia as it has cruelly withdrawn funding which would have seen upgrades of stations and the finessing of the park-and-ride facility. Other transport challenges within my electorate are the South Road corridor and the issue of the Oaklands crossing site. The transport vision for Adelaide's inner south, released late last year, makes reference to these issues, and I will continue to champion this plan.

To the many primary schools, the one secondary school, the private schools, the bowling clubs, community clubs, sporting clubs, religious communities and RSL, we are a diverse and enterprising group of people across the entire expanse of this electorate. While demography shows there is a significant Caucasian population, we also have a growing demographic of other nationalities from all over the world. The opportunity our country offers all of us is testimony to our forebears and their foresight.

On this point I would like to pause to congratulate Mr Tung Ngo, my colleague and friend. Tung, this election, has rightfully gained his seat in the Legislative Council. Tung arrived here with his family when he was a young child, as a refugee from Vietnam. Tung, congratulations: you are an inspiration to all of us, especially those whose stories may parallel yours. As an Australian Aboriginal saying goes: 'Traveller, there are no paths—paths are made by walking'. Tung, you are proof of this. I know you will be an amazing member: well done.

We can look with eyes and mindsets and see always what is wrong, and simply complain, or we can see what needs change and set about finding that solution and gathering the imaginations and energy of others. South Australia is a state of many firsts. We had the first police force in Australia, the first tram and the first female vote. We need to build on the vision and force of our past and keep this energy burning to be the first in so many areas to come. Every generation builds on every generation before.

While I believe the mantra of needing good women in pivotal positions in public life still resonates, I observe that we still have a very long way to go. I acknowledge, as a mother of three adult daughters, that it is dear to my heart to see them achieve in their chosen professions, and also to become the self-actualising adults that they and society need them to be.

I agree with Hillary Clinton, who so aptly reflects and says, 'Women have to dare to compete.' To compete we need the support of each other and our male colleagues. I owe much to my many colleagues and mentors, both male and female. My friend, the late Hon. Frank Blevins, was one such person who, in my experience, was active in support of women's attainment.

We must be determined to continue to champion and address the equilibrium of gender in places of leadership, thus ensuring society and the economy receive balanced representation. South Australia has seen women champion many bastions, and we must continue responsibly to live up to their really good work. Commentary on the importance of gender balance on boards is well documented. The private sector cites evidence that indicates that gender balance at board level increases performance through improved governance, decision making and financial returns.

I applaud the position of building a strong South Australia on so many fronts. I am passionate to support the progress of this state and in the building of South Australia. There is so much activity already with the Adelaide Oval, the SAHMRI building and new Royal Adelaide Hospital. With these projects come excitement, anticipation and sense of achievement. As a government we need to be ever vigilant to ensure that South Australia's enthusiasm and progress are not dampened by the pending federal budget.

I do not adhere to the federal coalition government's fabricated budget emergency. Australia has a solid credit rating. With talk of a GP tax, proposed inequities in the minimum wage and a possible shortfall in GST revenue, we find ourselves in less than friendly territory with our federal friends. Economists and commentators agree that Australia is doing well, and that increased taxes and fearful talk could set us back.

I was heartened on the weekend to read about the formation of The Engine Room, a group of optimistic young business people with determination to turn around our state's negative business

views and spread good news stories. Many economists also agree that key to economic growth and the quality of society is the quality of human capital. I support this view. I am passionate about our youngest and most vulnerable members of society, and know from my professional experience that the first five years of life are critical. We must support our child care workers and teachers to be their best, meaning recognition and professional rates.

I am passionate about a well-managed health care system offering universal health care for all. We have a responsibility to support the critical work of our nurses who work at the coalface every day in hospitals and the community. We must continue to care for those who care for us, and I am passionate about our education system that equips our young people for an ever-changing, competitive and exciting world.

Every day, as a member of this parliament, I will remember and act on all that has motivated me to be here. Thank you to everyone who has supported me to get to this point. I will endeavour, as the member for Elder, to represent the people of Elder and my government with enthusiasm and integrity, and in the best interests of South Australians at all times.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (11:26): It is my great pleasure to rise and second the motion. It is always a great occasion when His Excellency comes to the Parliament of South Australia, and it is always a great day when we open a parliament. I know that His Excellency is in the final months of his seven-year term and there will be plenty of occasions on which we can record our grateful thanks to him for his service to our state. However, I will also use this time to put on record again our very grateful thanks on behalf of the Liberal opposition for the way His Excellency has served the people of South Australia for almost seven years now. It is an enormous task and there is an enormous calendar of events each year at which the Governor represents us, the people of South Australia, and he does it with a great sense of style and, of course, a great sense of service, for which we are all very grateful.

One of his tasks, of course, is to attend the opening of parliament. Yesterday, he graced us with his presence and delivered his speech in the Legislative Council. This is a very exciting time. For my part, I even shined my shoes yesterday, because this is the moment when the Governor outlines the agenda of the government for the next session of parliament. We all came in yesterday to hear about this bold vision that the Labor Party has for our state going forward and, ladies and gentlemen, can I say: what a disappointment it was.

The SPEAKER: Leader, I am not a lady. You are addressing me. Do not address ladies and gentlemen. Your remarks are through the chair.

Mr MARSHALL: Sorry, Mr Speaker. I will, of course, refer all of my remarks to you. But what a disappointment it was, sir. It reminded me of that great T.S. Eliot line, 'not with a bang but a whimper'. We returned to the parliament to hear a big bang. The Premier was renewed and reinvigorated after his three-week overseas holiday. He needed to get into government to push forward with this agenda but he took three weeks off. He should have been here. He should have been here working on a bold agenda. At no other time in this state's history have we needed a bold reform agenda as we do right now and, unfortunately, yesterday was not one of those days.

When we look at the meagre offering that the government put up in terms of reform—I refer you to page 5 of His Excellency's speech—the first item of reform was of course the merger of DMITRE and DFEEST. As everybody would appreciate in this house, that was the Liberal Party policy, so it is interesting that the first item of reform referred to in the Governor's speech was our idea for reform. But, of course, as per usual, the government implements just part of the reform agenda and not nearly enough.

So, of course, we have DMITRE actually merging with DFEEST, which is interesting, but the dysfunction that exists around the overall mechanism of government still sits with us. The new acting chief executive will continue to report to—are you ready for this, sir?—four separate ministers of the Crown. I mean, where would anybody think that this is a logical reform, that a reform of the organisational structure of government has four ministers to whom this new poor acting chief executive of this merged department will have to report? And, of course, we still persist with the complete and utter dysfunction—14 separate government departments.

It is interesting to note that in NSW they have nine, but we have 14. We do not even have 14 ministers in South Australia, but we have 14 government departments, and of course some of those poor chief executives of those government departments do not report to four ministers, but some report to up to six separate ministers. What a chaotic mess it is under this government.

The Governor's speech went on to talk about reform of the Public Service here in South Australia and in fact it says: 'The Government must lead by example. The State's largest institution, the South Australian public sector, must be renewed.' Well, as their first act of that renewal, the government squibbed; they completely and utterly squibbed. They let down the Public Service and they let down the people of South Australia.

The second area that I wish to address is the area of the International Engagement Strategy. For some reason unbeknownst to me, the government thinks that they have done well in this area. Well, let me tell you, sir: when this government brought down its own state strategic plan with its own target for exports out of this state, they said that by the year 2013 (which, incidentally, was last year) we would have \$25 billion worth of exports out of this state. Well, let me tell you, sir: they did not achieve that goal.

In the first instance, they pushed the timeframe for that from 2013 out to 2014, but—you know what I am going to say next, sir—they knew they were not going to achieve that new target. So what did they do? They pushed it out to 2020; 2020 is when this government thinks it will be able to fulfil the target that it itself set back in 2004—2020, my goodness gracious me, sir. I hope that you will of course still be serving the people of Croydon right through to that point in time.

I was hoping that the government would fulfil the promise that the Premier made during the election campaign, and that was to adopt more of our strategies, and in particular the strategy that the member for Waite and I put forward regarding massively expanding our support of exporters here in South Australia—having an expanded focus, not just on India and China, but indeed on seven different identified regions throughout the world. The Premier said during the campaign that he would adopt our strategy for a special focus on South-East Asia, neglected by this government over an extended period of time. But was there any mention in this document? I am very sorry to say that there was nothing. It was completely silent on the matter and we are all the poorer for it. I think we are all the poorer for it.

Of course, in the speech that was made yesterday, there was reference made to the agreement between the Premier and the member for Frome for stable government and effective government here in South Australia. Yesterday the Premier came into the house, and I think in a moment where he wanted to convince us all that it was going to be open and transparent, the total agreement between the member for Frome and the government, he tabled the document—often referred to by people as the 'Brockument'—and it is a good document. However, yesterday in the parliament we heard, within minutes of the tabling of that document, that indeed it was not the total agreement between the two parties.

The Premier cannot have it both ways. He cannot say, 'We want to be totally open, totally transparent with the people of South Australia and yet we are not going to tell you all of the agreement.' We need to know what the totality of that agreement was or is and, in particular, we need to know what happened with regard to the Premier's commitments in terms of Nyrstar. What we knew before the election was that the government, supported by Her Majesty's loyal opposition, was more than happy to provide an underwriting for this important project for South Australia to \$100 million. What we do not know is what that is going forward. We hope that the Premier will keep us informed as to what our liability for this important project is going to be.

Payroll tax: His Excellency the Governor outlined to the house that there was some temporary payroll tax relief provided by this government—not nearly enough. It is not nearly enough and we will be holding the government to account on that matter. There was a small ray of sunshine in this document and that was the government's commitment to fixing the WorkCover system. This is a system which has been in complete and utter disarray over an extended period of time. Let me remind the house just how bad this system is for the employers and, importantly, the employees here in South Australia. It is not only the case that we have the highest rate in the country, almost double the national average—certainly more than double the rate that is paid by employers in Victoria—but, as if that is not enough, we also have the worst WorkCover scheme for employers and employees, with the lowest return-to-work statistics in the entire nation. It is completely and utterly broken.

When we look at the liability of this scheme it is almost impossible to believe. South Australia's scheme is only 67 per cent funded against a national comparison of schemes like this where they are 112 per cent funded. South Australia is 67 per cent funded, with the liability to the scheme currently sitting at \$1.23 million. It is broken and it has been presided over by a negligent government over an extended period of time. We say that we will work cooperatively with the government regarding reforms to the WorkCover scheme but they are reforms to a scheme which have been institutionalised by this negligent government over an extended period of time.

The government also says that it is going to reduce red tape. This is definitely something on which we will be holding the government to account. Business is struggling. Do not forget that in the last session of this parliament the government introduced the work health and safety legislation. This was meant to be a national, harmonised arrangement for workers compensation across the nation. Let me tell you that it is not national, it is not harmonised and it is a massive burden on each and every business here in South Australia.

The government would do well to take a look at its own work health and safety legislation before it makes these new claims that it is going to start looking at reducing red tape. I know where they should start: they should start with that act. It is a complete and utter disgrace and it hurts every single business here in South Australia.

I am very pleased to thank the member for Frome for really making the government focus on the regions. They have been neglected for a long period of time. I appreciate that the government does not have many seats in the regions here in South Australia but that is not important. The issue is: how do we get our entire state moving in the right direction? How do we start growing our state? How do we start creating jobs in this state?

Let me tell you: the regions are a powerhouse of opportunity for our entire state, and they have been neglected for too long. I was very pleased to hear in the Governor's speech yesterday that acknowledgement that, although only 20 per cent of our state's population rests in regional South Australia, they account for in excess of 50 per cent of the state's exports and, I would say, a huge majority of our state's opportunities going forward. So, I thank very much the member for Frome for turning the government's hand to this important task. Of course, what the government does will be interesting. We will be watching it with a great deal of focus.

Yesterday, in the parliament, the Premier himself gave a ministerial statement. He is going to come up with a charter for 'stronger regional policy' but, more than that, it is not just going to be a charter, there is going to be one of those famous organisations: a ministerial task force. Now we know they are really going to get stuck in! There is going to be a ministerial task force.

I ask you perhaps just to turn your mind back to that great forceful task force—the task force that the Premier established to support our manufacturing sector. That was a beauty! I just remind the house of the composition of this task force. Of course, we had that great manufacturing advocate the Treasurer of South Australia—he was on it—the Minister for Health was on it, as was the member for Newland and, of course, the former member for Hartley. I do not know about the rest of you, but I cannot remember one single, solitary outcome of this task force.

I hope, unequivocally and genuinely, and we all hope that this ministerial task force, this cabinet task force, will be far more effective for our regions than any of these task forces set up by this government in the past. Why? Because we know that it is important.

As part of our contribution to this, we have set up a regional committee on our side of this parliament because we know that regions are important. It is, of course, under the expert chairmanship of the member for Hammond, who is a great advocate for the regions and a great regional man. I know that he will work with the new Minister for Regional Development and with the Premier and, let me tell you, with this regional task force. If it takes that, we will work with the regional task force of the government because we know that this is important for the people of South Australia.

I was pleased, although a little bit confused, when the Governor announced yesterday that the government would be focusing on a renewal of the education sector. Now, look, we have had lots of chief executives, we have had lots of ministers, we have had lots of reports, but, apparently now, we are going to amend the Education Act to ensure that it better meets the needs of our children, our schools and our communities. Quite frankly, I would have thought that would have gone without saying but, nevertheless, that is what the act is going to be doing, and that is wonderful.

But, most importantly, again, the government has taken up an excellent Liberal suggestion. Can I commend the member for Unley, who has been the shadow minister for education for an extended period of time.

Mr Pisoni: Five ministers.

Mr MARSHALL: Five separate ministers he has had to break in—five separate ministers. I must say that he and his office have done an exceptional job understanding the complexities of our education system here in South Australia.

Let's face it, it is not an education system which is working well. When we look at the results, like the PISA results and the NAPLAN results, I know this is not the be all and end all and I know many people will say there are other things to consider and there are, but it is a benchmark. It is a benchmark right across the nation. In fact, my daughter will be sitting her NAPLAN test very soon, so I will keep you informed how she goes, but we are looking forward to it in our household.

When we look at those results, we are not performing well, and that is why I am pleased that the government will be taking up the Liberal Party's suggestion; that is, for greater school autonomy because this is the secret to improved results here in South Australia. For governing councils, for teachers, for principals, for communities to have a greater say in what happens at their school and how their expenditure is organised, this is extraordinarily important, and we applaud any moves to increase autonomy at the individual school level.

We believe also that the government needs to do more in terms of its reform agenda in this area. It is disappointing for many of us that the government is not going to proceed with the very logical policy of making the school research project non-compulsory or optional. This is something that I think the vast majority of people in South Australia think is a logical thing to happen, and the fact that it has been ignored by this government shows how completely and utterly out of date the government is with the people of South Australia

I also think that we remain completely out of step with the rest of the nation with our year 7 staying in the primary years. This really deprives our students from benefiting from smaller class sizes, specialist classes and many of the other advantages of moving year 7 to secondary school, as has happened in every other state in Australia. Every other state in Australia has made that decision to move, and most either have moved or are in the process of moving. It is an important reform; it is a difficult reform. It will cost money—it will cost money in terms of recurrent funding, it will cost money in terms of capital—to bring the schools up to speed, but it is a really important reform for our future.

I was pleased to see mentioned in the Governor's speech reference to mental health. The government often stands up and says, 'We've done really well in this area,' but, quite frankly, we have not. Any independent person who takes a look at the Social Inclusion Board's report into this issue, entitled 'Stepping Up: A Social Inclusion Action Plan for Mental Health Reform 2007-2012', will appreciate almost instantaneously how far behind we have slipped here in South Australia, and this is very sad because, if you go back to the time that the report was originally written, South Australia had a very good performance in this area. In fact, we had the highest number of acute inpatient mental health beds per head of population in the country; we are now at the bottom of the table.

It is great that the government says that it wants to have a renewed focus on this, but we need to see new money going into this area—it is absolutely critical for South Australia—and the government was completely and utterly silent on this all the way through the election process.

The Liberal Party, by contrast, said that it would permanently reopen 10 additional beds at the Margaret Tobin Centre, that it would put additional money into additional acute inpatient mental health beds, both north and south, in South Australia, and, most importantly, that it would put additional money into the issue of eating disorders here in South Australia. These are issues where we lag well behind best practice; in fact, we are at the bottom of the table. I think that governments should be held accountable, that they should be judged by the way in which they treat the most vulnerable in their society and, quite frankly, people living with mental illness in South Australia have been left out for a long period of time.

We understand, of course, that the government will be setting up a commission. Well, to be quite honest, we had the Stepping Up report 2007-12; there was no flow-on from that report. You would think that, in 2011, you would start thinking about, 'What is our next iteration?' Well, let me tell

you that, in 2014, the government is going to start thinking about it; in 2015, we might get a recommendation. This hiatus of support for those people living with a mental illness in South Australia is completely unacceptable and it is something that we do not believe we should be tolerating whatsoever. It is interesting also that, on the top of page 16, the government makes this statement:

My government will protect those who dedicate their lives to community safety...

Well, hear, hear! But where is the government on the matter of equity between our professional firefighters and our volunteer firefighters on the issue of cancer compensation? Let me read it again:

My government will protect those who dedicate their lives to community safety...

I say that our CFS volunteers put their lives on the line to protect our safety and our property, to protect our life, and they deserve nothing less—not a jot less—than full equity with the professional firefighters. The Liberal Party, those people on this side of the house, took this issue to the election, and we will continue to fight for it, and we hope to have the fulsome support from the member for Frome on this issue because we know how important this issue is to him. In fact, I was very privileged to visit his electorate and to visit the CFS staging area for the Bangor fires.

One amazing thing that occurred to me, was that there were not only CFS volunteers from the local area, there were CFS volunteers from throughout the state camped on that oval in Clare, and many of them for an extended period of time in incredible conditions. Let me tell you if you ever want to lose weight I think one of those tents on a 43 degree day would be quite a good option. They were very difficult conditions yet they were there, and I hope that the government can be held to account on this promise that they re-made yesterday to protect those who dedicate their lives to community safety.

Almost finally, the Governor's speech referred to an urgent need to reform our democracy and I will be making further comments about that in a couple of minutes time but I appreciate that the government has put the reform of our democracy and our electoral system into the Governor's speech because, quite frankly, this is a very important issue for the people of South Australia and one that we certainly must pursue.

As I said, it was a disappointing but not unexpected speech that outlined the next four years from a lacklustre, tired government, a government that has been in power for 12 years, and if they haven't implemented their reform agenda now, when are they going to do it? The Premier, as I said, had pretty much lost interest himself, taking three weeks holiday since the election. He needed time to renew himself I suppose. It says on the final page:

My government will deliver a bold agenda that puts people first and creates sustainable jobs for the future.

I hope they do. I genuinely hope they do because South Australia is in a complete and utter mess after 12 years of Labor government. Let's take a look at unemployment. If you recall, this was the big issue of the election. Our unemployment rate in South Australia is the highest it has been for 12 years. Our regional unemployment rate in South Australia is the highest it has been for 14 years. In the March statistics (the month in which we held the election) we lost 9,000 full-time jobs in South Australia. It is an enormous figure and at the same time that the overall unemployment rate in Australia fell. We went up and the rest of Australia went down. There are 61,000 people who are jobless in South Australia at the moment, and we were the only state which reported a decline in employment for last year. Quite frankly, that is unacceptable.

Mr Treloar interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: No, a decline in employment but thank you anyway—99 times you are helpful! Young people are completely and utterly giving up on our state. If we look at the net interstate migration figures out of South Australia at the moment they are appalling. We have had in excess of 33,000 net interstate migrants over the life of this government—this is the difference between those people who are leaving and those people who are coming back in. The majority are young people who are leaving South Australia, not because they do not love this state, but because they just cannot find meaningful employment in South Australia.

The business sector, of course, is struggling. We have the highest business taxes in Australia. We have had that situation for five long years in South Australia. We have increasing red tape, increasing fees and charges under Labor and, quite frankly, the business sector is giving up. When we look at business creation in South Australia, this is really worrying. In fact we have the

lowest rate of business start-up on mainland Australia. So, people are leaving and we are not even starting the new businesses up, and this is a real problem for us. If we do not focus on this issue, and there is no mention of this in the Governor's speech, where are we going to be down the track?

In South Australia we have a situation where a flood of young people and capital are moving across our borders into those states with Liberal reformist governments, governments which are focused on growing their economies, growing jobs and keeping young people in their states.

More than ever, we need bold ideas; more than ever, we need a government that is focused on reform. South Australia needs a government that is going to facilitate growing our economy. State final demand last year contracted. We need a government that is going to be focused on growing our economy. We need to have a government that is going to be focused on growing employment and keeping our young people here in South Australia.

The Liberal Party of course took a bold jobs plan to the election. In fact, that plan consisted of in excess of \$250 million worth of initiatives over the next three years. By contrast, the Labor Party took a \$393 million jobs plan to the election. People will recall this. Unfortunately, \$333 million of their \$393 million was dependent on federal government funding. Let me tell you what happened. That federal government funding did not come, so yesterday in the house we find out that the government has finally signed up to the manufacturing growth program put forward by the federal government.

During the election, of course, they said it was pathetic and inadequate and was not going to help anybody. Yesterday, without fanfare, without a ministerial statement, without a press conference, without even a press release, they said: 'This is a good program; we're going to sign up to it.' Wait on! What happened to the \$393 million? Well, that is gone. The \$393 million program is completely and utterly gone.

Mr Hamilton-Smith: A 'mirage in the desert'.

Mr MARSHALL: As the member for Waite said, it was a 'mirage in the desert'. It was something that you put forward to have a look at before an election. Days after the election, without any ministerial statement, it just goes. What is going to happen to our economy without a workable jobs plan? Sure, you have the federal government's plan—in excess of \$150 million to help transition our economy in 2017 and beyond when Holden exits South Australia—but what about now? We are in the midst of a dangerous jobs crisis right now.

We might be in an even worse situation in 2017. I do not want to speculate on that, but right now, our employment here in South Australia is heading in the wrong direction and we need a plan. That is why we went to the election saying that we needed to have a bold plan. We talked about the need for cutting payroll tax, and I was very pleased when Peter Malinauskas came out and supported this position, and he supported it because he knows that it is good policy, because payroll tax is a tax on jobs. It is a tax on jobs and it is one that really needs reform.

We talked about land tax reform. Importantly, and I have already mentioned this, we talked about the need to grow our economy by increasing exports out of this state. We are putting in almost \$20 million worth of new money. By contrast the government has been cutting money out of export assistance over an extended period of time. We are putting in \$20 million worth of new money to assist and help our exporters identify overseas markets. Why? We want to grow the size of our economy and grow our exports, because we know that when we sell our goods and services interstate and overseas, we are bringing somebody else's money into our state to grow our economy.

Importantly, in our jobs plan, in our jobs action agenda, we did talk about the importance of the regions before the election and we were very proud on this side of the house to talk about that before the election, which is so crucial. We talked about the regional development fund. It absolutely wound down to virtually nothing under Labor; in fact, it was down to \$1.6 million per year. What can you do with \$1.6 million for the entire state in terms of regional development?

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

Mr MARSHALL: It was completely and utterly unacceptable, and as the shadow treasurer points out, it pays about half a day's interest, so that is the situation. That is how much the government cared about the regions before the election. We talked about the regional development fund. We talked about the Murray Bridge rejuvenation project—an excellent project, which we hope the government will look at very seriously.

We talked in particular about opening up the northern Adelaide plains to make them more productive for our intense horticulture sector by expanding the irrigation scheme there—an excellent scheme and not one that was designed around a marginal seat. In fact I think it is in the member for Taylor's electorate and I trust that she will be out there advocating for this excellent program. We were out there doing the things that were important to grow our state and to grow jobs and we will stand by those projects that we put forward.

We also, of course, talked about the importance of innovation and commercialisation, huge slabs of new money into creating the sectors of the future, the jobs of the future, money into start-ups here in South Australia. I was also very proud that we on this side of the house identified the financial services sector as a great growth opportunity for our state. Many of the people working in this sector nationwide come from South Australia. We want to repatriate them back to South Australia, want them working in sustainable jobs here in South Australia.

We need a jobs action plan in South Australia. The government's admission yesterday is that with the lack of funding coming from the federal government there is no jobs program under Labor—there is no jobs program under Labor whatsoever—and this is really worrying. You would think that if the government did hear the message from this election they would be focused unequivocally on coming up with a program which is going to improve our young people's prospects in South Australia.

We took our agenda to the election, and I think it is fair to say that we did have extraordinarily strong support from the electorate. The Liberal Party had endorsement from the electorate, with 45 per cent of South Australian voters giving the primary vote to the Liberal Party. In fact, we ended up with 92,000 more votes than the Labor Party. Nevertheless, the Liberal—

Mr Pederick: 92,000.

Mr MARSHALL: Did I say 92? Ninety-two thousand; it's even larger. Nevertheless, the Liberal Party has been unable to form government after this election. The Labor Party has formed a minority government with the support of the member for Frome.

So what will this parliament look like? How will it operate? From the Liberal Party's perspective, we will work diligently in this house and in our electorates, and on behalf of the people of South Australia, every single day. We will hold this government to account every single day. We will relentlessly pursue and hold this government to account for every single one of the promises that they made to the people of South Australia before the election.

Of course, one of the most important promises that was made by the Premier was regarding returning our budget to surplus. This is an important commitment that the government has made, and we will be holding them to account on this issue. We will work with the government to advance that legislation which is a benefit to the people of South Australia.

I have already spoken about WorkCover, but it is very important that we do work with the government to advance this state, because never before in the history of this state have we needed a government and a parliament which operates effectively. In addition to this, we will continue to pursue the agenda which we took to the election. It was an agenda for change, it was an agenda for jobs, it was an agenda for growth, and it was an agenda which was supported by the majority of South Australians.

We ended up with 53 per cent of the two-party preferred vote. The people of South Australia voted for change, they voted for our agenda, and we will not be dropping it. We will not be dropping it because we know it is the will of the people of South Australia for us to continue to pursue that. So whichever way you look at it, democracy was not served with the outcome of the 2014 election result. The party which clearly received the majority of the votes in this election has not been in a position to form government, and this has happened far too often in recent years in this place. The people of South Australia wish to live in a democracy. Now, I know those opposite are making all sorts of bleatings at the moment—

The Hon. P. Caica: You can talk, you're the one bleating.

Mr MARSHALL: Well, actually, I'm the one making the speech. I think you'll get your turn.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The leader shouldn't be taken away by those remarks. The leader has the floor.

Mr MARSHALL: Thank you very much.

Mr Gardner: Throw him out, ma'am.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Not in my first moment.

Mr MARSHALL: Well, the government did say this was going to be a bold government; but, anyway.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Maybe in my second moment.

Mr MARSHALL: Let's look at the facts. It is the people of South Australia who have been denied the government of their choice. The people of South Australia voted for change; in fact 92,000 more people voted for the Liberal Party than for the Labor Party; so unequivocally the people of South Australia have not been given a democracy. People in South Australia want to live in a democracy. I think this is a fundamental responsibility of our parliament.

We should not be in a position where we deny the people of South Australia what they actually voted for. Fifty-three per cent of people wanted a Liberal Party to govern this state. I accept that the system has delivered a Labor Party to form minority government, but this indicates, quite frankly, that this parliament needs to allocate resources and time to look at our system and to reform our system before the 2018 election. If we squib on this, we are not doing our job. This will be a primary objective of the Liberal Party in this parliament going forward. Madam Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Don't call me Madam. Deputy Speaker; don't call me Madam, please.

Mr MARSHALL: Is this a new ruling? I'd like to see that one in writing. I would like to conclude my remarks by thanking the electors of Dunstan. I love Dunstan; it is a great electorate. I know every person in this place thinks that their electorate is the best. You all have claim to that, but I have the floor, so I can say that I love the electorate of Dunstan. I thank them very much for returning me, in fact as the first member for Dunstan, because of course we changed our electorate's name at this election. Diversity is the key in Norwood; you can never be bored in Norwood. There is always something new; there is always something happening and there is a huge amount of diversity. I love serving that and I will continue to represent not just those people who voted for me, of course, but the entire electorate, who have been absolutely wonderful to me.

I would like to congratulate other members of this house who were re-elected at the election and I would also like to welcome the new members. In particular I would like to welcome the new members on our side. It is fantastic to see so many people on our side of the house. I know that I cannot mention them by name, but I would like to acknowledge the new member for Mount Gambier, the new member for Schubert—big boots to fill there—the member for Hartley, the member for Bright and the member for Mitchell. Of course, we are very pleased also to have an additional legislative councillor in the other place. We look forward to working with him as well.

It was also wonderful yesterday to see the member for Fisher come into the parliament. He has a battle on his hands. I know only too well the brutal nature of chemotherapy and ray treatment. I think everybody in this house wishes him all the very best for a speedy and full recovery and we look forward to that time when he can return to the house. We look forward to the start of question time, when he can move multiple notices of motion. It was just not the same without him moving those yesterday at the start of question time.

I hope that this parliament will be characterised as a hardworking, diligent, reformist and progressive parliament here in South Australia. There is enormous work to be done; we are in a mess. We are in a mess in South Australia and it is incumbent upon all people right across the political spectrum, on all sides of politics, to do everything that we possibly can to advance the cause of this state. On behalf of everybody in Her Majesty's loyal opposition, the Liberal Party in South Australia, I know that we stand ready to fulfil our obligation under the constitution and to do everything that we possibly can to get this great state of South Australia back on track.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Lee. I remind the house that this is the member's inaugural speech. I ask members to accord him the customary courtesies. The member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister Assisting the Minister for Planning, Minister Assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (12:09): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. As I commence, I would like to acknowledge that we meet here today on the traditional lands of the Kaurna people and I acknowledge and respect their relationship with this land. Can I also acknowledge my fellow members on both sides of the house. I am grateful and humbled that so many would be present today to hear our contributions and I congratulate them for their elections to the house. Can I also congratulate you, Deputy Speaker, on your role as Deputy Speaker of the house.

I am deeply honoured to be standing here today as the member for Lee. Our community is one of the best in Adelaide and not just because of its beautiful beaches, proud industrial and maritime heritage, tourism attractions and successful sporting clubs. Our community is such a great part of South Australia because of its people. Residents of the Lefevre Peninsula and the western suburbs truly are the best going around: neighbourly, compassionate, proud of their heritage and always looking out for those in our community who need a hand. To be considered a worthy representative to this place is a great honour, indeed. Deputy Speaker, I can assure you that I will be working conscientiously to do my best on their behalf.

As I am sure all other honourable members would know, delivering a maiden speech to the house on behalf of your constituency is the culmination of a long, arduous and testing journey, and all of our paths here are different. Perhaps I can begin by telling the house a little about mine.

I come from a large, close-knit and loving family. I am the youngest of five boys and we had a fun and very fortunate upbringing. Mum stopped working when she had my eldest brother and stayed at home to raise us all and manage a very busy and demanding household. My father worked very long hours, but always made a point to take us to school every morning and to set aside time at weekends to spend with mum and us boys. As a result, we had a very happy childhood and I know that this has given me the confidence and fortitude I enjoy today.

Both of my parents were similarly proud of their upbringing. Dad was raised first at Semaphore, then at Largs Bay. His father, Fred, worked nearby at the old Osborne power station. Dad played junior footy for the Port Magpies, and he was the local postie while putting himself through university. When my brothers and I were growing up he would take us to Alberton Oval to watch the 'Pies', to visit the beach at Largs, or go fishing off North Haven. As it is now, in those days it was a tight-knit community on the Lefevre Peninsula.

My great uncle was Sir Cecil Hincks, a veteran of both Gallipoli and Western Front campaigns, and was a minister in the Playford government until his death in 1963. He would spend time at Largs visiting his sister, my grandmother, Emily.

When we were growing up, dad would take us to Largs or North Haven and show us where he grew up; where his uncle Cecil lived; the houses of the families he knew; and the shops, warehouses and factories in and around The Port that provided for so many livelihoods in the 1940s and 50s. Though I did not realise it at the time, these experiences as a young boy—of being driven around by my father and shown the community that meant so much to him—left a deep impression on me.

When it came time for me to buy a home, I bought in Largs. Though it had never been home for me, nonetheless it felt like it. Today I live on the same street on which dad was raised. This was only a small part of his influence on me and my brothers. Dad's Lefevre upbringing gave him a strong sense of justice, a cynicism towards privilege and establishment and a deep compassion for those less fortunate in our community. He sought out opportunities to help people. He worked incredibly hard, but always made room in his life for family, cricket and football (particularly the Port Adelaide Football Club) and for cooking and gardening. All attributes left deep impressions on me and my brothers, and these are qualities we seek to emulate today—except, perhaps, the gardening! Working hard and finding ways to help those less fortunate, particularly if we should be in a position to do so, was infused into all of us.

Unfortunately, I never met my maternal grandfather, Ray 'Jimmy' Campbell, a wing commander in the then Royal Air Force, who passed away before I was born. Instead, my brothers

and I spent much time growing up with his wife Rita, our nanna. Born in England, she lived through The Great Depression and, as a result, knew the value of a dollar. Like so many who had lived through the period of rationing she had an outstanding appetite for butter and being so thrifty we would joke that she would wash Glad Wrap for reuse.

Like nanna, my mother is not only very caring, but very astute—a font of wisdom and advice on anything we might seek her counsel on. It was often surprising and embarrassing what mum knew about us as we grew up, but she always had the right words and heartfelt concern for us. We were very lucky indeed to have the upbringing we did.

Though I was a good student at school, I never had a clear idea of what I wanted to do and like many who were uncertain about their future I commenced a Bachelor of Arts degree at the University of Adelaide in 1996. As I now realise, this was a turning point for me. Until then, from the age of five to the age of 18, I had grown up in a country governed by Labor, first under Bob Hawke and then under Paul Keating. While my family never really discussed politics—I still do not know how my parents voted—we would watch the news and current affairs programs. While we were not political, I guess I had become politically aware and I was shocked when Paul Keating lost government just as I was starting university. Instead, the country had a new conservative prime minister, John Howard. Immediately he and the new treasurer, Peter Costello, established a commission of audit foreshadowing savage cuts across a range of areas. How history repeats.

That year massive cuts were made to the higher education sector meaning, among other things, undergraduates like me were suddenly paying much more for our degrees and for other day-to-day costs. This sparked what was the last wave of student activism across the country. Our generation had always been led to believe that education is the key to a successful future and here was a government doing its best to make it harder to get a degree. We marched in our thousands through Adelaide, echoing other rallies around the country. These were my first weeks and months at university and for me they were heady times. My disappointment at Labor losing government turned to anger at the new Coalition government. Strangely enough, John Howard had activated a nascent Labor career.

In response to ongoing national protests and because the conservatives do not like collectivism, the Howard government had two attempts at introducing voluntary student unionism. It knew that if it could succeed in effectively defunding student organisations, it would undermine the organising capacity of future generations of activists and go a long way to silencing dissent against right-wing policies into the future. The Howard government eventually won that battle in the early 2000s and as a result students are now more poorly represented and denied much of the activities and experiences that used to make attending university such a rewarding and life enriching experience.

Of course, perhaps emboldened by this early success, Howard then attacked the union movement and the entitlements and representation of working Australians in his WorkChoices policies, which were fortunately defeated at the federal election in 2007.

I became involved in student representation and, through it, the Labor Party. As president of the students' association I learned about advocacy, about helping students, and about defending institutions. It was a time when the university was considering closing the Elder Conservatorium, restructuring its law school, and drastically cutting staff and services, and we managed to prevent the worst of these measures.

When I left university I was grateful to accept an offer from the member for Enfield, now Deputy Premier, to work part-time in his electorate office. Back then he had a regular spot on talkback radio and he took great delight in directing callers, regardless of their electorate, to the office for assistance. The office was—as all good electorate offices are—a de facto community legal centre, dispensing advice, assistance and, from time to time, advocacy to those who could not get help elsewhere.

For me it was another chance to help people regardless of how small or large their problem might be. We felt we were giving people someone to turn to or a voice when they felt neglected or disenfranchised, particularly given the social issues in the Parks and in Kilburn.

I also spent some years working for the then Treasurer, first as an adviser, then as chief of staff. It was a very productive period for the government. Bold initiatives to create the Economic

Development Board, to develop and release a strategic plan for the state, and the pursuit of industry development in both defence manufacturing and mining were undertaken, with significant successes. As the state economy rebounded after the 1990s, revenues increased and government debt was reduced, taxes were cut significantly, investments were made in infrastructure, and better services in health, education and social welfare were delivered. For me, it was a great time participating in the efforts to grow our economy and also to improve services to the community. This was a new and vastly more challenging way to help people.

The strategy for the government to invest in industry development policies and take an active role in facilitating the growth of the economy was a clear strategy. Further, it ensured that there was a clear social dividend from these investments through better services and infrastructure; that one followed the other and that a government has responsibilities in delivering both was a valuable lesson in the role of government. It was a hard, busy and rewarding time and I know that over the period the state has advanced significantly, socially and economically.

Nonetheless, I wanted to broaden my experience and I left for a role at Deloitte Access Economics, developing its South Australian business. The experience of being responsible for my own business unit, for recruiting and managing a team, for being accountable for budget targets, utilisation rates, industry strategies and marketing plans was very fulfilling. Being part of a national economic team was also a terrific experience. Working alongside some of the leading economists in the country, I saw government from the other perspective, where decisions, investments and programs are judged from a drier, more rationalist perspective.

Predominantly, government expenditures are assessed on whether they are the most efficient allocation of resources for a given outcome—the economist's bread and butter. In an environment of fiscal constraint, this is a valuable skill to apply to public policy. However, I also learnt that, while this perspective is important in assessing public sector expenditures, it is only one of many important considerations. Just as social groups should have a mind to the cost and financial implications of their priorities, so should economists and business groups have a mind to broader social objectives. It was gratifying to know that some of Australia's most well known and respected economists had a balanced view of their role in the public policy debate.

It is an important lesson, because much of the national debate at present seems to miss this balance. The pursuit of fiscal outcomes is certainly important, but is it a government's sole or even primary responsibility, and should the pursuit of these outcomes prevent investments in projects and programs that generate ongoing economic returns, such as secure employment? I felt we also missed a more balanced debate on this point regarding assistance for the automotive manufacturing industry. Government investments to secure industry development and jobs in the long term pay significant social dividends.

The state government's investment in the Techport Australia precinct is a case in point: it was central in winning the air warfare destroyer contract and thousands of jobs, and it has established Osborne as the premier shipbuilding location in Australia. It provided significant benefits for the local communities, particularly those of the northern and western suburbs, many of which fall into the electorate of Lee. With the neighbouring electorate of Port Adelaide, Lee shares the port and the Lefevre Peninsula. Ours are communities that have historically been central to much of South Australia's economic prosperity: the export and stevedoring operations, the warehousing and distribution, and the maintenance and construction of shipping.

As time and technology have moved on over the decades, so have many of the jobs. Government investments to secure industries into the future through major contracts, such as that air warfare destroyer contract, the relocation of the 7RAR Battalion to Edinburgh and the next generation submarine contract are critical. They underpin employment and economic opportunities in communities like Lee and more broadly throughout South Australia.

Over the past year I doorknocked many people who work at Techport. They were thankful that the government had the foresight to invest in such a facility, securing jobs and prosperity. On a side note, I am also very pleased to see how shipbuilding is providing wider benefits to the community. The Lefevre High School has been investing in programs to assist students to learn about shipbuilding, engineering, advanced manufacturing techniques and the trades, and they are already having success in placing graduates into jobs in related industries on the peninsula. This is

a model now being pursued by another peninsula school, Ocean View College, in the member for Port Adelaide's electorate, in the transport and logistics industries.

I also doorknocked many Holden workers and automotive component workers. They were less thankful for the decisions their national government has recently made. The commonwealth government saving \$500 million in automotive assistance might seem prudent to some, but if the forecasts are correct and tens of thousands of workers lose their jobs over the next three years, what will be the saving to government? We know that there is likely to be vast economic and social dislocation unless a well-funded and cleverly implemented adjustment package is rolled out by all levels of government. It beggars belief that the full costs of additional government efforts will not significantly exceed the dollars saved in industry assistance. I am not convinced that we were given the full cost-benefit analysis by the commonwealth in this respect.

The decision to withdraw support from the automotive sector is a good example of how the economic rationalists have dominated the national debate and won. We should be careful to balance these debates in the future because the impacts of these decisions have significant and lasting impacts through our communities.

My next-door neighbour is a Holden worker, and the challenge that he and his family faces in the coming years is disheartening, particularly when it was avoidable. His experience, and those of tens of thousands who will be similarly affected, convince me even further of the role the government has in facilitating economic growth and prosperity.

Our community in Lee has a very keen interest in the redevelopment of the Port. I am glad that the government has stepped in to take control of the future development of the inner harbor. Good development is exactly what the Port needs. It is rare to have a second chance at such significant developments, but we are lucky enough to have this in Port Adelaide.

Many residents, stakeholders and community groups felt disenfranchised at what occurred over the last 15 years. The first attempt by the previous developer has not delivered the benefits that the community anticipated. However, there is a tentative sense of momentum in the Port now. We are starting to feel proud of it again. We are starting to picture what it could look like and how good it could be, instead of just lamenting its current state. Those who have worked so tirelessly, and mostly thanklessly, sustaining our maritime heritage, a built heritage and the renowned Port Adelaide art scene, are feeling some optimism. I look forward to working hard to help the Port reach its considerable potential.

I am very proud that the consistent investment by this government in the Port and the Lefevre Peninsula has underpinned economic opportunities. The next step is to encourage more people to live in and around the Port and help it become the premier tourist destination it deserves to be.

Elsewhere, South Australians are waking up to the fact that we in fact have Adelaide's best beaches. Semaphore and Largs are beautiful places, so far unspoilt and not losing their character. It will be a challenge supporting the continued growth of Semaphore Road and Jetty Road at Largs without losing the country town atmosphere and the heritage that makes it such a unique part of Adelaide.

In West Lakes, the move of AFL football to Adelaide Oval and the planned redevelopment of the land surrounding AAMI Stadium are key concerns for residents. I campaigned with residents to scale back the SANFL's plans for the precinct to something a little more reasonable. West Lakes is one of the first and most successful broadscale housing developments in metropolitan Adelaide. Ensuring that the community has adequate input into how land is developed and ensuring that development is in keeping with the surrounding areas will be important, and I look forward to continuing to assist residents in this respect.

Before I finish, there are some people I would like to thank for their role in helping me here today. First, my family: to my mother Jan and my late father Ted, I can never adequately express how much your unfailing love and support has enabled me to pursue all that I have in life. either have ever sought to influence or dissuade me in the decisions I have made, but instead you have armed me with the wisdom and guidance that has enabled me to traverse the paths that I have today.

To my wife Antonia, thank you for your steadfast love, as well as patiently and generously accepting all the time, effort and energy that has gone into me arriving here. It has been a difficult

and challenging road, especially as newlyweds, and I am in awe of your reserves of love and encouragement.

To my brothers James, Charles, Paul and David, thank you for your encouragement and the confidence you give me, and your incredible support. I am so glad that no matter how old we get, we still enjoy chasing each other around mum's kitchen, whipping each other with her tea towels.

Thank you also to my wife's parents, Lefky and the late Ben, and their families as well, the Iannunzios and the Hizartdzidises, who were so generous with their support and efforts in helping me: Liz and Gio, Desi and Stelio, Jenny and Mick. Thank you also to George Mazarakos and his family, and the team at Sotos.

Thank you to my friends for the support and encouragement: Matt and Kirsten Hawthorn, Alex Dighton and Claire Jarratt, Tom and Carrie Radzevicius, Aaron and Tanya Witthoef, Matt and Nicky Sykes, Paul and Jane Sykes, Simon and Allison Dawe, Frances Dreyer, Sarah and Tim Goodchild, Chris and Penny Gent, Kelly Ansell, Annabel and Will Haslam, Sam Tomich, Rosslyn Cox, Victoria and Michael Brown, Nick Champion, John Bistrovic, Rik Morris, Caroline Rhodes, Aaron Hill, Rob Malinauskas, Mel Cocking, Jarrad Pilkington and Lucy Hood, Reggie Martin and Shannon Sampson, and Kim Eldridge.

I also want to thank those friends of mine who have been particularly supportive who are also in the Labor Party, especially Peter and Annabel Malinauskas; the member for West Torrens and his wife Anthea Koutsantonis; Don and Nimfa Farrell; Alex and Paola Gallacher; Aemon and Emily Bourke; the member for Enfield and Deputy Premier; Kevin Foley; Mike Rann; the member for Playford; the member for Little Para; the member for Newland; the Speaker; the member for Kaurana, the Hon. Tung Ngo; the member for Ramsay; the member for Port Adelaide; Jason Hall, the secretary of my union (the Finance Sector Union); John Bistrovic; Dan and Sonia Romeo; our Premier and member for Cheltenham, also for the fantastic campaign that he tirelessly led; the federal member for Port Adelaide (Mark Butler); Nick Bolkus; the former member for Lee (Hon. Michael Wright); and the former member for Semaphore (Hon. Norm Peterson) who joins us today.

I would also like to take some time to thank those who have spent a lot of time and effort to help, guide and mentor me, including Adrian O'Dea, Nick Alexandrides, Peter Bicknell, Adrian Tisato, Jeff Mills, Simon Blewett, and John Hood. And to my campaign team, thank you for working so tirelessly: Peter Gonis, Liam Golding, Dave Kirner, Warwick Norman and Kay Ronai, Jono Schomburgk, Lachlan McInnes, Pat and Donna Hansen, Brad Green, Daniela Rattenni, Shaylee Leach, Suzie Trifunic, Wasim Saeed, Julie MacDonald, Scott Freer, Eric and Jill Lavender, Kyall Smith, Damian Allison, David Wilkins, Hannah MacLeod, Amy Ware, and of course, the wonderful Karen Abineri.

I also thank all the others I may have neglected to mention who supported me, who bought raffle tickets, attended barbecues, made phone calls, letterboxed, handed out on polling day, or just offered me moral support.

I want to make mention of the way in which we chose to campaign for the electorate of Lee. I am a significant believer in the capacity of local MPs to be agents for positive change in their communities. In my campaign, we concentrated on helping groups with issues that were important to them. One I would like to make mention of, an issue of considerable community concern, is a development on a local park.

The campaign to prevent this continues, and it is being led by a group of residents, including Catherine McMahan, Pat Netschitowsky, Maureen Jones, Jane Edwards, Fiona McConchie, Alan O'Connor, Alison Hastings and Tim Walsh, and supported by South Australian Neighbour of the Year, Len Scott of Peterhead. Over time, as more and more people have become involved in this issue, and they have taken a more active interest in local clubs, community groups and other issues. This is one example of local capacity building, involving more and more people in what is happening in their communities, and the more it occurs the more inclusive and active our society will be. It also invariably leads to better decision-making. It has been a privilege to work with them, and with other groups, on the campaigns over the last 12 months.

I mentioned earlier how deeply honoured I am to be the representative for my community in this place. I have also mentioned a few of the challenges and the opportunities that await. My greatest thank you goes to the electors of Lee, who have placed such faith in me.

I am convinced that we all put our hands up to run for parliament because we genuinely want to do the best for our communities. In previous roles I have been fortunate to witness many members, from all sides, who, to me, exemplify what it is to be a good MP. There are also those who conduct themselves with an added air of integrity, of authenticity, and a willingness to put politics aside and work to deliver outcomes for the benefit of our state. I am pleased to say that there are a lot of those on both sides of this chamber today. At times they appear to be a diminishing breed, but I will do my best to learn from and to emulate them.

In finishing, I am very conscious that while we have what seems a long period in four years, it is merely a brief moment in the life of our respective communities and also of this house. All of us, quite frankly, do not have a moment to lose. While the challenges confronting us seem numerous, so are the opportunities. We should not hesitate to work tirelessly in moving our communities and our state forward, and always be mindful of the impact of the decisions we make on the people we represent.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (12:37): I rise in response to the Governor's speech yesterday in what is the Address in Reply debate, and I congratulate His Excellency and Lady Scarce on the wonderful job they do in their positions and the way they carry themselves throughout South Australia representing those positions.

Part of the Governor's speech yesterday dealt with the government's view that there appears to be a growing feeling of estrangement between politicians and the people they are elected to represent, and this suggests an urgent need to reform our democracy. I wish to spend my time in the Address in Reply debate talking about the need for electoral reform.

Electoral reform is not new to South Australia. It started, in most recent times, in 1968, after a significant campaign by the Labour Party—over a number of elections—about alleged bias and gerrymander within the then South Australian electoral system. In 1968 the Hall government started electoral reform.

This was continued, of course, in 1976 by the Dunstan government, and there was a redistribution of electoral boundaries in 1976. It is interesting that in this 1976 redistribution Dean Jaensch was reported as saying that he thought the Liberal Party would need to win 50.1 per cent of the vote and would only then receive 21 seats. In other words, they would be three short of a majority. *The Advertiser* wrote that the Liberal Party would have needed something like 54 per cent of the vote to achieve government.

The next significant area of electoral reform happened after the 1989 election—and I will come to that in a second—but in the lead up to the 1989 election, the Hon. Trevor Griffin in another place argued that under the way the boundaries had been constructed that in 1975 the Liberal Party would have had to win 55 per cent of the vote; in the 1977 election, 55.3 per cent of the vote; in the 1979 election, 54.8 per cent of the vote; in the 1982 election, 51.9 per cent of the vote; and in the 1985 election, 51.1 per cent of the vote. He argued that to win the 1989 election, the Liberal Party would have to win at least 52 per cent of the two-party preferred vote.

In fairness, the calculation of the two-party preferred vote did not actually take place in a formal sense by the Electoral Commission until about 1985 or 1989, so the two-party preferred votes as reported are a reconstruction based on the best methodology. People such as Jaensch and Forbes argue that in 1977 the Liberal Party would not have had to receive 55 per cent of the two-party preferred vote to form government, but at least prior to the 1989 election that was the argument put forward by the Hon. Trevor Griffin from another place.

Interestingly, his prediction that the Liberal Party would have to win more than 52 per cent of the vote in the 1989 election to win government came true. In that election the Liberal Party won essentially 52 per cent of the two-party preferred vote and failed to form government. Such was the community outrage in 1989 that ultimately there was a select committee of the parliament to look into electoral reform matters. As a result of that select committee a referendum was held to the question of whether a fairness clause should be inserted into the state's constitution. The fairness clause in principle was about saying that of the group of candidates, which we would call parties, the party that received the statewide two-party preferred vote of more than 50 per cent should form government; that was the principle of the referendum.

That referendum was supported by the South Australian public, it was then supported by the South Australian parliament, and that principle was put into the South Australian Constitution Act. Since 1989 we have had a fairness clause in the Electoral Act and a requirement for redistributions after every election to try to achieve the outcome that the party that receives 50 per cent or more of the two-party preferred vote forms government.

What has happened since the 1989 election, since the installation of the fairness clause? What has happened is that in half of the elections held since 1989 the party that has received more than 50 per cent of the vote has not formed government. In 2002 the Liberal Party received 50.9 per cent of the vote, in 2010 the Liberal Party received 51.6 per cent of the vote and in 2014, the most recent election, the Liberal Party received 53 per cent of the two-party preferred vote.

What is staggering, to my mind, is that having been outraged by a party receiving 52 per cent of the vote and not forming government, there has been a system put in place to try to ensure fairness and a 53 per cent vote cannot get a party into government. There was outrage at 52 per cent, a select committee, a referendum, a change to the constitution, and now the system has delivered a 53 per cent outcome where the party that has received 53 per cent of the two-party preferred vote does not form government. It was actually a worse result than when the fairness test was introduced.

To my mind, if a 53 to 47 per cent vote cannot guarantee government to the party that receives 53 per cent of the vote, then we need to start debating electoral reform in South Australia. The real question is: can we and should we design a system that guarantees that the majority of voters get what they vote for? Put aside for a minute the issue of whether a new system favours Labor or Liberal—that is quite irrelevant to me—and put aside whether the current system favours Labor or Liberal. I think the parliament has a duty to ask a very simple question: how does the voting system serve the voter? After all, in a democracy, the voting system should be about delivering a vote, delivering to the majority of the state the government that they vote for.

What we have had in South Australia on a repeated basis over many decades, over many elections, is a system where the majority of voters are being outvoted by the minority of voters. Now, for a state that prides itself on its democratic principles, its democratic reforms, the women's vote, the secret ballot, the vote for Aboriginal men early in the piece and ultimately Aboriginal women later in the piece, as I understand it, why would we accept a system going forward that continually delivers a result where the minority of the state can outvote the majority of the state?

My mind turns to the question: how does the current system serve the voter? Members opposite will come in—and you will hear them in the press as well—and say that the simple fact is that the Labor Party ran a better campaign in marginal seats. I will not dispute the argument—they have won the election, that is obvious. It appears to me that I am still on this side of the chamber, which indicates that we are still in opposition. So, lots of experts will talk about what happened at the 2014 or 2010 elections. But at the 2010 election, having won 52 per cent of the vote, we had a redistribution to try to ensure that the party that won 50 per cent of the vote would win government. So, having won 52 per cent in 2010 and then 53 per cent in 2014, the Liberal Party still finds itself in opposition.

How is the voter served by the current system when 92,000 more South Australians wanted a change of government than those who wanted to keep the government—92,000? If you look at it on a two-party preferred basis, about 60,000 people wanted a change of government. On the first preference it is about 92,000. So, on what basis will the parliament sit here and say that we will not engage in the debate to ask whether we should change the system, not to try to help one party or another but in fact to deliver the system that will give the voter the government they vote for?

The purists will say that the way the parliament works is this: that 47 electorates, all on the same day at a general election, vote for their representative. Their representative is voted into the parliament, and then the parliament decides who is the government. The parliament decides who is the government. That would be the purist's argument. There is some validity in that argument, certainly in the process.

There was certainly some validity in the argument 200 years ago, when there was no electronic communications, internet, mobile phones, cars and all those sorts of new transport and communications, where communities were more isolated and when parties did not exist. However, in modern politics, where parties have existed since the early 1900s, I think the public has moved past the system. I think the public has moved to a point where, when they go in to vote in the ballot,

they are going in to vote either to keep a government or to change the government. They do that through voting for Fred or Mary from party A or party B who happens to be their local representative.

I have lost count of the number of people who have walked up to me and said, 'I just do not understand how 53 per cent of the state—92,000 more people in this state—can vote for a party and they do not win.' I think the public would support a change to the system that says if the majority of the state votes for a particular party, they should form government. That was the principle, after all, that the 1989 select committee dealt with and agreed to, that was the principle the parliament signed off on when it put it to the referendum of the people, that was the principle that the people voted for in the 1989 referendum and it is a principle that the current system has failed to deliver on a consistent basis.

It is clear to me that the interface between the system with a fairness clause that uses a two-party preferred vote and a system that uses a 47-seat single-member electorate system is simply not working, and we are getting the results we see. I think it is time to debate changes to the electoral system so that the party that wins the two-party preferred vote is guaranteed government.

You could achieve this through simply asking a different question based on the same ballot we use now. Without changing the ballot, instead of saying, 'Whichever party wins the majority of the 47 seats forms government,' the question you could ask, using exactly the same ballot, is, 'Which party has won the two-party preferred vote statewide?' If you ask that question and that party forms government, then you ask the second question, which is the question we ask now, which is, 'Party A, having won more than 50 per cent of the two-party preferred vote, therefore will be the government: can they control the house?' In other words, do they have 24 seats, or 24 votes, in the house? If they do not have 24 votes in the house, then you need a mechanism to give them 24 votes in the house.

The reason I have this debate is this. The current system requires a redistribution after every election every four years. The redistribution is a difficult process. The law requires the Electoral Commission to look four years ahead at the demographic and population changes, then look at the most recent vote in the election and try to redraw boundaries in four years' time so that if everyone who votes in four years' time votes exactly the same way as the election just passed, the party that gets 50 per cent-plus-one of the two-party preferred vote has the best chance of forming government. That is a most difficult task for a whole range of reasons—population movements, the political issues are different, the economic issues are different and there is a 10 to 15 per cent change in the personalities of voters in electorates through job shift and employment shift and families moving out. There is a whole range of changes. That system is open to error and misjudgement.

What boundary is not open to error or misjudgement? That boundary is the state boundary. The state boundary never changes. There is no calculation needed for population. There is no calculation needed for how people voted last time. All you need to say is, 'We will take the vote on the two-party preferred statewide, and whoever wins that two-party preferred vote wins government.'

The other advantage of this system, and I will come to some more technical issues in a minute, is that governments would govern differently because no longer would the government be concentrated on six or eight marginal seats which they need to win at the election so they pork barrel infrastructure and spending into those seats. Now you would have to win the vote statewide. You would actually have to go out and campaign statewide. So, the cabinet and the government would have a different focus on the way it spent money. There would be more spent on the economic and social benefit rather than the political merit of the decision.

It would also go to campaigning: political parties would campaign significantly differently because, again, you would not concentrate on the marginal seats as much as the statewide vote. What it means is that a Labor vote in Port Adelaide is worth as much as a Labor vote in Burnside or a Labor vote in a marginal seat; a Liberal vote in Burnside is worth as much as a Liberal vote in Port Adelaide or a Liberal vote in a marginal seat. It would enliven the whole campaign, because political parties could lift their vote in areas in which they tend to either run little or no campaigns at the moment. So, I see that advantage: it changes government expenditure, it changes the way political parties campaign and, more importantly, it gives the majority of voters the government they vote for.

So, coming to the question, having decided that a party has won 50 per cent plus one of the two-party preferred vote statewide and therefore that party would be the government, how then can you guarantee that they will form government in the house if it does not have a majority? Well, the way you can guarantee that is with a number of options. They essentially revolve around a top-up

system, whether that be top-up members or top-up votes, and I will just walk through those two or three options.

The first one is you could have top-up members. So, at the point of the election, when all the candidates are nominated, the political parties could nominate a top-up list of somewhere between six and 10 members—pick a figure, it does not really matter—let's say it is 10 members. That list is used if, after the election, the government that wins 50 per cent plus one of the two-party preferred vote and therefore would be the government does not have a majority in the house. They would be entitled to bring people off the list into the chamber as MPs so that they do have a majority of one in the house. What that does is guarantee the public that when the majority of people vote for a party on a statewide basis, that party forms government.

There are options as to how those people could become members of parliament. Should they be elected? Well, you could quite easily put an extension to the existing House of Assembly ballot and simply have a ballot for the top-up members, like you do for the Senate, above the line or below the line. You could even have a separate ballot paper if you wished. Some people argue that is too complicated and people would not understand it.

An option that has been talked about previously is not having them elected but rather simply nominated by the state executive of the particular party and then brought in off the list if they are used. Regardless of the system that is chosen, the ills of that system are less, in my view, than the ills of having a system that allows 92,000 more people to vote for a government and not get the government that they voted for.

Another option is not to have top-up members, but to have top-up votes. That is, rather than saying, 'You need two or three more members of a top-up list to form a majority in the house,' what you say is simply, 'The government that has been elected needs two more votes,' and you simply give the leader of the house or a nominee of the government extra votes so that there are no extra politicians but the public get the government they voted for. Another option that has been put to me is you simply take the number of extra votes that the party got (so 92,000)—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, you might wish to seek leave to continue your remarks.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

[Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00]

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2014

Message from Governor

His Excellency, the Governor, by message, recommended to the House of Assembly the appropriation of such amounts of money as may be required for the purposes mentioned in the Supply Bill 2014.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Lease made under the following Act
Adelaide Park Lands—Park Lands Lease Agreement

By the Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007, Operation of—Report
December 2013

Save the River Murray Fund—Annual Report 2012-13

State of the Environment Report South Australia—Government's Response 2013

Response by the Government—86th Report—Natural Resources Committee—Alinytjara Wilurara APY Ranges Sub-Region Fact-Finding Visit 'Camelot'

Question Time

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Premier. Why was land at Gillman sold to Adelaide Capital Partners without going to tender?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:03): Because it was in the interests of the state of South Australia.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): I have a supplementary question, sir. Why was it not in the public interest to go to tender on that project?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:03): I set this out at length before—and this was an argument you advanced during the election campaign and lost—but if you want the long version we will give you the long version. The truth is that no agreement for sale has in fact been concluded yet; it is only an option. The option was provided because it gave extraordinary benefit for the people of South Australia in this way: first, it attracted a premium price; secondly, it provided for a developer to use—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We know because the relevant independent statutory body told us so.

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The relevant independent statutory body, Renewal SA, told us so. They undertook an exercise to evaluate whether it was good value for money and they told the government that, in fact, it was good value for money. The proposition that was brought to me first by Mr Raymond Spencer, the head of the Economic Development Board, was that this was a proposal which was urgent and in the public interest.

It was about ensuring that a piece of land, which had lain there disused since the old MFP days, a piece of land there at Gillman, could be developed—not using state government's money, but developed using the private sector's money. That money would have to be raised through using investors—South Australian, interstate and overseas investors—to actually put their money on the line to invest the many tens of millions of dollars to bring this land up to a standard which would allow it to be used as a crucial piece of infrastructure for, amongst other things, the mining services sector.

That was an extraordinary opportunity for us here in South Australia. Given that we had identified the fact that this particular endeavour—that is, the mining services sector—is a crucial priority for South Australia, and given that there is a race, essentially, across the nation, for who will be the hub for the nation to actually provide mining services—in particular, for the exciting opportunities in the Cooper Basin for the development of our gas resources—it was critical that we seized an early opportunity for us to be able to provide critical infrastructure for mining services.

What we had was a company that was coming to us with an unsolicited bid which meant that they were proposing to use their money to develop this land in a fashion which would provide for that opportunity—not only the many hundreds of jobs associated with the development of this land, but also the potentially many hundreds and thousands of jobs that would be available if they created a hub for mining services here in South Australia.

So, a company like that comes to us with a proposition of that sort. They say to us, 'We are not going to be in a position to actually go out and seek the international investors that would be necessary to put at risk all of their money unless we have a period of exclusivity so that we can carry out the due diligence necessary for us to be able to then present a serious business case to that community.' So, once we had satisfied ourselves that it was an appropriate land use, once we had satisfied ourselves that this was actually a premium price and good value for money, of course, we said, 'Yes, you have that period of exclusivity.'

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: If, indeed, it be a supplementary.

Mr MARSHALL: Yes. The Premier has told us that the Renewal SA board provided advice that it was a premium price. Can the Premier outline to the house what method Renewal SA used to convey that message regarding the premium price paid?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:08): In writing—the traditional method of communication. In writing, verbally—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Not smoke signals?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —all the traditional methods of communication. No, they didn't use smoke signals.

The SPEAKER: They used words—

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: They used words.

The SPEAKER: —verbally.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right, verbally. We've made that all very clear.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, you'll find this all out. When you cooperate with your mates upstairs to have this inquiry, you will get that mullet in the mouth when you ask that question, because it will become obvious to you. Quite a fascinating piece of communication I did see during this exercise was actually another party that gave an unsolicited bid to us who wanted to use that land, who communicated with the government and said, 'Frankly, this proposition is much superior to the proposition we put to you, and it's not surprising that you actually accepted it.'

Look, I don't understand why those opposite, when they are actually around talking about the nature of the challenges that face South Australia in terms of generating jobs, and who are meant to be the party of private enterprise, don't get in behind a government that's prepared to actually go out there and give a South Australian company—a consortium of fine, young South Australian entrepreneurs who actually have been successful, who want to have a bit of a go and actually do something that's going to develop a piece of land that's lain there dormant for decades—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, you could do nothing with it. We are actually getting on and finding a way of doing something with this piece of land, and here you are wanting to cooperate with an inquiry upstairs that will only jeopardise and cast doubt on this project. When these gentlemen go interstate or overseas and actually advance this proposition, they are going to have to put up with the carping and nonsense and talking down of this proposition by those opposite, so at least do this for us: when you carry out your little exercise with your mates upstairs, at least do it in a way that actually protects the capacity of this deal ultimately to be resolved in the interests of South Australia.

Mr MARSHALL: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Leader, be seated. That would be three supplementaries. I will give it to you. The Premier should not refer to the opposition in the second person. He is, after all, meant to be addressing his remarks through the Speaker. The member for Chaffey needs to be reminded that, in the previous parliament, he had the good fortune to be a long way from the chair and shielded by a bench of agitators who could be blamed for his interjections. That is no longer the case.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It could be, as the leader suggests, Jedi mind control by the member for Kavel. The leader.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My supplementary, sir, is asking the Premier whether he will release this Renewal SA advice regarding the premium price.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:11): You have my answer on the public record.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: You have my answer about the means by which things were communicated to the government.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I have told the house the facts of the matter. I am not accountable—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Bragg and the member for Morialta are called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We have put on the public record all of the relevant information concerning this matter. If those opposite seek to advance an alternative version of events, let them do so, but I am not going to be trotting out at this point—when the negotiations have not yet been concluded—any material which may have the effect of jeopardising—or assisting people who are enemies of—our capacity to reach this agreement, because it is in the interests of South Australia. It is in the interests of South Australia. There are competitors, of course, to this company who might want to advance a different proposition. I am not going to be putting out in the public sphere any information—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —or material that will—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned a first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I will not be putting out in the public sphere any material that will assist those people who are seeking to tear down this important agreement for the state of South Australia. I have made it very clear in this house what the facts of the matter are. If you have an alternative version of those facts, then you have all of your rights to actually exercise particular prerogatives in this place.

If you do not believe what I am saying, make that assertion, but I have told you it has been communicated to us and I am not going to be releasing a swathe of material when there is litigation on foot, when there are competitors who are going to seek to take advantage of this matter. You are only giving comfort to them. You are only putting at risk this important deal in the interests of South Australia.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to the parliament students of Westminster School, who are guests of the member for Elder.

*Question Time***NATIONAL COMMISSION OF AUDIT**

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about the effect on South Australia of introducing measures outlined in the National Commission of Audit?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I warn the member for Bragg for the first time and I call to order the Minister for Health. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:14): The implementation of the recommendations found within the commission of audit—that is, the National Commission of Audit, not to be confused with the proposed state commission of audit from the Liberal Party, should they have formed government—would be dire for South Australia. The report released last Thursday is actually—

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Yes, point of order. Member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: How is this question not hypothetical given that the commission of audit has only made recommendations to the government which hasn't responded? So, how can the Premier possibly respond to policies of the federal government that have not yet been determined by the federal government?

The SPEAKER: We have been here before, member for Davenport. The National Commission of Audit is a fact. It is not an apparition, or a mirage, or a poltergeist.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned for the second and final time. The commission of audit is a fact and it is not hypothetical to say what the effect of its recommendations would be on the state of South Australia.

Mr Whetstone: It's like saying, 'Where's Wally?'

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: In fact it is difficult to identify any areas that have been quarantined from cuts in the National Commission of Audit. The report targets such fundamental government services such as income assistance, education, housing and health care, of course, by charging to access primary health care and increasing the cost of life-saving medicines. It proposes to limit services, slowing the roll-out of initiatives that would better support those with disabilities, reducing funding for children in our schools, rationalising programs for Aboriginal Australians and charging for and changing housing support services.

It proposes to devolve functions without necessarily devolving the financing. It seeks to implement reforms that would see many South Australians receive less money for doing the same work. It raises the retirement age while reducing the amount of the aged pension, forcing thousands of South Australians to work years longer before retiring to receive meagre retirement benefits. Of course, when I raised the spectre of cuts of this sort during the election campaign, the Leader of the Opposition scoffed at those propositions.

These recommendations for implementation were developed by four individuals—not by parliament, not by a minister, not even by a cabinet, not even by an elected member, but by four individuals—headed by a representative from, obviously, one of the more privileged sections of our community. While the federal Liberal government has been widely criticised for this report, the reality is that the cuts commission is actually deep in the DNA of Liberals everywhere. It represents the real agenda of Liberal governments and, when I warned about this in the election about the governments of Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria all having implemented similar cuts commissions where policy decisions were outsourced, once again we found that we were ridiculed.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will not provoke the Treasurer, who is a hair's breadth from departing the chamber.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the leader to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is the fate that we dodged through not having those opposite on the Treasury benches now. This is precisely what was coming our way if the Leader of the Opposition had received—

Mr PISONI: Point of order, sir. The Premier is entering debate.

Mr Marshall: And not very well either!

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to what the Premier has to say.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The government is the only government in this nation that is prepared to stand up against these cuts.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We saw the spectre at COAG the other day, a series of Liberal ministers all lining up—

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —to express how grateful they were for the Prime Minister bestowing some modest spending proposals on them at COAG, and no references were made to these important cuts. We are standing up here in South Australia for ourselves and also for the nation. We are prepared to stand up to protect the basic services that have created the standard of living that many of us find enviable in this state and this nation. There is no doubt that what is happening here is a challenge for us in this state, but we cannot cut and affect those most vulnerable in our community to resolve it.

NATIONAL COMMISSION OF AUDIT

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (14:19): Supplementary question: following the Premier's comments about cuts, is it still the government's intention to proceed with \$900 million worth of cuts to the health budget over the forward estimates?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Health Industries) (14:19): The health budget will grow by \$500 million between now and—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Let there be no mistake, the greatest threat to the South Australian health system is those members opposite, those members opposite whose friends in Canberra and their audit commission—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order from the member for Stuart. If I anticipate it correctly, the Minister for Health is not responsible to the house for the opposition in this house, though he may be responsible for the effect of the federal government's policies.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: If you're going to support that one, then that is what I was going to say.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I agree with myself.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: And that is exactly what I was going to say, sir. The greatest threat to the South Australian health budget is the proposals coming from Canberra, particularly the commonwealth government's proposal, or the proposal coming out of the audit commission, to

renege on the national health agreement. That would have a significant impact on the South Australian health budget and seriously compromise services.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: standing order 98. The minister is not directing his answer to the substance of the question, which was simply: is he going to continue with his \$900 million cut? He is debating the issue.

The SPEAKER: Well, that's a fine judgement. It seems to me that the member for Davenport really invited this rant, and he is going to have to hear it.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Thank you, sir. I don't know whether to take that as a compliment, sir. Every dollar in health will be reinvested back into our state hospitals. Every single dollar that we find in making our system more efficient will be reinvested back into our health system, an opportunity members opposite had to make a pledge about before the last election, along those lines, but something that they studiously refused to do.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Was an independent valuation of the land at Gilman undertaken and was the advice provided to cabinet when making a decision regarding the Adelaide Capital Partners proposal?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:22): The advice that we based our decision on was whether this was good value for money in relation to the offer that we received for this piece of land. We were told that we were gaining a premium price. That was the very clear advice that we received from Renewal SA. The way in which they gathered their information is a matter for them. They presented that to us. We relied upon that advice we received in reaching that judgement.

Can I just add this particular caveat? This has not been an agreement that has been settled yet. This is an option for a company to go out to investigate whether it can gain the international investors necessary to be able to proceed with this process. They were not going to spend the money necessary to do that unless they had a period of exclusivity. That is all that has been given. We are preserving the capacity for them to be able to raise the funds to allow them to be able to make this extraordinary investment which will develop this important piece of land for the future of South Australia.

So, in all of your efforts about scrutinising this matter—and I have no difficulty with the scrutiny at all; in fact, I think you will be surprised at what you will find when you do participate in the select committee in the upper house—I ask you to take care in ensuring that you do not do this in a way that puts in jeopardy this important arrangement for the future of South Australia. Of course it is a massive threat to South Australia if you behave badly and destructively and cause us to lose this opportunity. The people of South Australia will visit at your feet the loss of the opportunity to develop a piece of land that has been lying idle for decades and decades. If that happens, we will place it firmly at your feet.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary from the leader.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Can the Premier confirm which board gave this advice to cabinet: whether it was the Renewal SA board before or after the four out of seven resignations?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:25): The Renewal SA board provided this information.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Renewal SA—

Mr Pisoni: What was the date? Give us the date then.

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I might add that these are spookily like the fishing exercise that is being undertaken in litigation proceedings that are actually going on at the moment. I know those opposite come in here advancing the interests—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: A point of order.

Mr GARDNER: This bears no relationship to the question, which was: which board, before or after the resignations, provided the advice?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am not going to stand here—

The SPEAKER: Premier, I should make a ruling on that. I would draw the Premier back to the substance of the question: which board gave the advice?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Mr Speaker, there is one board and it has continuous existence. The constitution of the board at any one point in time is irrelevant and I will not be putting in the public sphere information which is being sought to be gained through litigation which is presently being undertaken in the courts.

Ms Chapman: It's got nothing to do with it.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No. Of course, it's got a lot to do with it. You are coming in here advancing questions that certain litigants—are being advanced against the government. They are competitors in these processes—commercial competitors. Rather than acting on the basis of some commercial interest, why not act in the public interest, South Australia's interest, which is to actually preserve the capacity for us to enter an arrangement in South Australia's interest? Don't start coming in here running a line on behalf of some private sector competitor that wants to unravel this arrangement.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir: 127. That is clearly imputing improper motive on members of the opposition.

The SPEAKER: There's a point of order from the member for Morialta: 127. Refresh my memory.

Mr GARDNER: The Premier is clearly imputing improper motive on members of the opposition.

The SPEAKER: And the improper motive is that the opposition is acting in the interests of a litigant?

Mr GARDNER: Those are the Premier's words, sir.

The SPEAKER: I ask the Premier, if indeed he is imputing improper motives, not to do so.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: My proposition is this: that those opposite—I don't know what their motivations are, but they are asking questions which are the same questions that are being asked in litigation of the government and I am requesting that they act in the state interest, not in the interests of a private—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be seated. I understood the Premier—

Mr GARDNER: Sir, I have a new point of order.

The SPEAKER: I will hear your point of order first.

Mr GARDNER: The Premier has gone on to not withdraw the allegations that he made that the opposition was coming in here and asking questions on behalf of a group of people. He is saying it in a different way, but the original claim still stands and it is clearly in contravention of 127 in the standing orders.

The SPEAKER: No, I don't think it is. I think the Premier has now reformulated in a way that makes it comply with the standing orders. The Premier said that the questions the opposition are asking are questions that a party to litigation are asking, and that is an acceptable formulation; it is not to impute that the opposition are acting in the interests of a party to litigation. The Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The gravamen of the matter is this: we have advice that has been provided by an independent statutory body, not by the personal opinions of any board members, however constituted at any one point in time, but information which demonstrates that this is a premium price for the piece of land in question. That is not a matter of opinion by board members at any one point in time, it is a matter of empirical fact that is gathered from valuations, etc., that have formed the basis for their opinion.

That is not something that is going to alter, whatever the composition of the board is at any one point in time. That is information that has a factual basis to it and is going to be able to be rebutted or confirmed on the basis of the analysis of that material, so let's be absolutely clear about that. The advice to us was crystal clear that this was a premium price for that land.

The point about this is that we needed to preserve the capacity for this piece of land to be developed in this fashion. Remember that the only other propositions that have been advanced about this matter had actually involved much inferior offers on the price for this land, or the state government itself investing significant sums of money to actually lift the value of this land. It is pretty basic, sir: if you were to spend tens and tens of millions of dollars on a piece of land to upgrade it by filling it up and bringing it to a certain standard, of course it is going to be worth more. That is the basic proposition that has been advanced against us.

This company was not only prepared to spend its own money increasing the value of the land, it was prepared to give us a premium price for the land, so of course we wanted to preserve the capacity for the South Australian government to get that arrangement in the state's interest, and that is all that we have done. They have been given a period of exclusivity so that they can prove this thing up, and I hope that they get to do that. I hope those opposite do not destroy our opportunity to do so.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary, sir: can the Premier inform the house when this independent statutory advice was provided to cabinet?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:31): I can bring back an answer about that particular; I don't have it at my fingertips.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the first time. The member for Colton.

UNIVERSAL ACCESS PROGRAM

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development, and I also congratulate you on your election to high office, sir. Can the minister update the house regarding the continuation of federal funding for increased preschool access for South Australian children?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:31): I thank the member for Colton for this question. The former federal Labor government, with state and territory governments, established the Universal Access Program to increase the hours of preschool that children receive in the year before commencing full-time schooling from 12 hours a week to 15 hours a week. We entered that agreement because this government recognises that early childhood education is the foundation on which later education is based, and that is why we have made the early years one of our highest priorities across government.

This is an important social issue and it is an important economic issue to ensure that our children develop to their best potential. This national partnership agreement on early childhood education was aimed at improving early childhood services throughout Australia, and importantly, lifting participation. This partnership provides \$955 million nationally; in 2012-13, it delivered \$30.9 million to the South Australian preschool sector.

On 11 April, I joined fellow education and early childhood ministers in Canberra for the Standing Council on School Education and Early Childhood. At this standing council, South Australia sought agreement from the Abbott Liberal government for their ongoing financial commitment which funds the additional hours of preschool here in South Australia. These extra preschool hours are

critical in giving our kids the best possible start to their formal education, and funding ceases at the end of this year.

Not surprisingly, the other states and territories were also extremely concerned about the very real possibility that our preschool-aged children will have their access cut. In South Australia, as I said, it is three hours per week (20 per cent). In some jurisdictions where state governments do not fund access to preschool at the same level as the South Australian government, access could drop to as low as 10 hours a week. South Australia invests nearly double the national average in the early years.

Our children's centres, our preschools and, importantly, our families, have worked hard to provide the best possible learning experience for our youngsters. Removal of this funding will cause chaos in the system and distress to something like 20,000 families in South Australia alone. Our children should not be the subject of Tony Abbott's costcutting; they deserve better.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond, whom I should have called to order much earlier, is now called to order. I see the member for Unley.

UNIVERSAL ACCESS PROGRAM

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:34): A supplementary question. Can the minister rule out that any of the \$190 million in unspecified cuts that were announced in May and confirmed in the November Budget and Finance Committee hearing last year will not be in the areas of early childhood development?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:35): What I can assure the house is that the budget for the Department for Education and Child Development is growing, and over the period 2013-14 to 2017-18 we will see something like a \$1.9 billion increase in budgets. What I can rule out is any cut to frontline services; what I can rule out is the 25,000 cuts across the Public Service that Isobel Redmond announced; what I can confirm—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated.

Mr GARDNER: The minister is indulging in what you have previously always ruled as debate, so 98, and while I am here I might as well also point out that she is referring to members not by their titles.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the minister was not referring to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Gardner: The member for Heysen.

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen, who is not even here to defend herself, and accordingly I call—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, I warn the minister for the first time and call her back to the substance of the supplementary question.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I apologise to the member for Heysen. My mind flipped back to a video that I recently saw that used the line that Isobel Redmond wanted to cut 25,000 jobs, so I apologise to the house and Isobel Redmond.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: On this occasion—

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am apologising.

The SPEAKER: — the minister was quoting from a celebrated video.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am apologising. South Australia leads the nation in its early childhood services. We are incredibly proud of the innovations that we have put in place, none of which were in place when the Liberals were in government. Early childhood was not even on the agenda; it was never discussed.

The SPEAKER: That is of historical interest but not relevant to the question. The Leader of the Opposition.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): My question is to the Premier. Does the agreement between the state government and Adelaide Capital Partners that was entered into in December last year require the state government to provide any infrastructure upgrades near or on the subject land?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:37): I will take that on notice, because I believe that any information in respect of that would be something I would have to inquire of Renewal SA.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): A supplementary question. Will the Premier, or the Deputy Premier for that matter, release the agreement between the state government and Adelaide Capital Partners that was entered into in December last year?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:38): I think the Premier has made this fairly clear. At the moment the situation is that—and I will use terminology different from the Premier—there is what amounts to an option which has yet to be exercised. And can I say that there are commercial matters relevant to the current holder of that option which would be affected by their potential competitors, some of which are well known to members opposite, I believe, being apprised of elements of their commercial arrangements while still in the period where the option is yet to be exercised. Therefore, I have no intention of releasing that material.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): A supplementary question. Will the government cooperate with the select committee of the inquiry into the sale of the state government owned land at Gillman and, if requested by that select committee to release that, will the government release that agreement?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:39): As always, the government will comply with all of the usual niceties attached to requests for information from select committees directed towards the government of the day.

NATIONAL COMMISSION OF AUDIT

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Health. What will be the impact on South Australian hospitals of a \$15 GP tax, as recommended by Tony Abbott's Commission of Audit?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health might answer that bearing in mind that he has already given us the benefit of his wisdom on much of this in response to a supplementary from the member for Davenport.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Health Industries) (14:40): But sir, there is so much more information to provide to the house, and I thank the member for Elder for her question. She is obviously very concerned about what impact this tax might have.

Let me make one thing clear to the house: this is a reprehensible proposal. The Abbott government's ever-increasing GP tax will put unprecedented pressure on our emergency departments. Tony Abbott's government spent most of 2014 softening Australians up that they will have to pay \$6 every time they visit a GP; now the Commission of Audit has said it should be \$15. For the majority of people who aren't bulk-billed, that is on top of the existing gap payment.

So—let's be under no illusions—this is what will happen: we will see an influx of people avoiding their doctor because of the GP tax and instead heading straight to their local emergency department. On average, South Australians spend around 20 minutes waiting to be seen in an emergency department. Our very own conservative internal modelling has shown that even if just over 6 per cent of South Australians boycotted the \$15 GP tax, that wait could grow to at least 98 minutes, and that is just an average. The wait would be far greater in our peak periods.

This is the situation we are faced with: we can expect to see an extra 610,000 patients every year in the non-emergency triage categories of 3, 4 and 5 if this \$15 tax goes ahead. The biggest problem with this is that the predicted increase in primary care-type patients coming to an emergency department for treatment is likely to compromise the ability to treat more acute patients in an emergency. Worse still, patients in need may choose to delay access to treatment for their illness.

I have asked the federal health minister in person before and I ask him and Tony Abbott again to immediately rule out a GP tax. If this reprehensible proposal proceeds, South Australian families will be paying more for their health care but receiving far less as a result of Tony Abbott's budget of broken promises. What's more, given we saw the charge more than double overnight, from \$6 to \$15, we should all have grave fears for what it might be in coming years.

The government believes that all South Australian families have a fundamental right to the world's best health care; it is clear that the opposition's colleagues in Canberra believe the exact opposite. By their inaction, members opposite are complicit in the death of Medicare as we know it. It is past time—

Members interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Health will be seated.

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, you may not have heard, but the minister just accused the opposition of being complicit in the deaths of South Australians. That is a disgraceful allegation and I ask him to withdraw it immediately.

The SPEAKER: Under standing orders—indeed under the general law—you can defame groups of people; it is only individuals you can't defame. I would ask the Minister for Health to bridle his tongue, and in fact I think we have probably heard enough of the Minister for Health.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier or the Premier's office been asked by the Auditor-General to provide evidence to an inquiry concerning the Gillman land deal?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:44): Maybe it would be better described as the downfall of Medicare rather than the death of Medicare, if that is an acceptable formulation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Not funny?

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey isn't funny either, and he's warned a first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: If the Auditor-General were to ask us any questions to assist him in evaluating the Gillman land deal of course we would cooperate but I'm unaware as to whether he has. I understand that this would be a routine transaction that he would inquire into and ask questions about, and when and if he does he will receive the full cooperation of the government, because we have nothing to hide. In fact, it is something I hope will ultimately lead to a successful agreement and something that we will be very proud of, but let's abide those considerations.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): I have a supplementary question. Has the Premier or the Premier's office been asked by any other investigative body to provide evidence to an inquiry concerning the Gillman land deal?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:45): Not that I'm aware of, no.

PREMIER'S COMMUNITY EXCELLENCE AWARDS IN MINING AND ENERGY

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Can the minister inform the house about the outcome of the Premier's Community Excellence Awards in Mining and Energy?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Automotive Transformation) (14:46): Mr Speaker, I understand that it is traditional to congratulate the Speaker on his re-election. Last night it was an honour to present the awards at the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy Annual Resources Industry Dinner—its night of nights. I was pleased to see members of the opposition there last night: the member for Flinders, the member for Hammond and, of course, the shadow minister was there.

These awards acknowledge and celebrate companies that contribute not just economically but socially to South Australia's local, regional and statewide communities. This government is committed to delivering benefits from mining for all South Australians. Many in this place have heard of the significant growth in the resources sector under the stewardship of this government. The bipartisan approach to growing our state's resources sector for the benefit of all South Australians has seen much success.

Combined, the South Australian minerals and petroleum sectors have produced a record production of \$6.9 billion. That compares to about \$1.6 billion a decade ago. The \$6.9 billion in production value is also a considerable step up from the \$6.2 billion in 2012. It is a tremendous progression. However, monetary output is not the only expression of this sector's success. The Premier's awards provide a fitting platform to recognise companies that are digging deeper.

This year's entries showcased an impressive range of initiatives contributing economically, socially and environmentally to the South Australian community. The fourth year of the Premier's awards saw a growing number of entrants with 18 entrants from 13 companies. The 2014 Premier's Community Excellence Awards in Mining and Energy produced winners in four categories. The first one is very close to my heart because I was the corrections minister when we started this program, and that is Excellence in Social Inclusion. BHP Billiton's Prisoner Reintegration Employment Opportunities (PREOP) stood out as a bold initiative. The program has brought about life-changing opportunities for participants and has had a remarkable success rate since BHP Billiton implemented it in 2009.

Another category, Excellence in Supporting Communities, was awarded to IMX Resources. IMX Resources has made a major contribution to life in Coober Pedy by providing financial incentives to fly-in fly-out workers to settle in the town of Coober Pedy, bolstering the community's local economic viability. The next one—and as a father of two daughters a very important award for me—was the Excellence in Leadership—Women in Resources, and that went to Thiess. Thiess has implemented a broad range of initiatives to support the potential of women at all levels in its workforce and included the company's Women in Mining Strategic Plan which addressed the needs of women to progress their mining careers and achieve equality.

Of course, environmental excellence was awarded to Iluka Resources, recognised for its Pro-Activity-Beyond Compliance initiative and research work. That research work involves collaboration with the Adelaide Botanic Garden and local universities on Iluka's rehabilitation activities.

All the winners and applicants showcased their substantial and lasting impacts on our resources sector, and it is shaping our state's social landscape. There are a number of licences that companies apply for, and one that this parliament cannot grant—that is, their social licence to operate—and these companies are exemplars of what South Australian companies are doing to gain their social licence to operate.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Did the minister attend any meetings with Adelaide Capital Partners last year, when he was deputy chief of staff to the Premier?

The SPEAKER: I don't think the minister can be responsible to the house for things he did before he was a minister.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: If this is a question about the Gillman land deal, it should be directed to either the Deputy Premier or the Premier. Questions of ministers about what their involvement was with things—

The SPEAKER: Yes. Well, I agree with that. I agree with the Minister for Health and, therefore, it is quite in order for the Treasurer to answer it, or the Premier.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Could you ask it again?

Ms CHAPMAN: I certainly can. Did the now Minister for Transport attend any meetings with Adelaide Capital Partners last year, during the time that he was the deputy chief of staff to the Premier?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:51): I'm not aware of the answer to that question, but we will make inquiries and we'll find out what the answer is.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the first time.

An honourable member: Second.

The SPEAKER: The second time? I'm sorry; second time.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): I'll address again a question to the Minister for Transport as the minister assisting the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Minister, were you involved in the evaluation of the Adelaide Capital Partners Gillman proposal?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:52): Again, I will seek to obtain information about these matters and get back—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Finniss is called to order and the leader is warned for the first time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Let's be very clear about this. What the honourable member is asking of the member of this house is a question regarding a matter which appears to be of interest to those members opposite because they, I assume, have not listened carefully to what the Premier has been telling them all day. Their questions are now directed towards a member of this house in respect of a period during which he was neither a member of this house nor the responsible minister, but the question is framed in terms of the particular ministry that he currently holds. I will attempt to answer the question and, in order to do so, I will have to seek information.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Was that the member for Chaffey again—sighing? He is warned for the second time.

Mr WILLIAMS: Mr Speaker, is it your ruling that sighing is unparliamentary?

The SPEAKER: Yes, if it's audible. The deputy leader.

DEBELLE INQUIRY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): My question again is to the Attorney-General. Has the legal event identified by Justice Debelle in the education inquiry report as preventing the publication of the unedited version of the report now occurred?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for her question, and I would like to advise the parliament as best I can in relation to the matter. As things presently stand, I have sought advice from the Director of Public Prosecutions, so what I am about to say might seem a little unhelpful but, nevertheless, for those who can read between the lines, it says all it needs to say. I think I should start off by quoting the famous former secretary of state of the United States, Mr Donald Rumsfeld, that there are the things called the 'known knowns, the known unknowns—

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Defence.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —defence, I beg your pardon. There are the 'known knowns, the known unknowns and the unknown unknowns.' The particular answer to this question incorporates all three of those and, because of that—if I can still explain it this way—there are known knowns. They are not so bad; that is all good. Then there are seriously some known unknowns which are yet to become known.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am not joking. I am being quite serious about this.

An honourable member: You do have privilege, John.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, I know, but I am trying to stick with the spirit of the recommendations of Mr Debelle's report. Mr Debelle was concerned that before a particular event had been resolved, there should not be the release of an unedited version of the report.

An honourable member: Correct.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Okay. Perhaps another way of explaining it is that, in the space of known unknowns and unknown unknowns, there is still the capability of a matter yet to be resolved.

Ms Chapman: So the answer is no.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: So, the answer is: for the time being, in view of those unknowns, it is not my intention to release the report but, having said that, as soon as I am clear from the Director of Public Prosecutions that those unknowns have become clear, one way or the other, the spirit of the recommendations of Mr Debelle will be embraced and that will in due course result in the release of the material unedited.

DEBELLE INQUIRY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): Could the Attorney-General then advise as to the further events that are to occur or not occur to disqualify the release of the report and transcript and documents and the like, given that this morning charges against the offender have been dropped and the suppression order lifted? I am sure the Attorney will be well aware of that. What are the other impeding features that prevent him from determining that the legal event has occurred?

An honourable member: That's the unknown unknowns

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (14:57): Yes. Look, I was trying to be slightly—

Ms Chapman: Funny.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, careful about how I described this. Again, because I am not wishing to cross the boundary that was originally set by Mr Debelle, I am being careful in what I am saying. I have been advised by the DPP—and I am being careful about what I am saying here—that at present there is the possibility of further legal action relevant to this particular matter which may disturb the

current state of affairs. For that reason, and for that reason alone, I am reluctant to go into any further exposition on the matter, but I can tell the honourable member that it will be clear fairly soon whether or not that other matter is a live matter.

If it is clear that that other matter is not going to proceed, then that is fine and as far as I am concerned the release that the honourable member is asking about would be in order. If that other matter remains a live matter, then it may be some time until the release is in order. Another way of explaining this is that this is completely out of the hands of the Crown, this particular unknown that I am talking about. It is not a matter of the Crown having to make a choice here. It is a matter of somebody else having to make a choice.

CLARE VALLEY WATER SUPPLY

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. What will be the savings for Clare Valley grape growers as a result of the government agreeing to provide relief in respect of their water prices?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Automotive Transformation) (14:59): I will get a detailed answer from the Minister for Water and get back to the house for the member.

SA WATER

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (14:59): I hope this one can be answered. Again, it is for the Minister for Regional Development. Has the government agreed to the minister's proposal to return part of the SA Water dividends to regional sporting associations and councils?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Automotive Transformation) (14:59): All these announcements will become very clear on budget day, and I am sure that the member for Goyder (who is an eager reader of the South Australian budget) will have all his questions answered on that day.

MEMBER FOR FROME, GOVERNMENT AGREEMENT

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:00): I hope we'll get an answer to this one, sir. My question is again to the Minister for Regional Development, and I refer to the question I posed to you yesterday about the agreement you have with the Premier. Now that the minister has had 24 hours to check if his agreement with the Premier allows him to introduce private members' bills, can the minister confirm the position?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:00): Thank you. To answer your question, no, I haven't had that opportunity. I have been doing some other things and I haven't had the opportunity to ask the Premier at this particular point, but it will be done in the next 24 hours.

The SPEAKER: Member for Goyder are you finished?

Mr GRIFFITHS: I am rather frustrated sir.

The SPEAKER: I didn't ask for your state of mind: I asked whether you wanted another question.

Mr GRIFFITHS: That all impacts on the way we say things.

ROAD FUNDING

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:00): My question is again to the Minister for Regional Development. Minister, have you sought contact with the federal departments about the extension of the supplementary special local road funding beyond the 2013-14 financial year?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Automotive Transformation) (15:00): I'll do it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: All negotiations with the commonwealth government regarding funding are done through the Treasurer. I will have negotiations with Treasurer Hockey. In terms of road funding, other ministers will have their appropriate discussions with their federal counterparts. As we wait for the May budget, we will see what the commonwealth does. We will see what Mr Hockey delivers for South Australia and, indeed, what our federal South Australian Liberal ministers deliver for South Australia to which, no doubt, we will hold them to account. So we will wait with eagerness to see what they deliver for South Australians in their funding.

ROAD FUNDING

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:01): A supplementary question: given that the Treasurer refers to 'holding to account', and I have received—as other members have—numerous letters from local government seeking support for an extension to this funding program, as the minister responsible, is minister Brock able to outline what he has done?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:01): To answer this, we have made contact with minister Truss's office and are waiting for a response to come back from there.

COMMUNITY HOUSING

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Social Housing. Can the minister tell the house when the transfer of the two parcels of 500 Housing SA properties at Elizabeth Vale and Mitchell Park will be finalised?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:02): I thank the member for his question. The Better Places Stronger Communities Project which was announced in June 2013 includes a number of initiatives to help achieve the government's aim of growing the community housing sector. The program will transfer the management of approximately 1,000 tenanted public housing dwellings to community housing providers in two transfers of around 500 properties in the first half of 2015.

A two-stage national tender process has been used to select the community housing providers to partner with Housing SA in this program. Stage 1 of the tender process was completed in January 2014. Shortlisted organisations from Stage 1 of the tender were asked to submit formal proposals for management strategy in Stage 2 which closed on 25 March 2014. Responses are currently being evaluated with the outcomes expected to be announced in September 2014.

COMMUNITY HOUSING

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (15:04): My question is again to the Minister for Social Housing. Will the successful tenderers for these properties be paying council rates, and will the rates be discounted?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:04): I thank the member for his question. As I am aware, community housing providers do not currently pay the full council rates, but I will come back to the house with a full answer to this question.

Grievance Debate

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:04): I rise today to speak about the lack of appropriate health services available to Hammond residents living in Goolwa and the Fleurieu Peninsula as well. The Fleurieu Peninsula is one of the many magnificent regional areas to live in in South Australia, and sustained population growth in the area reflects this. However, I am continually contacted about concerns regarding the lack of appropriate services available to the area, particularly regarding health.

First and foremost, my concerns do not lie with the local GPs, nurses and medical support staff who serve the Fleurieu Peninsula community. Regional medical staff do a fantastic job with the limited resources available, often working ridiculously long hours to better the lives of those living in

the area. My concerns rest with the state Labor government. The state government has driven this state into devastating debt and deficit, and I would be outraged if regional health is impacted in the coming state budget.

We have heard the government bang on about its charter for a stronger regional policy and its new-found commitment to be more responsive to the needs of South Australia's regional communities. However, forgive me for being sceptical after 12 years of neglect. If this government is to govern for all the people, those in regional areas such as the Fleurieu Peninsula deserve the same health services as are afforded to their city cousins. Whilst health services as a whole on the Fleurieu Peninsula do require improvement, there are specific matters I would like to bring to the attention of the parliament of South Australia.

Firstly, it is devastating to hear that the Southern Fleurieu Cancer Support and Resources Group is facing service closures because of changes made to transport programs by the health department. The group, which relies entirely on donations, fundraising and volunteers, provides a door-to-door cancer car transport service for Fleurieu Peninsula residents who need to travel to Adelaide for cancer-related treatment and medical appointments. In the past year, this group made 450 trips to Adelaide and carried 1,166 passengers at a cost of only \$21,000. However, the service is currently at risk because passengers relying on the service are no longer eligible for reimbursement thanks to changes made by the health department to the transport assistance scheme.

A cancer sufferer recently highlighted to me that it costs her \$44 for a return trip to the Flinders Medical Centre from the Fleurieu for radiotherapy treatment, a total of \$1,320 to undergo her radiotherapy program, five days per week for six weeks. Isn't she suffering enough? Combined with the current lack of affordable and public transport between metropolitan areas and the Fleurieu and residents being ineligible for the Patient Assisted Transport Scheme due to the hundred kilometre distance threshold, the cancer car is extremely important. Residents are being left in a vulnerable position.

Finally, I am concerned with the limited services available for residents suffering from mental health issues and substance abuse. There are very limited services of support and rehabilitation for people and their families who are suffering from and impacted upon by drug addiction. This has become a very common issue in regional areas, which I am consistently learning about. Currently, Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia visits the Fleurieu Peninsula on limited occasions, and the closest support group for families is based in Hallett Cove, 70 kilometres away. These families are suffering. Surely this support is not enough.

Secondly, whilst it is refreshing to hear the state government has committed to improving mental health in this state, this dire situation requires serious attention. As stated yesterday by the Governor, the rate of suicide in South Australian rural areas is significantly worse than those in metropolitan areas. One constituent recently expressed how difficult mental health is for her family and simply how bad the situation is, and I quote:

My son who is only 19 has tried to take his own life 3 times in the last month. The only way I got him help was to have him detained under the Mental Health Act.

This is outrageous, and support services must be improved. I have raised this matter with the government in the past, and it is disappointing that my concerns continue to fall on deaf ears. I am sure the member for Finniss wholly supports me in this endeavour. I call on the government of South Australia to improve health services on the Fleurieu Peninsula through its supposed commitment to regional South Australia.

MODBURY CRICKET CLUB

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:10): It was my recent pleasure on 4 April to attend the Modbury Hawks Cricket Club 2013-14 presentation dinner at Sfera's on the Park at Modbury. Being patron and enjoying an association with this section of the Modbury Sporting Club is one of my greatest pleasures as the member for Florey. They are a great group of people supporting a fine group of young men, who really impressed at the presentation night in the way they handled the event. Cricket is certainly in good hands—or should I say 'safe' hands—with a very bright future ahead for this local cricket club.

Thanks go to outgoing president Sue Russell, who took over from past president Dean Anderson three years ago. Sue has done a marvellous job and has set a fine example for Mark

Hickey and the new committee. Sue faced the daunting role of locating grounds for this very big club to use for competitions and practice while major works have been going on at their home oval on Golden Grove Road, which is very close to the member for Newland's boundary as well.

Volunteers play a huge and very important role in the management and smooth running of any club, and the Modbury Cricket Club is no different. We have Michael Wood with tea and selection night sausage sizzles. Tanner Claessen-Smith has assisted collecting subs and assisted Paul Summerton with team management of the under 17s. Special thanks go to Sue's right hands Keldyn Radan and Aaron Summerton and the wonderful Gayle Summerton, of course, who has been a mainstay and stalwart of the club for many years.

Murray Duthie and Mark Galliford as coach and senior coach to the five senior sides are rebuilding teams and experiencing great early successes, with many juniors coming through the ranks. C grade made the grand final and the young side fell just short to the very experienced Ingle Farm team in their final game. Congratulations and thanks go to all the junior coaches. Junior teams made many finals this year and every age group won a flag, which is a remarkable achievement and augurs very well for the future of the club and cricket in general in our area.

Sue has developed the relationship between the Adelaide Turf Cricket Association, with the Modbury Cricket Club winning third place in the 'Spirit of Cricket' award. While on the ATCA achievements, Steve Bryan won C3 bowler of the year with 31 wickets and Brayden Nicol was equal winner of the under 17s bowler of the year with 23 wickets.

We also have the under 17 Bank SA reps Venusha Halahakoon and Brayden Nicol being selected to play. In the under 15 SAMCA we have Jashanpreet Singh, Isaac Hewson and Jai Kite being selected, as well as Mark Hickey being coach. For the under 13 NEJCA we have Kyle Brazil making the team. Kyle also made the SAMCA under 13 team of the year. For the under 11 SAMCA team, congratulations go to Hayden Cesaro, William Morris and William Radan. Hayden was captain and made the under 11 team of the year.

While on special mentions, we have hat tricks, which are very difficult to get in cricket: Randil Gunasinghe bowled a 3/9 in the under 13 brown team twenty20 knockouts against Modbury Gold, and Hayden Cesaro bowled 5/2, which is an amazing figure, in the under 11 browns against the Eastern Suburbs #1 Dragons. There are too many other career milestones to go through. We had a huge list of firsts in the Modbury Cricket Club this year.

I know the club would also like me to mention Glenn 'Kanga' Brakmanis, who sadly lost his battle with cancer aged 45 last year. He has been a stalwart of the club, starting his junior career in the 1980-81 season as a 12 year old and winning the junior cricketer of the year and playing in the premierships, before progressing to the seniors where he excelled as both a player and an administrator. He served seven consecutive years as secretary of the Modbury Cricket Club, including holding the dual role of secretary/treasurer in the 1989-90 season at the tender age of 21.

In that same season, Glenn also produced one of the most outstanding individual performances that will probably never be matched, picking up the A grade bowling award, senior cricketer of the year and the prestigious clubman of the year award. Among the many highlights of his 141 games, he played in two B grade premierships and collected 169 wickets, highlighted by a 7/51 versus ETSA in the A grade. He amassed 1,541 runs, with a highest score of 84, and shared a record opening C grade partnership of 220.

In 1998, just when he was due to hit his prime, Glenn prematurely retired, aged 30, to further his career interstate with the National Bank. He tried to play a few games in Melbourne but never really stuck at it; he was truly a Modbury boy with one brown eye and one gold eye. He was a true legend of the Modbury Cricket Club and will be sadly missed by all who have known him. Although he has been called away far too early, his legacy will live on in the club and his name will remain forever in the hearts and memories of all involved.

WATER CATCHMENT AREAS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (15:15): I rise today to talk about very important publicly owned—so, taxpayer owned—assets under the control of SA Water: I am talking specifically of the water catchments in regional areas all around the state. They are very important, and in many cases are used for drinking water, but in many cases are not used for drinking water. I put clearly on

the record my disappointment at the very limited access the public is given to its own assets by SA Water.

I understand the importance of drinking water and the importance of having to protect those assets. The assets are not just the reservoirs, but the bush catchments around them. They do need to be managed, and they do need to be looked after very well, because you cannot take chances with drinking water. I guess there are two really important points here: one is that many of these reservoirs are not used for drinking water; many of them are just used for irrigation.

Many of them, in fact, are used for drinking water interstate without any problems whatsoever. I am aware that in Tasmania, New South Wales, Victoria and the ACT for sure, and quite possibly in other states and territories, reservoirs which are used for drinking water are open to the public. They are not open to the public to do absolutely anything that they want to do in them, quite naturally, but they are made available to the public for recreational purposes.

I think it is also important to point out that the River Murray is where we get the vast majority of drinking water for our state, and yet you are allowed to canoe, swim, fish etc. in the River Murray. These assets interstate are used for a very wide range of recreational activities, but I do not actually suggest quite that range here for us in South Australia.

We have many of these reservoirs, particularly in the Southern Flinders Ranges in the electorate of Stuart; we have the Baroota Reservoir, the Beetaloo Reservoir, and the Bundaleer Reservoir, which are all very close to each other. All of these could be used for these purposes; none of them are used for drinking water. They would open up tourism and recreation and sporting activities significantly, not only to the people of the local area, but to people who would like to visit from other parts of the state and potentially even interstate.

I do not recommend motorised vehicle access, just to be very clear. I am not talking about four-wheel driving, trail bikes and the like, but certainly there is an enormous number of low-impact activities, such as bushwalking around the catchments; orienteering and rogaining; mountain biking; picnicking on the banks—that is not even allowed; you are not even allowed to have a picnic on the banks of these reservoirs at the moment—swimming, which will not cause any harm whatsoever; boating; canoeing; kayaking; the use of small sailing boats; and windsurfing. The use of small motorised boats with electric motors only would be perfectly good, as would, of course, fishing.

Fishing for stocked native fish would be a perfectly acceptable practice. In fact, even trout—it might interest people to know that while trout fishing is considered to be a very environmentally friendly activity, trout are not native to Australia, but stocking trout in some of these deeper cold reservoirs would be quite appropriate. So, there are numerous activities that would be perfectly acceptable to do. It is not necessarily a big burden on management and management costs. It is very structurally easy to limit vehicle access, and it is very structurally easy to regulate that it might be only daylight hours, or eight until eight in summer, or whatever the appropriate thing would be.

I would like to propose that the South Australian government takes on a trial of this proposal at the Baroota Reservoir near Baroota and at the Aroona Dam near Leigh Creek. Both of those places would make exceptionally good recreational prospects. They would be good for any of those activities that I mentioned before.

They would bring in tourism and many opportunities for local people to really enjoy the assets they own in their local areas that they are currently locked out of. I think that is a great shame and, as I said before, I understand the significance of protecting water catchments; if other states can do it, we can certainly do it. There is absolutely no reason why a trial could not commence almost immediately. It would be exceptionally low cost and exceptionally high value.

KHMER KROM COMMUNITY

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:20): I would like to speak today about the recent Khmer, Thai, Lao and Burmese New Year that was celebrated in my electorate. My electorate of Taylor is culturally diverse and I had the pleasure of joining a new temple that I had never visited before recently for the Year of the Horse BE 2558 (AD 2014).

With the Venerable Monks from this Khmer Krom community, I met with Uongvara Thach, President of the National Khmer Krom Community in Australia; Thach Song, Chairman of the Khmer Krom Buddhist Monastery; and Danh Tran Quang, President of the Khmer Kampuchea Krom

Association of South Australia. It was a very pleasant and enjoyable afternoon that my children and the community had together.

Let me tell you in brief about the Khmer Krom and the history of New Year. The government of Australia was very kind and wise in taking in 400 Khmer Krom refugees from the Mekong Delta of Vietnam. They have settled largely in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. As a result, they have built their associations and Buddhist temples across these areas, especially in South Australia and my electorate.

The Khmer Kampuchea Krom Association was formed in 1991 and the Khmer Krom Buddhist Monastery was established in 2006, and that was the site we visited on Waterloo Corner Road on that day. In fact, there were many Cambodian and Khmer Krom Horticultural Association members participating on that day with about 50 Khmer Krom self-employed growers in the Northern Adelaide district contributing to our horticultural and agricultural produce for the state. Their areas consist of about 300 acres for farming and they truly enjoy the freedoms of our country, our democracy and productive lifestyle that Australia provides them, having fled their area of Vietnam.

The Khmer Krom territory is a Khmer name for the Mekong Delta region whose indigenous people are the Khmer Krom, and currently they are under the control of Vietnam. The Khmer Krom trace their origins back to the first century AD to the founding Funan, a maritime empire that stretched from the Malay Peninsula to the Mekong. In the past, these territories had been part of the Kingdom of Cambodia and are still inhabited by over 12 million Khmer Krom who are still deeply attached to their culture, religion, customs, language, traditions and ancestral lands in Cambodia.

At the beginning of the early 17th century, colonisation of the area by Vietnamese settlers gradually isolated the Khmer of the Mekong Delta from their brethren in Cambodia and, as a result, they became an ethnic minority. Historically, the identity and name of the Khmer Krom people and their ancestral lands has changed due to the colonising governments they have dealt with. Under the French colonisation, Kampuchea Krom was called Cochinchina. The terms Khmer, Khmer Krom, Vietnamese of Khmer origin, Khmer Nam Bo, and Cambodian are all interchangeable when referring to people of Funan descent.

At the recent New Year's celebration, we had the good fortune to witness a different form of ceremony, still Buddhist but quite different to some of the other temple ceremonies that I have experienced with Buddhist New Year, particularly in the Cambodian and Khmer community. I am sincerely thankful for this community for opening their temple to my children and me, for welcoming us with open arms and for teaching my children the importance of their practice to them, their ancestors, their elderly and their junior people who they are trying to gift their culture to for a future generation. I am glad I have them in my electorate, I welcome them and I know that many people in Australia welcome their presence in our nation.

THURNWALD, MRS L.G.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:24): Thank you, Deputy Speaker, and I congratulate you on your new position. Today I rise to celebrate the life of Lois Geraldine Thurnwald (nee Liddocat). It is funny that this part of the debate in the chamber is called the grievance debate, and today I give this speech with a real sense of grief. I have known Lois for about 13 or 14 years. She lived from 6 June 1931 to 24 April 2014. I was deeply sorry that I could not be at her funeral on Monday because of parliamentary business. These things happen. I was very glad that the member for Adelaide, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Simon Birmingham and a great many Liberal Party members were amongst the great number of mourners on Monday. It has been good to talk to some of those people this week.

Lois Thurnwald was born at the Yorketown Hospital and grew up on a farming property at Warooka on the Yorke Peninsula. She was a tough, no-nonsense lady; she had an attitude similar to many women in particular that I know who grew up on a farm. She was the youngest of four children. All three elder siblings served during the war, leaving her alone on the farm for a number of her formative years. Her family moved to Adelaide during Lois's teenage years, and she was a student at Adelaide High.

Like many of her generation, Lois left school at 14, going on to work in a number of roles, including for the Postmaster-General. She fell for a young Czech migrant, Josef. They married and set up home and a jewellery business in Kintore Avenue, Kilburn. In helping Josef with the business,

they discovered Lois had a magnificent knack for sales—she was a great talker. Many women in Adelaide owe their engagement rings and other gifts to Lois's sense of style and the guidance that she gave to the men in their lives.

While the business kept them busy, having four boys added a real sense of activity to the house, which Lois took in her stride, ensuring the boys not only had the opportunity to play footy but also learnt to cook. Footy was a big part of life for Lois and the Thurnwalds, supporting North Adelaide, where Lois was known to have something of a thing for the legendary Barrie Robran. I am told that at the funeral on Monday it was identified that a photo of him would light up her face, even in her final years. One of her family's last precious moments that was recalled was to watch with her the telecast showing the return of footy to Adelaide Oval, although the result of the game with the Crows losing brought her no more pleasure than it brought all good people in this house.

In addition to the boys, the business and the footy, the other great passion of Lois's family life was the German shepherds. Those who visited her at her house would remember fondly some of those beautiful dogs. One of those stayed with her right to her final day at home.

When the boys were older, Lois threw herself into the Liberal Party. For 50 years, she was a member of the Liberal Party. She was a true supporter of policies both supporting business growth and the disadvantaged. She had a strong passion for that. The Hon. Trish Worth sent an email that was read at the funeral which identified 'she was very dedicated to the whole idea of good government for her fellow Australians'. The member for Unley recalls working with Lois on his first political campaign for the Hon. Michael Armitage, of which Lois was a great supporter.

Lois was the president of the Prospect branch and held all of the positions available on the Adelaide SEC and FEC over the years. As the president of the Prospect branch, it was on that occasion that I met her when I was working for Trish Worth in about 2000 or 2001. Lois invited me to speak at the Christmas show, and it was in fact the first time (I was president of the Young Liberals at the time) I had been invited to a meeting as guest speaker on my own behalf. She was a great supporter of young people.

I remember working with her on Michael Harbison's campaign in 2002, and after she lost she told me she had three great hopes for the Liberal Party in the future. She hoped that we would regain the seat of Adelaide, and she was thrilled with the member for Adelaide's elevation. She helped her a great deal. She hoped that the Hon. Michelle Lensink and the Hon. Simon Birmingham would be elected to parliament. Those were her three wishes in 2002, and I am very pleased that she was able to see them all come to pass. She was in fact a massive help in making all those three come to light.

She supported many young people in the Liberal Party and I know that all members have people such as Lois in their lives. Without people such as Lois, none of us would be here. I will miss her. I extend my condolence to her family, her children and grandchildren. On behalf of the Liberal Party, we wish them all well. Vale Lois Thurnwald.

MILLSWOOD RAILWAY STATION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:29): I would like to talk about what has become the infamous Millswood station. As members may recall in the many contributions I have made on this issue in this house, the Millswood station was opened in 1910 and, in those days, had broad gauge tracks. The Millswood station was closed permanently in 1995. Apparently the opportunity was taken at that time to convert the tracks (people will know about the debates about the different gauge tracks we have had in South Australia and Australia) to western broad gauge tracks, and this was in line with the Belair line.

Having been involved in this campaign for over 10 years I really welcomed the announcement made by the former minister for transport services, which was supported by the former minister for transport and infrastructure, and also our Premier, that the station will be opened this year. It was also confirmed by the current Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. I guess the challenge will be for us and all those people in the community who have worked so hard to try to get the station reopened to make sure that the station is utilised properly.

The opening of the station also builds on a concept that, again, I have raised in this house before, which is to renew the Millswood area and particularly the Millswood traffic and pedestrian underpass on Goodwood Road. This wonderful engineering structure, which is partly in Ashford and

partly in Unley, is 100 years old next year, so I am hoping that we can turn what might be a fantastic engineering project into a beautiful art space and one that will be a significant place in the electorate of Ashford and also, obviously, in the electorate of Unley.

Both the underpass and the area surrounding the station provide a basis, I think, for a great Millswood precinct renewal. I have been very impressed seeing the different renewal projects and pop-up projects that have been supported by the Weatherill government, but I think it is about time we had one in Ashford. Some of the other electorates, I am sure, would argue their case as well. However, being the member for Ashford, I would like to see the Millswood underpass turned into a beautiful space. While we are at it, if we are going to have a Millswood station reopening then that whole area around there could be improved considerably. It looks like a wasteland at the moment. There are a number of walkers who go through that area and hopefully there will be hundreds of people using the Millswood station as a public transport stop but we can also perhaps use that space for a whole lot of community events.

The proposal for the underpass community arts project has wide support in the community: the Unley council, the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society of South Australia (of which I am a member), the Goodwood Traders, the Community Arts Network of South Australia, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure—although it has some limited support for the concept—the Goodwood Residents Association, the Millswood Residents Group and I am very pleased to say that I have had great support from the member for Unley in trying to get this underpass project underway. It would be terrific if in 2015 we could have a celebration and an opening for our community.

Bills

CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION (PRESCRIBED DRUG OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:35): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:35): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The prosecution of the activities of outlaw motorcycle gangs and their members is a high priority for the government. Outlaw motorcycle gangs and their members are notoriously involved in drug trafficking. The government is pledged to attack them with all the means at its disposal. Labor's 2010 serious crime election policy stated that it '...will amend the Criminal Assets Confiscation Act...to target persistent or high-level drug offenders to provide for total confiscation of the property of a declared drug trafficker.'

The policy details were that new powers will be given to the DPP to allow criminal drug dealers who commit three prescribed offences within a span of 10 years to be a declared drug trafficker. Under this proposal, which targets high-level and major drug trafficking offenders, all of the convicted offender's property can be confiscated, whether or not it is established as unlawfully acquired and whether or not there is a level of proof about any property at all. Property and assets could also be restrained pending prosecution of matters before the court. The legislation will attack repeat drug offenders. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation in *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

The offences that will attract the declaration if committed 3 or more times within a span of 10 years include:

- Trafficking in controlled drugs;
- Manufacture of controlled drugs for sale;
- Sale of controlled precursor for the purpose of manufacture;

- Cultivation of controlled plants for sale;
- Sale of controlled plants; and
- Any offence involving children and school zones.

The Bill, with an exception based on legal advice, fulfilling this election pledge was introduced into Parliament on 18 May 2011. It was passed by the House of Assembly on 28 July 2011. Once in the Legislative Council, though, the opposition, with the support of a majority of the cross-benchers, effectively defeated all of the operative parts of the policy by amendments to the Bill. At the end of 2011, Parliament was prorogued.

The Bill was re-introduced on 14 February 2012. The same thing happened in the Legislative Council. The usual procedures were followed where the Houses disagree, and it appeared that the Bill was destined to go to deadlock conference.

At that point, the Bill was split into two parts—the first, a Bill containing the operative provisions of the policy as described above, the second, a Bill containing a group of unrelated miscellaneous amendments to the principal Act that were uncontroversial. The latter passed without controversy.

The prescribed drug offenders Bill was introduced into the House of Assembly on 16 October 2012, and passed that day. It reached the Legislative Council on 18 October 2012. And there it sat. On 18 October 2013, the opposition moved that the second reading be deferred for six months. That effectively killed the Bill, since six months took it past the election and another prorogation.

The Labor Election Policies for 2014 included a pledge to pursue this initiative and bankrupt the Mr Bigs of the drug trade.

The general opposition to this proposal in South Australia seems to be based on the idea that this is a new and unprincipled proposition that is unparalleled in the known universe. In fact, it is enacted and operating in a more drastic form (for some time) in Western Australia, the Northern Territory and Queensland. Arguably, a combination of provisions in New South Wales has similar effect. This is not a re-invention of the wheel.

The Liberal Opposition repeatedly opposed the introduction of this measure in part, so it said, because of doubts over its constitutional validity. It is true that, by majority, the Northern Territory Court of Criminal Appeal ruled against the validity of that jurisdiction's scheme: *Emmerson v DPP* (2013) 225 A Crim R 409. But that doubt is now gone. In April 2014, the High Court delivered judgment on an appeal from that decision and in *Attorney-General (NT) v Emmerson* [2014] HCA 13, a majority of 6/1 held the Act and scheme valid. There is no longer that excuse for opposing this policy.

The idea that all of the property of certain drug traffickers (known as prescribed drug offenders) should be confiscated, whether or not it has any link to crime at all and whether or not legitimately earned or acquired, originated in the Western Australian *Criminal Property Forfeiture Act 2000*. If a person is taken to be a declared drug trafficker under either s 32A(1) of their *Drugs Misuse Act* or is declared under s 159(2) of the Confiscation Act, then, effectively, all of their property is confiscated without any exercise of discretion at all, whether or not it is lawfully acquired and whether or not there is any level of proof about any property at all.

The Bill reflects the Western Australian scheme, with minor modifications.

The two prescribed situations are a convicted drug trafficker of a certain kind and an absconding accused. The first category is the most general.

An absconding accused aside, there are two situations catered for. The first is the repeat offender. The second is the major offender (whether repeat or not).

- (a) The repeat offender is caught if he is convicted on a third (or more) offence for nominated offences within a period of 10 years.
- (b) The major offender is caught if he or she is convicted of a commercial drug offence. A commercial drug offence is one of certain extremely serious offences in the *Controlled Substances Act 1984*, or any of the serious drug offences that involves a commercial amount of the controlled drug.

The extremely serious offences nominated are: trafficking, manufacture for sale, selling or possession with intent to sell a large commercial quantity or a commercial quantity of controlled substances or controlled plants and cultivation of a large commercial quantity or a commercial quantity of controlled plants.

As a sidenote, the Northern Territory *Criminal Property Forfeiture Act* contains very similar provisions, obviously modelled on the Western Australian Act. However, the Northern Territory Act contains only the repeat offender version of the first category and the second category (death and absconding). It does not contain what is described above as the major offender category. The Queensland *Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act 2002* contains a scheme that is similar in intent but different in complicated ways as to details.

Under the legislation in Western Australia and the Northern Territory, all of the declared drug trafficker's assets are subject to forfeiture. This would include such things as baby clothes, washing machines, garden hoses, children's toys—the lot.

In order to ameliorate the harshness of the scheme and possible forfeiture to the Crown of goods and chattels that are worthless, encumbrances or otherwise not worth the trouble, the Bill states that the prescribed trafficker forfeit everything except what a bankrupt would be allowed to keep. These are to be found in r 6.03 of the Commonwealth *Bankruptcy Regulations 1996*. The lists are extensive, but the general principle is stated in this way: section 116(1) of the Act does not extend to household property (including recreational and sports equipment) that is reasonably necessary for the domestic use of the bankrupt's household, having regard to current social standards.

The Queensland *Criminal Proceeds Confiscation Act 2002* adopts the same principle.

High Level or Major Traffickers

Whether or not a person can be presumed to be, in common usage, a high level or major trafficker will depend largely, but not wholly, on the amount of the drug with which he or she is associated. The table below illustrates various amounts for the more commonly prosecuted controlled substances. The S.A. amounts were prescribed as a result of a national consultative process fixing amounts and methods of calculation. The nationally agreed amounts were settled on the basis of research across Australia on the actual activities of the illicit drug markets informed by police expertise.

<i>Drug</i>	<i>SA Trafficking Amount</i>	<i>SA Commercial Amount</i>	<i>SA Large Commercial Amount</i>
<i>Amphetamine</i>	2 gms (mixed)	0.5 kgs (mixed)	1 kg (mixed)
<i>Cannabis</i>	250 gms (mixed)	2.5 kgs (mixed)	12.5 kgs (mixed)
<i>Cannabis Resin</i>	25 gms (mixed)	2 kgs (mixed)	10 kgs (mixed)
<i>Heroin</i>	2 gms (mixed)	0.2 kgs (mixed)	1 kg (mixed)
<i>Cannabis Plants</i>	10 plants	100 plants	500 plants

Repeat Offenders

The legislation also attacks repeat offenders. The key to this category is settling the offences to which it applies—that is, what offences will attract the declaration if committed 3 or more times within a span of 10 years. It is suggested that the offences to which it should apply are any serious drug offences that are indictable. These are those offences listed in that part of the *Controlled Substances Act 1984* under the headings 'Commercial offences' and 'Offences involving children and school zones'.

The Fund

The proceeds from the existing criminal assets confiscation scheme must be paid into the Victims of Crime Fund (after the costs of administering the scheme are deducted). It is proposed that funds raised by the application of this initiative be devoted to another fund, to be called the Justice Resources Fund. This Fund will be devoted to the provision of moneys for courts infrastructure, equipment and services, the provision of moneys for justice programs and facilities for dealing with drug and alcohol related crime and for the provision of funding for justice reform initiatives. Disbursements will not overlap with those made from or eligible for moneys from the existing Victims of Crime Fund.

Other Aspects of the Scheme

The Western Australian scheme has been modified so that a court has a discretion to ameliorate the harsh and inflexible application of this scheme if the offender has effectively co-operated with a law enforcement agency relating directly to the investigation or occurrence or possible occurrence of a serious and organised crime offence. For these purposes, a serious and organised crime offence is defined in a way that mirrors the definition in the *Australian Crime Commission (South Australia) Act 2004*. Every encouragement should be given to serious criminals to inform on their co-offenders and any criminal organisations to which they belong or are party.

As is the case with the WA and NT legislation, a person is a prescribed drug offender where there is sufficient evidence to conclude that a person would have been liable to be a prescribed drug offender and the person either absconds or dies.

The Bill also adopts the Northern Territory innovation that the time period of 10 years in relation to the repeat offender does not run if and while the offender is imprisoned.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005*

4—Amendment of long title

This clause amends the long title of the principal Act to reflect the changes made by this measure.

5—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause amends section 3 of the principal Act to include, or to consequentially amend, definitions of terms used in respect of the amendments made by this measure.

6—Insertion of section 6A

This clause inserts new section 6A into the principal Act. It sets out what is a prescribed drug offender, namely a person who is convicted of a commercial drug offence after the commencement of the proposed section, or who is convicted of another serious drug offence and has at least 2 other convictions for prescribed drug offences, those offences and the conviction offence all being committed on separate occasions within a period of 10 years. However, the 10 year period does not include any time spent in government custody. The proposed section makes procedural provision in respect of the convictions able to be used in determining whether a person is a prescribed drug offender. The proposed section also defines key terms used in respect of prescribed drug offenders, including setting out what are commercial and prescribed drug offences.

7—Amendment of section 10—Application of Act

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 10 of the principal Act.

8—Amendment of section 24—Restraining orders

This clause inserts new subsection (5a) into section 24 of the principal Act, which prevents a court from specifying protected property (the definition of which is inserted by this measure) in a restraining order unless there are reasonable grounds to suspect that the property is the proceeds of, or is an instrument of, a serious offence.

9—Amendment of section 34—Court may exclude property from restraining order

This clause amends section 34 of the principal Act by inserting new subparagraph (ia), adding to the list of matters a court must be satisfied of before it may exclude property from a restraining order. The subparagraph is divided into parts dealing with where the suspect has, and has not, been convicted of the serious offence to which the restraining order relates.

The first such matter is that the court can only exclude property where the suspect has not, or would not, become a prescribed drug offender on conviction of the serious offence. Alternatively, the property may be excluded if the court is satisfied it is not owned by, nor under the effective control of, the suspect in the circumstances spelt out in the provision (even if the suspect is, or will be upon conviction of the relevant offence, a prescribed drug offender).

The power to correct an error in respect of the inclusion of the relevant property when making the restraining order is given to the court because the property restrained in respect of prescribed drug offenders is not necessarily proceeds nor an instrument of crime.

10—Amendment of section 47—Forfeiture orders

This clause amends section 47(1)(a) of the principal Act to include the fact that a person is a prescribed drug offender as a ground for the making of a forfeiture order under that section (provided that the relevant property was owned by or subject to the effective control of the person on the conviction day for the conviction offence).

11—Amendment of section 57—Relieving certain dependants from hardship

This clause makes a consequential amendment due to the amendment of section 47(1)(a) by this measure.

12—Amendment of section 58—Making exclusion orders before forfeiture order is made

This clause amends section 58 of the principal Act to provide that property sought to be excluded from a forfeiture order must not, in the case of a forfeiture order to which section 47(1)(a)(ii) applies (ie a prescribed drug offender order), at the relevant time be owned by, or under the effective control of, the prescribed drug offender (unless it is protected property of the person).

13—Amendment of section 59—Making exclusion orders after forfeiture

This clause amends section 59, consistently with clause 15, to provide that property sought to be excluded from a forfeiture order must not, in the case of a forfeiture order to which section 47(1)(a)(ii) applies (ie a prescribed drug offender order), at the relevant time be owned by, or under the effective control of, the prescribed drug offender (unless it is protected property of the person).

14—Insertion of section 59A

This clause inserts new section 59A into the principal Act. That section allows a person to apply for property to be excluded from a restraining order because the person has cooperated with a law enforcement authority in relation to a serious and organised crime offence, be it one that has occurred or may occur in future.

The mechanisms and procedures in relation to an order excluding the property are similar to other such provisions in the principal Act.

15—Amendment of section 62A—No exclusion or compensation where forfeiture taken into account in sentencing

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 62A.

16—Amendment of section 76—Excluding property from forfeiture under this Division

This clause amends section 76 to prevent exclusion of property owned by or under the effective control of a prescribed drug offender (other than protected property).

17—Insertion of section 76AA

This clause inserts a provision similar to the provision in clause 14 allowing for exclusion from forfeiture based on cooperation with a law enforcement agency.

18—Amendment of section 76A—No exclusion where forfeiture taken into account in sentencing

This clause makes a consequential amendment.

19—Substitution of section 203

This clause amends the structure of section 203 of the principal Act to reflect the changes made by this measure.

20—Amendment of heading

This clause is consequential.

21—Amendment of section 209—Credits to Victims of Crime Fund

This clause is consequential.

22—Insertion of section 209A

This clause provides for the establishment of the Justice Resources Fund, to be administered by the Attorney-General, and for the proceeds of confiscated assets of prescribed drug offenders to be paid into the fund.

23—Amendment of section 224—Effect of confiscation scheme on sentencing

This clause amends section 224 to provide that a sentencing court must not have regard to any forfeiture or pecuniary penalty order that might result from the conviction if it results in the defendant becoming a serious drug offender (within the meaning of this measure) and the property to which the forfeiture or order relates was owned by, or subject to the effective control of, the defendant on the conviction day for the relevant offence.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.F. Evans.

CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) (CHARACTER EVIDENCE) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:37): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:37): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Good Character in Sentencing for Child Sex Offences

Section 10(1) of the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 says that:

In determining the sentence for an offence, a court must have regard to such of the following factors and principles as may be relevant...[amongst other things] the character, antecedents, age, means and physical or mental condition of the defendant...

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

Leave granted.

This reflects the common law. The authoritative discussion of the principle involved is contained in the judgment of the High Court in *Ryan v The Queen* [2001] HCA 21; (2001) 75 ALJR 815. That was an appeal against sentence by a former priest who had been convicted of 14 serious sexual offences against 12 young boys aged between six years and 14 years and had asked the sentencing judge to take into account 39 additional offences. The offences had occurred over a period of 20 years. He had otherwise been a person of good character. He was sentenced to imprisonment for 16 years. Earlier he had been convicted of 20 similar offences against a number of

victims and had been sentenced to imprisonment for six years. It was ordered that the two sentences be served cumulatively. The appeal to the High Court was against the sentence of 16 years.

In the course of that case, the High Court was asked to rule on the relevance of evidence of prior good character in mitigation of sentence for such offences. The court was divided. Callinan and Kirby JJ thought that evidence of previous good character was relevant in mitigation when sentencing for offences of this kind. Hayne J disagreed. Gummow J did not comment. McHugh J said he was inclined to disagree. There was, therefore, no majority position on this issue.

The leading South Australian decision on point is *R v Liddy* [2002] SASC 306. This was an appeal against sentence for child sexual offences committed by a magistrate who took opportunities presented by his office and by his volunteer work in life-saving by young people to commit a series of sexual offences against children over a period of many years. He was eventually sentenced to imprisonment for 25 years with a non-parole period of 18 years upon his having been found guilty by a jury of six counts of unlawful sexual intercourse with a person under the age of 12 years, three counts of indecent assault and one count of offering a benefit to a witness. He appealed against sentence. One of the grounds relied upon was the failure to take into account, or sufficient account, evidence of previous good character. Again, there was not an unanimous view. Mullighan J, (with whom Williams J agreed), said:

There is no clear statement by three members of the Court in Ryan that otherwise good character should usually operate in mitigation. Obviously there are clear cases where it could reduce a sentence, however in cases such as the present case I do not think this matter is of much significance. The appellant used his otherwise good character and his position of trust and prominence in the community to gain the confidence of the parents of the boys and, indeed of the boys themselves, which is a matter of aggravation. The fact that he had otherwise lived his life without offending and had made positive contributions to the community is a matter in his favour but, in all the circumstances, does not justify a reduction in the sentence.

However, Gray J said:

In re-sentencing the appellant a relevant consideration includes the need for some credit to be given for his previous good works and his prior good character and reputation. However any credit arising from these matters must be measured against the use of his position as a surf lifesaving coach and his office as a magistrate as instruments to effect his criminal purposes. In the particular circumstances of this case only limited credit can be afforded.

There continues to be a difference of opinion on the point. This ambiguity in authority is used as leverage by defence counsel making sentencing submission in mitigation of child sexual offences. I am of the opinion that the matter needs to be cleared up, that there needs to be a statement that the law does not regard previous good character to be mitigating in certain cases, and that the operative principle should be one that Mullighan and Gray JJ agree about, that there is no mitigation where the offender has used his good character or good works as a mask or tool by which to access or control his victims. It does the law no credit to say that, even where the offender has used his good name as the means by which to commit his crimes, that fact is mitigating. In my view, it is at best neutral, at worst, an aggravating factor.

New South Wales has legislated to this effect. Section 21A(5A) of the *Crimes (Sentencing Procedure) Act 1999* says:

(5A) *Special rules for child sexual offences*

In determining the appropriate sentence for a child sexual offence, the good character or lack of previous convictions of an offender is not to be taken into account as a mitigating factor if the court is satisfied that the factor concerned was of assistance to the offender in the commission of the offence.

At the 2014 election, Labor pledged to enact this provision in South Australia. This Bill fulfils that pledge.

Correcting an error

Section 20AAC of the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988* says (emphasis added):

20AAC—*Sentence of imprisonment not to be suspended*

(1) *Subject to subsection (2), but despite any other provision of this Act or any other Act or law, the following provisions apply in relation to the sentencing of a person who is a serious firearm offender for a serious firearm offence (including where the offence is the serious firearm offence that resulted in the person being a serious firearm offender):*

- (a) *if the maximum penalty for the serious firearm offence includes a period of imprisonment—a sentence of imprisonment must be imposed on the person;*
- (b) *the sentence of imprisonment cannot be suspended;*
- (c) *section 18 does not apply in respect of the sentencing of the person;*
- (d) *if—*
 - (i) *the person is also being sentenced in respect of other offences; and*
 - (ii) *1 or more of those offences are not serious firearm offences,*

section 18A does not apply to the sentencing of the person in respect of the serious firearm offence (however nothing in this paragraph affects the operation of section 18A in respect of the other offences).

- (2) *A court sentencing a person who is a serious firearm offender for a serious firearm offence may declare that subsection (1)(b) does not apply to the person if he or she satisfies the court, by evidence given on oath, that—*
- (a) *his or her personal circumstances are so exceptional as to outweigh the primary policy of the criminal law in respect of firearms offences set out in section 10(3a); and*
 - (b) *it is, in all the circumstances, appropriate to suspend the sentence.*

The issue concerning section 20AAC(2)(a) is that section 10(3a) of the Act no longer exists.

Section 10(3a) previously stated that: 'A primary policy of the criminal law in relation to offences involving firearms is to emphasise public safety by ensuring that, in any sentence for such an offence, paramount consideration is given to the need for deterrence.'

Section 10(3a) was replaced by section 10(2)(e).

Section 10(2)(e) states that in determining the sentence for an offence, a court must give proper effect to the following:

- (e) *in the case of an offence involving a firearm—the need to protect the safety of the community by ensuring that paramount consideration is given to the need for general and personal deterrence.*

Section 20AAC(2)(a) should be amended to delete the reference to section 10(3a) and replace it with a reference to section 10(2)(e) and in addition, to adopt the wording in that section.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988*

4—Amendment of section 10—Sentencing considerations

This clause amends section 10 to provide that a sentencing court is not to have regard to the good character or lack of previous convictions of the offender if the offence is a class 1 or class 2 offence (within the meaning of the *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006*) and the court is satisfied that the alleged good character or lack of previous convictions assisted the defendant to commit the offence.

5—Amendment of section 20AAC—Sentence of imprisonment not to be suspended

This clause corrects an incorrect cross reference.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.F. Evans.

LADY KINTORE COTTAGES (TRUST PROPERTY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:40): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Lady Kintore Cottages Act 1920. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Industrial Relations) (15:40): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Lady Kintore Cottages Act 1920 was enacted to enable the transfer of certain real property and moneys held by the Lady Kintore Cottages Incorporated to the Adelaide Benevolent and Strangers' Friend Society Inc.

Up until that time, Lady Kintore Cottages Incorporated had been the subject of a Declaration of Trust dated 20 December 1894. At the time, the trust provided for an elected committee which was empowered to determine the application of trust property for the purposes of providing accommodation to 'indigent widows and deserted wives and their families'.

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

Leave granted.

The *Lady Kintore Cottages Act 1920* (the Act) was enacted to enable the transfer of certain real property and moneys held by the Lady Kintore Cottages Incorporated to the Adelaide Benevolent Strangers' Friend Society Inc ('the Society').

Up until that time, Lady Kintore Cottages Inc had been the subject of a Declaration of Trust dated 20 December 1894. At the time, the trust provided for an elected committee which was empowered to determine the application of trust property for the purposes of providing accommodation to 'indigent widows and deserted wives and their families'.

For various technical reasons it became impracticable for this to continue, and so the Act was passed in 1920. The effect of the Act was to transfer all trust funds and real property to the Society. Section 3(1) of the Act provided that these were to be held by the Society upon the same charitable purposes as the terms of the original trust and for no other purposes.

The original Lady Kintore properties which vested in the Society at the commencement of the Act were sold in 1990 to the SA Housing Trust. The Society has since purchased and developed other properties with the sale proceeds. Currently, six properties are held on trust under the Lady Kintore Cottages Act. This represents a fairly small proportion of the Society's overall property portfolio, which is comprised of around 130 properties in total.

The Society is a not for profit incorporated association, whose objects and purpose are to receive gifts of cash and kind and to administer relief to the sick or disadvantaged within South Australia. A further object is to provide affordable housing and other assistance in necessitous and deserving cases to people in South Australia including new immigrants.

The objects and purpose of the Society are broader than those under the Lady Kintore Trust. The Bill aims to recognise these wider objects purposes. The Society's objects are 'to receive gifts of cash and kind and to administer relief to the sick and/or disadvantaged within South Australia'. The aim of the trust was to hold such real property and moneys on trust for the purpose of providing homes for indigent widows and deserted wives and their families in the State. The Society states that it has been determining applications for accommodation for the trust properties on the basis of the necessity in accordance with its objects, namely 'relief to the sick or disadvantaged within South Australia'. It considers that it would be more appropriate that the property and moneys held on trust under the Act be used in accordance with the broader objectives of the Society, rather than restricting this to 'indigent widows and deserted wives and their families'. This is what clause 4 of the Bill intends to do.

The Society base their policy on providing affordable accommodation to people on lower incomes. In 90 per cent of cases this means people who are receiving Centrelink benefits such as the aged pension, disability pension, family assistance or Newstart. Some applicants participate in part time work. The income limit is around \$40,000 per annum. This allows for tenants to move into one of the Society's properties on Newstart, gain employment and then start earning a wage.

The tenants are generally referred to the Society by agencies including, Adelaide Day Centre, Catherine House, Hutt St Centre, Towards Independence (Salvation Army) and the Southern and Western Domestic Violence Services.

To administer the terms of the Lady Kintore trust has given rise to practical difficulties. For example, even if prospective tenants for a house or unit were screened, so that tenancies were only offered to a woman who met the description of 'deserted wife with children', it would be difficult in practical terms for the trustee to monitor that person's ongoing relationship status.

Further, in order to monitor the relationship status, the tenant would be required to volunteer such information as circumstances changed, with the potential for a tenancy to be terminated upon the happening of a defined event, such as commencing cohabitation with another adult, or if her children left home. As well as being administratively cumbersome, the Government's view is that this would be unreasonable and oppressive. Also, in order to provide for such contingency the lease would have to contain a term which allowed the trustee to terminate the lease should such a defined event occur.

It is considered appropriate to amend the Lady Kintore Cottages Act, so as to bring its objects into line with those of the Society more generally. Further, the current situation effectively requires the Society to quarantine

properties from its much larger pool, in order to give effect to a narrower purpose as currently set out in the original Act. This would appear to be difficult from an administrative perspective.

Although there may well be a number of women in society who may in a technical sense fit the description of 'indigent widow' or 'deserted wife', these are undoubtedly antiquated terms. The original objects of the trust need to be considered against the background of the social norms and stigmas as well as a paucity of Government social services available to assist such persons at that time. Notably, since the trust was founded, there have been significant developments in the area of government welfare payments, as well as a cultural shift in attitudes towards women who are without male partners.

The Bill also introduces a new clause to recognise that the Adelaide Benevolent and Strangers' Friend Society may wish to transfer its undertaking to a company limited by guarantee structure sometime in the future.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Lady Kintore Cottages Act 1920*

4—Amendment of section 3—Trusts of property

Currently, the Act provides that the assets held by the Society on trust are to be used for the purpose of 'providing homes for indigent widows and deserted wives and their families in this State, and for no other purpose.' The amendment expands that purpose to 'administering relief and providing affordable housing and other assistance to sick or disadvantaged people in the State' (and things or activities necessary, incidental or conducive to the advancement of such a purpose).

5—Insertion of section 7

This clause proposes the insertion of new section 7

7—Change in corporate structure of Society—references

Proposed section 7 is an interpretive provision dealing with references to the Society in the Act and subordinate instruments in the event that the Society becomes registered as a company limited by guarantee under the *Corporations Act 2001* of the Commonwealth, or transfers the whole of its assets and undertaking to such a company.

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

Schedule 1 validates certain acts of the Society done prior to the commencement of the *Lady Kintore Cottages (Trust Property) Amendment Act 2014* and provides for immunity from liability for the Society in relation to such acts.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.F. Evans.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:42): Prior to the break, I was outlining reasons why South Australia needs to debate electoral reform and I was explaining that there were at least three options available in relation to a top-up system, which would guarantee that when the majority of South Australians vote for a particular party, that party would form government. Prior to the break, I explained the first two options. I will now explain the third option.

The third option is an option where more members of parliament are allocated to the winning party based on the number of extra votes they got. For instance, in the last election, 92,000 extra votes were obtained by the Liberal Party. If you divide 92,000 by the average of the number of votes in an electorate, that gives you 22,000, so you get another four members of parliament. That option was put to me by an academic. I do not think it totally resolves the problem, but it is another option that could be considered in the mix.

The reason that I am raising electoral reform is simply this: the parliament now knows that despite the best endeavours of the 1989 reforms and the referendum and the insertion of a fairness clause, the parliament cannot hide from one fact. South Australia now has an electoral system where it is possible that 92,000 extra people in the state voted for the party that lost. Regardless of party, regardless of the calibre of the campaign which will be subject to debate—to me that is irrelevant—what we have now in South Australia is a system that is broken.

It is a system that is broken because the voters are not being served by this system. Try to start an incorporated association and, when you bring the members together, you say, 'I'm going to design the voting system so that a minority of votes can outvote the majority.' That would be unacceptable, and for a state that prides itself on the fairness of its electoral reforms—the vote for women, the vote for Aboriginals (which were earlier than any other state), the fairness test which was brought in and the secret ballot developed in South Australia by Boothby—why now would we turn our back on the problem, regardless of party? The issue is very simply this: we now have an electoral system in South Australia that is clearly not delivering to the majority of South Australians the party they vote for, or the government they vote for.

By going to a system where government is established by whoever wins 50 per cent plus one of the whole statewide vote, it solves a number of issues for the voter. No longer do the vagaries and misjudgements of the electoral redistribution system carry such weight in the formation of government. After the last electoral redistribution the then leader, Isobel Redmond, came out and said that this side of the house would need 54 per cent of the vote to form government and people laughed at us. Of course, we won 53 per cent of the vote and lost.

After the election, ABC radio's electoral specialist, Anthony Green—read the transcript—gave an expert view that we would have needed 54.5 per cent of the vote to win. Put that to one side for a minute because that is a Labor versus Liberal issue. I am past that in this instance. What we have to explain to the public, if the parliament decides to do nothing about this, is why are we leaving in place a system where the majority of voters—not by one or two votes, but 92,000 no less, 92,000 extra votes (which is roughly 10 per cent of the vote); there are roughly one million votes in South Australia, so about 9 per cent of the votes—9 per cent more vote for a particular group and they lose. I cannot think of another organisation where that would happen.

My argument is simply this: the voting system is not serving the voting public. It may well be serving political parties, but the primary role of the voting system has to be to give the voter, the majority of voters in the state, the government they vote for. So, I have outlined today a method to get to that position. All of the options have some difficult questions to resolve, but none of the resolutions to those questions are as ill as the ill that exists currently where we know that 92,000 more people can vote for a particular group and they lose. Why should the majority lose?

The Labor Party will come back and say that this is all about winning 24 seats and that is the current system. That is fine. The reality of what that means is that the battle ground is about eight seats; there is \$300,000 or \$400,000 spent in eight seats and all the rest of the seats cannot really have a lot of attention paid to them. So, the whole battle ground, the whole state, revolves around six or eight seats.

The reality is, I am arguing: how is that in the best interests of the majority of South Australians? I am arguing there are different ways to resolve this issue, a different way of forming government through exactly the same voting process. That is, rather than ask the question on polling night, 'Who won 24 seats?', ask, 'Who did the whole state vote for?' Whoever wins that question then we need to amend the legislation to provide that that group has a majority of one in the house if they have not won enough seats to do so. It would totally change the way that governments operate; it would change the way that the parties campaign.

The reality is that my side of politics has benefited from this system nationally. It is rather interesting—and if the Labor Party is going to argue against this, I will be interested in its response—because of course in the 1998 federal election when John Howard won the GST question, he received less than the majority of votes. I think Beasley won 51 per cent and Howard won 49 per cent. The reality is that this works both ways.

To me, this is not a Labor/Liberal thing. We know the rules of the game. You go out and play to the rules of the game and you win or lose based on those rules. What I am saying is that the people we are meant to serve, the voters, are not being served well by the current rules. The last

two elections clearly show it, and I think the parliament has a duty to have the debate and see if we can't deliver the voter one simple thing: that is, a system that guarantees that, when the majority of South Australians vote for a particular group, that group wins. The simple reality is this: if that new system existed, the government will win sometimes and the opposition will win other times, but at least the voter would get the government they vote for.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Reynell I would like to remind the house that this is the member's first speech, and I ask that members accord her the customary courtesies. The member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:51): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and congratulations on your appointment. Congratulations also to all new and continuing members. I start by acknowledging that the land we are on today is the traditional land of the Kaurna people. I acknowledge their spiritual and cultural relationship with this land and pay my deep respect to Kaurna elders past and present.

I am a proud and active supporter of and speaker for our recognised movement. Australia's and, indeed, South Australia's story is one of the richest in human history. It spans tens of thousands of years and at its heart is the oldest living culture on the planet. It is an inspiring and impressive history. But Australia's constitution, our set of rules, our founding document, which symbolises on the global stage what we are about, does not recognise that culture. It is silent about tens of thousands of years of history. It does not recognise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people and, shamefully, it also gives governments power to discriminate against groups of Australians voting based on race. We need to remove that discrimination and we need to include recognition of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, because it is the right thing to do.

I acknowledge what has been done to date in this parliament to right this wrong. Removing this discrimination will mean Australia can lift its head and authentically live the values we pride ourselves on having as a nation: fairness, inclusiveness and diversity. It is our generation that can do this. It is our generation that can break the silence and proudly shape a better and fairer future. I am committed to working with all this house, with our federal parliamentarians, and all of the communities that we represent to do just this.

I have had the great pleasure of collaboratively organising a number of community forums across South Australia about our nation's need for recognition, and I look forward to continuing to deepen our nation's conversation. I also start by acknowledging the compassionate, lovely, strong and community-minded people of Reynell, who have bestowed on me this incredible privilege of being their member of parliament following 17 years of representation by former member Gay Thompson. I thank the many individuals, families and dedicated people involved in clubs, schools, the RSL and community groups and organisations of Christie Downs, Christies Beach, Morphett Vale, O'Sullivan Beach and Lonsdale from the bottom of my heart for their faith in me. I commit myself to working as hard as I possibly can every day, every single day, to make a difference with and for them.

My being here today is nothing less than a dream come true. It is an honour and a privilege to be elected to serve my community and my beloved state of South Australia, and that is exactly what I will do. We are all the product of our experiences, and experience can be both the hardest and the best teacher, and in my case a teacher that could so easily have taken me on a different journey.

I was born here in Adelaide and taken to my first home in Netley where I grew up just a couple of streets from the back of the airport runway. My mum, Jeanette Walsh, then Hildyard, was at home with my four-year-old brother and three-year-old sister and at that time my dad worked for the Lands Titles Office in Adelaide.

I have very early memories of things not being as they should in my house. One of the experiences that shaped me was my father's chronic alcoholism. My father possessed significant sporting prowess and sharp intelligence, but his overwhelming addiction and propensity for violence when under the influence of alcohol also often made me feel confused, unsafe and scared. It sometimes made me feel as if I somehow did not fit.

My younger sister was born when I was four and in the few years that followed my dad left us. He came back from time to time when he was drunk to try to break into our home. I remember

having to stay at school long after home time to stay safe. I remember on the very rare occasions when he promised to come and see us and take us out, waiting for him to come and take us wherever he said he would, and eventually realising that it was not to be. As a child, it was hard to make sense of it all. I now understand that there are a range of events that people in our community experience that result in them losing their way. My dad is also a product of his own experiences and I forgive him and always wish him the best.

The question for us here in this house, as representatives who have the great opportunity to work with and for our community to make change, is: what can we do to help people who are lost find their way again? Growing up in a single parent family where we faced significant financial hardship, as the single mother's pension was never quite enough to make ends meet, where we witnessed domestic violence and felt a sense of abandonment, it often felt as if there were only a few short steps between losing my own way and continuing onward.

However, despite our difficulties, I did not lose my way and that is because I watched my mum walk her journey where, in the face of significant hardship, she did not get lost but grew stronger. She went back to school, completed her year 12 and got herself a teaching degree. She had the courage to speak up fiercely for herself and for others. She taught my brother and sisters and I very strongly to value the family we were and, importantly, to be active participants in our community. She also taught us, no matter what was happening for us, to look upwards and outwards and see what was happening for those who may have been doing it even harder, and to help where we could.

My mum taught me to speak up for myself, for others and for what is right, to listen to your heart and sometimes the uneasy feeling in your stomach, and to speak it always. She is a tireless advocate for many causes and particularly for those affected by mental illness, and her voice against injustice is fierce. As our neighbours growing up know, her voice is also very loud. She was incredibly resourceful and taught me the value of really hard work, as did my grandfather Charles Beaumont, who was a source of much kindness in our lives. He loved musicals, cricket and his family. He tried, very unsuccessfully, from a young age to teach me the value of saving, but taught me successfully the value of being kind to others when times were difficult for them.

My grandfather recited a poem to me over and over again and wrote it in my autograph book, opposite the page that held the signature of South Australia's greatest legend, Russell Ebert. It went: 'Life is mostly froth and bubble, but two things stand like stone: kindness in another's trouble and courage in one's own'. My grandpa Charles worked his way from being an office hand from the age of 14 who emptied bins in an office to being the CEO of a major South Australian insurance company. I dare say he would not have agreed with all my political views, but he would have shared my unwavering values of respecting others, being kind to them, particularly when they were down, and just getting on with things in the face of your own adversity.

I see a number of his qualities in my big brother Luke Hildyard, for whom I have the utmost love and admiration. Luke is an excellent father to his boys Charlie and Danny Hildyard; a beautiful husband to his lovely wife Leanne Carr; an outstanding sportsperson, having represented our state numerous times; a patient teacher; an incredibly generous volunteer running, football and lifesaving coach; and someone who has forged his own strong path set by his own strong and sometimes unique moral compass. Luke is someone who has defied statistics and shown how a good man can be developed. In that regard, I also acknowledge my lovely stepfather Noel Walsh.

I was also strongly influenced by my two frankly fabulous aunts, Dr Rosemary Beaumont, who is also my godmother, and Dianne Beaumont. They lived interstate when we were growing up, but came whenever they could to support us, as they have done today.

My mum and aunts lost their mum at an early age and together formed an extraordinary trio from whom I learned much. The aunts introduced me to many things, from surfing (which I love to this day) and camping (which I am not so cut out for) to fondue, fierce and frank discussions sometimes fuelled by their occasional love of green ginger wine, and to the concept that women could do anything—anything at all. They also helped me to make sense of why we were sent to an emergency recess so our teachers could tune in to the television on 11 November 1975 to find out what the hell had happened to our prime minister.

I see their outstanding intelligence in my older sister, Sally Hildyard. I was in awe of her incredible creative talent from a very young age—not so much when she forced me into her constant

dramatic productions which she would put on for the neighbourhood, but I do remain in awe of her incredible talent today.

My commitment to making a difference with and for our community was born in those early years and nurtured through subsequent experiences. I learned not to get lost. I was also guided by the lessons taught by a much broader community family in our schools, our church community, and the numerous sporting, lifesaving and other clubs of which we were members, all of which housed a great network of community-minded people, including the member for Colton.

I see in my community in Reynell today so many wonderful people who are similarly committed to supporting children and other community members. I see volunteers who donate hours and days every week to their club or community organisation they support for completely selfless reasons, purely for the benefit of their community. They are the lifeblood of the south, and I look forward to working alongside each and every one of them to make our community as resilient, strong and compassionate as it possibly can be.

Participation in sport and other activities was always a great place for me; it made me feel valued and equal. I am an avid follower of many sporting codes and a passionate supporter of many sporting teams, particularly a number of women's teams. I am dismayed that our sportswomen are often very poorly recognised, and I look forward to working with others to right this wrong.

My mum demonstrated very strongly an unwavering faith—a faith in things unfolding as they are meant to, and a faith in our own strength to accept and deal with difficult times. I was raised by my mum as a Catholic and I am still a Catholic; importantly, however, I fundamentally value the Christian ethos of not judging others, of accepting everyone in their choices, whichever part of the world they come from, and showing love and compassion in all circumstances—all of them—no matter what.

One of the circumstances that my family and many families in our community increasingly have to deal with is mental illness. I heard yesterday that 45 per cent of South Australians are affected by mental illness at some point in their lives. It is one of the greatest challenges of our time, and it is a challenge that requires our most compassionate response and a collective focus on how all of our decisions can positively enhance our community's mental health.

My younger sister, Alison Hildyard, first developed acute schizophrenia when she was 15, and now at age 40 she continues to live her life with it. She is beautiful, she is kind, and she is the strongest person I know. Her illness has taken her to hell and back, and sometimes from the brink of despair she has only just returned. In the first 10 years of her illness, she spent half of that time in psychiatric wards in various hospitals in Adelaide, and sometimes in the locked wards of those institutions. After 25 years of taking large doses of psychotropic medication her physical health is negatively impacted, but she remains beautiful, strong and kind. Despite experiencing some of the most traumatic and debilitating times, there is never a negative thing to be said about her, nor how she has dealt with those times.

Hundreds of incredibly dedicated and compassionate people work in our mental health sector. They are often all that stands between dignity and isolation, respect and solitude for people like my sister. I cannot applaud their commitment enough. I also say, however, that our systems and resources have not always been structured in a way that ensures our most vulnerable citizens are treated at the level of compassion they need and with the support they deserve.

One of my worst memories is visiting my sister in one of our hospitals to find her unnecessarily and inappropriately restrained physically. I will do everything I can as a member of parliament to ensure that this or anything like it never happens again to anyone's sister. I will also work, however I can, to ensure that the insecurity that the federal government's proposed cuts are currently creating for people affected by mental illness, as well as many other vulnerable people, those who care for them, support them and provide resources for their wellbeing—cuts which will see this group of people further marginalised and at further risk—will not come to fruition. How we treat our most vulnerable citizens as a society is a measure of our society's wellbeing and success, and I intend to do everything I can to ensure that we are measured well.

Following primary school, I attended Plympton High School. I worked out from a very young age that if I wanted to do anything socially or buy anything new rather than second-hand I had to work. From a young age I learnt to work really hard all of the time. I got my first job cleaning at a

butcher's shop in Kurraltta Park at 14 and, at 15, I worked at Coles where I was proud SDA member, and in a number of other jobs. I have supported myself since that time. I left school after year 12 at 16 years of age and worked as a clerical worker. I moved out of home when I was 17.

During my time working as a clerical worker my unrelenting passion for fairness and my desire to speak up with and for others became apparent to colleagues, particularly during my time with a global corporation where I found myself shocked at some of the things I experienced, heard and saw. My ability to speak up in an articulate fashion was somewhat limited at this young age, but what may have been lacking in polish was certainly never lacking in passion. The unrelenting passion for fairness, developed throughout my childhood, grew during these years. It is where I began to hone my skills to speak up and also where I realised that sometimes the best thing you can do is speak up with and for others and give them a voice.

It is where I began to think about what makes things fair in a workplace and how you achieve that fairness. It is those years that led me to question more strongly what I could do to channel all of the views, thoughts and feelings I had into a pathway that would lead me to constructively make a difference to the lives of others.

I studied full time at Flinders University as a mature age student while simultaneously working as a cleaner, a highly unsuccessful professional runner, a typist, a swimming teacher and a lecturer in keyboard skills. I somehow found time to frequent my favourite south-western suburban nightclub, Lennies, where I have some very fond memories of some very bad dancing and also to enjoy the Adelaide live music scene which was thriving at that time with bands like the Numbskulls, the Clowns of Decadence, and Exploding White Mice.

Importantly, through my years at university, I began to discover the structures and organisations that you could work within to change the world. I proudly joined the Labor Party in the early 1990s as well as the Federated Clerks' Union, and I was privileged to work from 1994 to 1996 for federal minister for immigration and ethnic affairs Senator Nick Bolkus.

I was also privileged to be part of a great political discussion and to get to know and be supported by Mick Tumbers, Clyde Cameron, Penny Wong, Ian Hunter, Mark Butler, our Premier (the member for Cheltenham), Quentin 'Blinky' Cook, and Marg Sexton amongst others. They planted ideas about where my burning passion could take me. I was also humbled on joining my union to begin to learn about other stalwarts of the progressive movement in South Australia—Harry Krantz, Marg Adams, and Elliott and Elizabeth Johnston. I had the pleasure over the years to get to know Marg, Harry and Elliott more, and their words, actions, bravery and clear vision about what kind of world we should live in and how what we do creates that world inspire me to this day, as do their campaigning skills.

I will never forget visiting Harry Krantz in his later years with Marg in hospital. It was at the start of the WorkChoices campaign, and he was clearly very unwell. On our coming in, he perked up, waved aside my questions about his health and asked me a series of questions about the campaign and, once satisfied with the answers, fell asleep.

In 1996 I had the great honour of beginning to work for my union, the Australian Services Union, which the FCU had become a part of. Finally, I had found a place in which I could work with and for others to achieve fairness. I had the honour of standing alongside union members in so many different industries as they went through experiences at their workplaces that changed their lives, sometimes for the better and sometimes for the worse. That was common about every one of those experiences was that their unity, their generosity and their commitment to supporting one another got them through those times.

ASU members serve and support other people. I was honoured to become the secretary of that union in 2009. Collaboratively leading your union and working in the union movement is extraordinary. Along with the Australian Labor Party, there are no organisations more focused on working with and for people to achieve fairness that better accord with the values of supporting others to be treated with dignity and respect, and that enshrine a collective and fundamental belief that bringing people together is the best way to positively achieve change. Our union movement is almost 150 years strong here in South Australia and for all of that time it has stood up for people across our nation and, despite attempts to bring it down, it will be there for another 150 years and beyond, standing up for generations of the future.

I wholeheartedly thank my friends, leaders of United Voice and mentors whose support for me has been unwavering and whose commitment to focusing on workers is extraordinary—David Di Troia, David Gray and others at that union including Cheyne Rich, Demi Pnevmatikos and Larissa Harrison. David Gray's leadership is at the root of a number of progressive reforms and achievements in South Australia and I am humbled to have his support.

I pay tribute to my friend and secretary of SA Unions, Joe Szakacs, and thank him for his support and friendship. He is an incredible leader who will make a difference to the lives of South Australians for decades to come. I pay tribute to the incredible women leaders of the union movement, who have guided me and given me strength for many years, including during the hardest of times: Max Adlam, Karen Atherton, Kate Coleman, Janet Giles and Karen Brown. I also state my deep gratitude for the wise guidance over many, many years of union leader and family friend Wayne Hanson, and express my delight at the lovely friendship I have with Justin Hanson and Alex Overley.

During my time with my union, all of the best moments were those where we empowered members to take a step to lead on an issue they were experiencing, to do and say things they had never said or done before, sometimes in front of thousands, to stand up, to take on a new challenge, and to find others to work with to make change. That is what being union is all about.

It is my fundamental belief that leadership is both inherently personal and fundamentally collective. In choosing to lead, to do something different, we all have to make a personal and courageous decision to lead, but the best leadership is when the outcomes focus on achieving a collective goal, and the best leadership is undertaken in a way that builds leadership capacity in others. I thank former ASU secretaries Andrew Dennard and Senator Anne McEwen for doing just that for me.

I thank every ASU member that I have worked alongside and take my hat off to the hundreds of union reps who also give others the courage to stand up. I acknowledge those reps who have tirelessly given even more to their union—members of the ASU executive—who work in energy, local government, community services and the finance industry: President Kristen Gilbertson; vice presidents Robert Habel, Zerebar Karimi, Rosi Reschke and Darren Wicks; and all members of their council.

There are many stories of union work that I can share. The one that I will share is the incredible privilege of working with thousands of community workers and hundreds of community organisations to historically achieve equal pay. Community workers are at the heart of our community. They work in large charitable organisations, homeless shelters, youth organisations, domestic violence shelters, community centres, Aboriginal organisations, peak bodies and advocacy with our most vulnerable citizens to ensure they participate with dignity in life.

I asked community workers for years about why they do the work that they do, and 100 per cent of the time those workers replied that they did this work because they cared about people and wanted to make a difference. Eighty-five per cent of these workers are women, and for years I also witnessed the impact of the deep undervaluing of their work—the seeing of care work as an extension of women's work in the home as unskilled, as something one should only volunteer to do.

I was part of a movement that said, 'Enough.' It said that it was time for this work at the heart of our community to be valued and it was time for equal pay. By working together across Australia we secured an incredible legal victory to ensure that this group of workers received pay increases of between 23 per cent and 45 per cent and to enshrine, finally, equal pay. What we also secured was value for this work and, importantly, a deep valuing of the work by workers themselves and a preparedness to speak out for themselves.

I pay tribute to women like Maria Hagias, Megan Hughes and Sandra Dunn who have literally dedicated their working lives to supporting women and children affected by domestic violence. One in three women globally, or one billion women, are now affected every year by domestic violence, and their children are negatively impacted. It is an issue that we have to address. It is pressing and it is urgent and we all have to stop it. I acknowledge the vigil that is happening just 200 metres from here tonight to remember the women and children who have lost their lives due to domestic and family violence.

I remember asking one of those women, Sandra Dunn, to speak at a rally in Adelaide for equal pay about her working commitment and she was incredibly apprehensive about doing so. She asked why on earth people would want to listen to her. She told me that she felt sick before doing it and I think she may have actually been sick. She spoke and she was wonderful. Later that night I tried to find her to tell her how great she was but I could not find her anywhere. When I finally watched all of the taped news services, lo and behold, I saw Sandra on every channel. Not only had she spoken to hundreds of people, she had also spoken on TV and to radio crews and print media. She spoke out for what she believed in.

Through our equal pay campaign we gave women like Sandra a voice. We also shifted a workforce from believing that if they valued themselves somehow something could be taken from those they supported, to a deep knowing that if they valued themselves and were paid what they were worth that they could stay in the sector into the future to keep supporting those most vulnerable. Together across Australia we worked with large and small community employers to secure funding for equal pay and only together we won.

I look forward to continuing to work to ensure rights at work are maintained, to ensure that women's work is valued, to continue to secure equal pay for every woman in every industry and to create great jobs for the future. I strongly believe that one of the best ways to ensure a person is included in community life is to ensure that they have access to secure and decent employment. It is indeed urgent for us to nurture and grow the industries of the future; industries that can be uniquely South Australian so that we can build good pathways to good jobs for our kids and for generations to come.

It is pressing for us to do this at both a local and statewide level and I commit to working with all of you to do this. Through my years of working with both workers and employers in a range of industries, and most recently working in the community sector for collective impact backbone organisation Together SA, we create the best pathways and address our kids' needs through strategic collaboration, through working together in a coordinated way, through partnering with unlikely partners committed to the same goal. Collective impact is a mechanism for deeply engaging community around the results they want to see and focusing all of the energy in a community: business, community organisations, philanthropy, government, local government and the community itself in achieving that result and measuring progress against that result.

There are results that together we have to achieve in the electorate of Reynell and across South Australia. We have to reinvest in Christie Downs and listen to our community, and we have to keep ensuring that everyone in our community has access to secure and decent housing, quality education, great transport, great services and excellent care when they most need it. I will stand up for these things for the people of Reynell.

Despite our best efforts there is much to do if we are to realise a fair and equal South Australia. There remain those with far more means than others. There are those who are at far greater risk of illness than others, those who access great education and others who cannot, those who are accepted by everyone in our community and those who are not. My desire to work with others to achieve fairness for all community members and to create a fair, strong and vibrant South Australia remains my driving and unrelenting passion. It is indeed why I am here—but I am only here because of the support of the people I have mentioned and my family and friends.

Thank you to everyone who campaigned alongside me in Reynell, so that we could continue to build a progressive, fair and vibrant South Australia. My volunteers—who are all friends, old and new—telephoned, letterboxed, visited shopping centres and doorknocked alongside me. They also cooked for me, calmed me down, ran quizzes and fundraisers for me, drove my children around and stopped me from driving them up the wall.

Thank you Kerry, Andrew, BJ and Henry Oates, Matty and Louise Blowes, Mark Hubbard, Andrew Hunter and Sally Foster, Elizabeth DeCaux, Nat Cook, Neil Davis, Vicky Williams, Andrew and Lorrae Clark, Olive Weston, Norah Fahy, Nola Stone, Nic Szuster, Christie Baverstock, Anne-Marie Griffin, Stephen Barclay, Sam Lane, Sam King, Ellen McLoughlin, Vicki Osland, Rhiannon Newman, Kim Stewart, Brad Chilcott, Carina Lawless, fellow candidates in the south Kyam Maher and Chris Picton, Cameron Smith, Justin Kentish, Lois Boswell, Don Frater, Sinead Hollingworth-Hughes, Idris Martin, Leon Cermak, Angus Oehme, Emily Gore, federal member for

Kingston Amanda Rishworth, and the dozens of enthusiastic and passionate members of Young Labor, who were tireless in their efforts, and so many more.

I want to individually acknowledge so many friends but will single out just a few. Nat Cook and Neil Davis, I am so sorry for what happened to your son Sam. It is tragic. I am so thankful for the work your foundation does to empower young people and to ensure that no other family has to go through what yours did. I am proud to volunteer for the Sammy D Foundation, and I am proud and happy to call you friends. Your courage inspires me and your friendship makes me very happy.

Thank you to my oldest and dear friends Ilka Walkley, Mary Hajistassi and Elizabeth DeCaux—who have been with me for decades—for everything. They are incredibly special women whom I admire and love. They are wise, they are sometimes incorrigible, they are hilarious, they are loyal, they are my family.

I have never been able to relax. I used to mistakenly equate contentment with restlessness or a need for change, and then I met my husband, Charles Wright, or, as he is affectionately known by many in our life and a number of communities across South Australia and, indeed, probably nationally and internationally, 'poor Charles'.

Charles has taught me to be peaceful, even as I rush around. He has taught me to allow myself to be loved well and to love well. His support of me is unshakeable and, as we discovered in our election campaign, literally knows no bounds. He is kindness personified and his calm, clever and compassionate way of going about things, very rarely for himself and always for others, is extraordinary. Thank you for getting me, for getting most things and for loving me when I am at my best and also when I am at my worst.

Last, but certainly not least, are my boys Che Cielens and Liam Wright. Thank you for your full hearts and your open minds. Thank you for your incredible resilience during the marathon that was our campaign. Che, you had my immense love from the moment you were born and it grows every single day. Liam, we have built our relationship from when you were six, and I thank you for all it has been and all it will be into the future. You always have my love and support—always. Thank you for the beautiful young men you have become. You give me hope and make me believe that we can indeed shape the world into what it needs to be for the future.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Hartley, who has sought and been granted leave to speak out of his place, I would like to remind the house that this is the member's first speech and I ask members to accord him the customary courtesies. The member for Hartley.

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (16:24): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Firstly, I thank the member for Morialta who has today allowed me to sit in his seat. I have done this so that one of my constituents, the very hardworking Mr Philip Menz, President of the Physical Disability Council of South Australia who is in the gallery today, can see me from his wheelchair during the course of this speech. During the course of my parliamentary career, I hope this parliament makes this place more accessible for those who are in such a position. May I begin by also wishing the honourable member for Fisher all the best with his treatment and I extend my thoughts and prayers to him and his family during this hard time.

We observe today a victory for the state Liberals in the battle for Hartley—a victory for the long term, for regeneration, for change and for growth for the future. It is a great honour and a pleasure to stand here today as the fifth member for Hartley, and currently the youngest member of this place. Hartley is in the heart of the inner north-east of Adelaide. It is a close-knit community comprised of many migrants, many of whom share a common ambition and a drive to succeed to the best of their aspirations. I stand here today proud to represent such admirable people and eager to serve this great state of ours.

First, I would like to congratulate the Speaker of this house on his re-election and I would also like to thank the Governor of this great state, His Excellency Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce for his opening of the 53rd Parliament. I would like to congratulate all the new members and also all the members who have been re-elected. The recent election was hard fought and I am proud of Steven Marshall and the state Liberal team for our campaign. Steven Marshall and our team present a vision for this state by drawing on the ambitions of businesses and restoring confidence and pride in all South Australians.

We on this side of the chamber sit in stark contrast to the government opposite us, which has presided over—and continues to preside over—the decline of the state's future economic prospects. In fact, Deputy Speaker, it is my opinion that the economy is a bit like the clock in this house. It runs backwards and it has been going backwards time and time again.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: That's not true. It's digital and it is moving well today. You're misleading the house.

Mr TARZIA: It is completely in the wrong direction, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, it's meant to make you watch.

Mr TARZIA: Deputy Speaker, I am a product of what you would call post-World War II migration into Australia and it is in times like these where long-term thinking is required and bold, balanced, long-term decisions are needed, I am reminded of my two late grandparents: Vincenzo Tarzia (my namesake) and Salvatore Bruno, both of whom were Italian migrants from poverty-stricken southern Italy and who moved to South Australia seeking a new life and better opportunities for their families. Vincenzo and Salvatore were two honourable men and I know that they would certainly be proud to see me here today as the member for Hartley.

As the descendant of European migrants, I would like to pay a tribute to many before me with Italian heritage who have served this electorate and this state in this parliament, and other parliaments, including but not limited to: the Hon. Mario Feleppa MLC, whom you may remember, the Hon. Julian Stefani MLC, the Hon. Carmel Zollo MLC and, of course, my immediate predecessors in Hartley, Joe Scalzi and the Hon. Grace Portolesi.

The spirit of post-World War II European migrants has always been a great source of inspiration for me. With about 18 per cent of the Hartley electorate being solely of Italian origin, many families can relate to a story similar to that of my family. I would like to dedicate my election victory to the sons and daughters of all migrants in South Australia, because without their ambition and their sacrifice and their entrepreneurial spirit the state certainly would not be what it is today.

My late grandfather Vincenzo Tarzia was born in the seaside town of Siderno Marina, Reggio Calabria. He was a fisherman and later a soldier who fought in World War II for the Italian army. He was captured but escaped and migrated to Australia and settled in South Australia. My other grandfather was Salvatore Bruno, born in the country town of Altavilla Irpina in the Campania region, about 70 kilometres outside Naples, where he worked day in, day out down a sulphur mine. But he wanted a better future for his family. He never sought a handout. He looked for new opportunities to give his family a better life and once he settled in South Australia my grandfather got his first job at General Motors Holden, within the first week of his migration—a job that he proudly held for over 30 years until his retirement.

Both my grandfathers worked tirelessly for their family and for their children—my parents. They were not afraid to make tough decisions in their hope for a better future for their family, and I am proud of my grandparents, and, through their example, they have taught me the value of hard work, of ambition and of sheer determination for a more prosperous future. It is these values that have ultimately guided me to undertake this honourable responsibility. It is migrants and the children of migrants, like my grandparents, Vincenzo and Salvatore, and my parents, Mary and Tony, who have helped to make this state, and Hartley, great. It is these migrants who have inspired me to commit myself to public service today.

I was born and raised in South Australia and I was privileged enough to attend St Joseph's School, Payneham, a primary school founded by the Sisters of St Joseph in 1962. It began with 42 students and it has expanded to about 400 today, from preschool to year seven. I am truly grateful for the Catholic values that were instilled in me from a young age and I acknowledge Father Allen Winter, who was my first local parish priest. I am pleased that he is still there today serving his community as well as he did when I was at school. He tells me that I am his first MP to come out of his parish. It is also fitting to mention that my parents first met each other at that parish at the Feast of St Anthony held on the school grounds in 1974, they tell me.

My journey continued on to Rostrevor College where in my final year I was fortunate enough to be head prefect and dux of the college. That school was established by the Christian Brothers in 1923 as an extension of the facilities offered at CBC, Wakefield Street. The school borders the current boundary of Hartley, and its motto of *Palma merenti*—Latin for 'Reward to the one who earns

it'— has always inspired me. It was good to see Ty Cheesman, my previous legal studies teacher, who by chance was in the gallery today hosting a group of school students, as I understand it.

After completing school I studied and graduated with degrees in law and commerce from the University of Adelaide and later went on to tutor in commercial and corporate law at that university in the business school. My studies were a good opportunity to serve my students and provide them with good advice to help them succeed. It is this passion for service to others that inspired me to work in many professional fields, including funds management and the legal and commercial sectors. It is also this passion that made me want to be involved in politics from a young age and to make this state and the electorate of Hartley great.

However, I make the point that I am certainly not a career politician, but I will serve this electorate and house hopefully for many years to come. I come to politics from the private sector. I have no union alliance; I have no political bloodline; but I have a long-term vision to improve my local area and this state. This path for me has been a choice that I have carefully considered and I have decided to undertake, leaving behind my immediate legal and commercial career. I am not afraid of hard work. My first job was at Foodland working for the Romeo family stacking shelves at the age of 13.

I made the decision to run for public office at age 23 and in late 2010 I was elected as a councillor of the City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters, part of which lies in Hartley. It would be fitting of me to mention that I see two hard-working Norwood, Payneham and St Peters councillors in the gallery today, and I acknowledge the role that they have played in mentoring me and assisting me along the way—Councillor Minney and Councillor Duke. As a councillor, I believe I was able to help improve the vibrancy of the City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters and I am proud of our work here, particularly in helping and lobbying for PISA (the Italian Meals on Wheels) to stay at its current premises in Firle.

I would like to acknowledge and thank the volunteers who keep that council area ticking (because they are the backbone of the community) as well as the tireless staff and elected members of that council. I would also like to acknowledge the City of Burnside and the City of Campbelltown which also lie in Hartley. I would like to specifically acknowledge the hardworking volunteers, the staff and elected members of those councils who I have worked with over many years and who together make our community a better place.

My membership in local council has certainly allowed me to participate in various local charitable, community and sporting groups, such as Faith Hope Charity, the breast cancer group that my mother, Mary (a remitted breast-cancer sufferer), founded which raises money for breast cancer research, patient care, and breast cancer awareness, proceeds of which are distributed to hospitals and institutions here within South Australia. I have watched my mother's organisation spring from small beginnings, to watching it gain corporate sponsorship, and I am proud to say that she has raised over \$500,000 since the organisation was founded 10 years ago.

Throughout my time as a councillor, a candidate, and now as a member of this place, I have been privileged to support charities such as the Little Heroes Foundation supporting children battling cancer, and the St Vincent De Paul Society, and I am active in the Campbelltown Rotary Club, Payneham RSL and, of course, a proud follower of the Norwood Football Club.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr TARZIA: I notice I was in the minority there, Deputy Speaker; in fact Deputy Speaker, I put it to the house that down the track perhaps the Address in Reply board could reflect the colours of the previous premierships team rather than what looks like black, white and teal.

It is estimated that philanthropic organisations receive over \$2 billion each year and that the intended targets of many charities receive only 60¢ in every dollar that is donated. While Australia's charitable donation trends are increasing, Australia does not possess the ingrained philanthropic culture that is seen in countries such as the United States, for example. Research conducted a number of years ago shows that the US gives around 1.6 per cent of GDP per capita to not-for-profit organisations, whereas Australia gives just 0.7 per cent. I believe that as elected representatives we should always lead by example to participate in and promote these organisations and by doing so encourage members of our community to assume a degree of responsibility for their fellow

compatriots, to lead from the front and partake in these organisations as many of our members from both sides of the chamber do already.

South Australia is a great state, but we are in a state that has been underperforming well below our best for at least the last 12 to 13 years. Let there be no misunderstanding: no one is more responsible for this calamity than the government sitting opposite me. Under this government South Australia is suffering under the highest taxes in the nation, the worst performing workers comp scheme in the nation, the worst small business conditions and confidence in the nation and spiralling public debt.

At the same time, South Australia's export market is dying. Over the past 12 years of this Labor government, our total number of exports has fallen from 7.5 per cent to 4.4 per cent of the national market. As a young professional I am passionate about ensuring that South Australian school and tertiary graduates are afforded the same opportunities of employment that other states enjoy. As the great Roman senator and advocate Cicero once said, 'Let the welfare of the people'—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In Latin.

Mr TARZIA: In Latin? I could go for Italian, perhaps, Deputy Speaker. He said, 'Let the welfare of the people be the ultimate law.' Sadly, this ethos is not reflected in the approach taken by this government. Unemployment in South Australia is the highest of any mainland state and has risen to 7.1 per cent compared to the national average of 5.8, and this is obviously at a time when all other states are increasing their rate of employment. It is South Australia's highest unemployment rate in 12 years. And what about regional South Australia experiencing its highest unemployment rate in 14 years? In my electorate of Hartley one in five young people are unemployed—one in five—and this is in spite of the fact that my predecessor was minister for employment.

I spoke previously about the hard work and sacrifices of families like mine and others to migrate to help build this state. Liberal Party great and former premier Sir Thomas Playford is remembered for bringing new industries and new migrants to build our great state because he understood that bold decisions had to be made to secure our future and with it create new jobs and prosperity. The current government will be remembered for abandoning South Australia's long-term economic future and investment for short-term political fixes by engaging in public spending projects which they do not have the revenue to sustain.

As a result of the corrosive impact of the government's policies they risk losing a generation of young professionals and workers to other states and overseas. For example, since this government first took office, over 34,000 South Australians have migrated interstate, many of them young people. As the youngest member of this place and as a member of South Australia's emerging workforce, I regret to inform you that many have already left us and unfortunately will not be coming back. What remains of my generation will be paying for this government's recklessness and poor economic management, for many years to come.

How is an economy supposed to thrive, rebuild and prosper when the productive element of its economy, that is, our young brains trust, our graduates, our up-and-comers, are rapidly leaving, as they are? Our state simply cannot prosper when only a diminishing few do well. Prosperity rests upon every child in South Australia having an opportunity to have the same start, the same chance, to achieve their ambitions.

For 12 years this government has ignored the increasingly obvious signs that are written on the wall, that South Australia's reliance on manufacturing and agribusiness exports alone will no longer sustain South Australia's revenue base. This government has done nothing to improve the efficiency and productivity of our labour market. It should be of no surprise to any member of this place that in a developed economy which has traditionally relied on certain industries, that in a period of changing times and markets these industries cannot continue to support our economy on their own. The job opportunities in these areas, which people like my grandparents grasped, are not new industries and new opportunities are required.

I believe it is time for all South Australians to increasingly look to other sectors, like the resources sector, to guarantee long-term investment and job creation. I believe for too long South Australia has missed out on this opportunity. Have a look at the Angas Zinc Mine and BHP Billiton's decision to shelve the Olympic Dam expansion. The list goes on and on. By now we could have had one of the largest producers of minerals, particularly uranium.

In the midst of these disastrous and shameful truths about the ills this state suffers sits a government that has done nothing to address these problems. It has become clear to me, while observing this government over the past 12 years, that only the Liberal Party has the appetite and the dedication to change our current direction and avoid the cliff from which we are about to fall economically.

I am determined as a member of this place to do all I can to rectify the problems that our great state faces. I do not fear these problems; I welcome the opportunity to help solve them and I stand before you as a breath of fresh air in this place. I believe we must invest more in research and development to harness our new ideas and our technology, alter our tax laws, improve our schools and hospitals, and explore and empower our citizens to learn more, to reach higher and to get the state moving again.

Hartley is a hard working, multicultural electorate. A significant proportion of people are from migrant families, with 48 per cent having both parents born overseas and 35 per cent speak two or more languages. Hartley is one of the most religious electorates, with a strong Judeo-Christian population comprising almost 50 per cent of the electorate, and there is barely a weekend that does not feature a fair, a fete, a Festa, a festival or a fundraiser.

Members interjecting:

Mr TARZIA: Lots of F words there. Hartley's diversity is shown, with 11.4 per cent of households in Hartley speaking fluent Italian, as I try to from time to time. Hartley is a true representation of the vibrant cultural diversity that exists in 21st century South Australia. It covers about 15.5 square kilometres and includes suburbs like Campbelltown, Felixstow, Glynde, Hectorville, Kensington Gardens, Tranmere, Magill, Auldana, Rosslyn Park and parts of Payneham and Paradise.

Hartley is an electorate that is blessed with many outstanding local businesses—over 500 in total—which employ thousands of South Australians, and with an array of local cafes. Where would I be without the hundreds of macchiatos that I consumed during the election period. There is something for everyone in Hartley. In the south of the electorate, Penfolds Magill Estate Winery and Restaurant is one of the state's premium food destinations and is located in the heart of Hartley. For the sweet tooth there are endless locations—for example, Robern Menz, home of FruChocs. There are families like the Capaldos at Glynde Mitre 10, which has recently been recognised for its excellence within the hardware industry at the Hardware Association of South Australia Awards.

Areas like Glynde showcase a plethora of Australia's finest food manufacturers, including Gelato Bello, Nuts About Food, AR Ravioli and La Casa Del Formaggio. Furthermore, the continental stores in the seat are some of the best in Australia. It was very hard to keep the weight off during the election campaign. Have a look at Pasta Deli, the Italian Place and il Mercato, for example.

Hartley was named after John Anderson Hartley, who established the system of compulsory education in South Australia in 1875, and the seat was created in the electoral redistribution of 1976. On behalf of my volunteers, I am proud to say that Hartley now has the worst Labor vote since 1993 and the best Liberal two-party preferred vote since 1993, and we won it with a commitment to help improve the area for all residents of Hartley.

During the course of my campaign it was a privilege to hear the views of my constituents that impact their day-to-day lives and to fight for their causes. Whilst there are many local issues, I was especially honoured and privileged to stand beside Prime Minister Tony Abbott and the local federal member and minister, Hon. Christopher Pyne, during the campaign to announce funding to build a fully developed Campbelltown leisure centre, with an eight-lane FINA qualified swimming pool, so that the children of Hartley can have the opportunity to learn how to swim, in Campbelltown, in Hartley.

Backing sport in our community is a good thing, especially in our youth, for sport teaches children about winning and losing, about discipline and about keeping fit and healthy. I am proud to say that it did these things for me when I won my first premiership with the Payneham Norwood Union Football Club many years ago, and that amongst other things, the state Liberal Party made a significant commitment to the Hectorville Sports and Community Club at the last state election.

Traffic in the electorate is a concerning issue, and I am proud to say, as many would view if they drove through the electorate today, that we were successful in lobbying the current government

to upgrade the Magill Road/Glynburn Road intersection, which has been plagued with congestion problems. I also particularly highlight the need for a solution for better parking in Paradise. It is vital that the proposed McNally development has a traffic management plan. We also experienced a change in planning initiatives during the course of the campaign, particularly in Felixstow and Paradise, with the community's concerns being heard and listened to.

Preventing a substation from being built in residential Glynde continues to be an ongoing cause which we must keep fighting for, and I welcome the government's election commitment—and we will hold them to account—to relocate the substation to an alternative industrial site. I welcome the Italian government's decision to keep the Italian consulate open in Adelaide.

I believe that the best life we can lead is in the service of others. I grew up in and around the seat of Hartley; it is where I live and the place that has given my family and our community so much, and it is time to give something back. While we make a living by what we get, we certainly make a life by what we give back. I want to bring a positive change to the people of Hartley and for the people of South Australia. Our community can be better.

I am committed to the people of Hartley because there is no reason why Hartley cannot be stronger than ever before. It is this drive to serve others that made me want to enter public life. It is this drive that has drawn me to the Liberal Party. A key objective of the Liberal Party as set out in our constitution is to:

...[encourage] individual initiative and enterprise as the dynamic force of progress...In which the youth of the nation is given every encouragement to develop its talents to the full, recognising that from its ranks will come the leaders of tomorrow...[and] in which family life is seen as fundamental to the well-being of society, and in which every family is enabled to live in and preferably to own a comfortable home at reasonable cost, and with adequate community amenities.

Sir Robert Menzies, our longest-serving prime minister, thought of the Liberal Party as a:

...progressive party, willing to make experiments, in no sense reactionary but believing in the individual, his rights and his enterprise.

He also stated that:

If liberalism stands for anything, and young liberalism above all, it's for a passion to contribute to the nation.

History shows us that our society and our government interact at its best when the size and impact of our government is curtailed and free enterprise is encouraged. Governments have a duty to empower private enterprise to succeed to expand the economy. State owned and operated industries cannot alone sustain an economy into the future. It is only through the drive and industrious energy of the individual that truly drive the direction of our economy. For too long in South Australia that drive has been stifled and crushed by mismanagement, by red tape and by the carelessness of this government.

As a Liberal, I believe in equal opportunity for all South Australians and the encouragement and facilitation of wealth so that all may enjoy the highest possible standards of living, in health, in education and in social justice. I believe we should certainly fight for a free market but ensure there are rules to ensure competition and fair play, and care for the most vulnerable in our community. It is this dedication to giving back and to making sensible decisions that inspired me to help the people of Hartley and to make our state more prosperous.

The recent election was a challenge for all involved, and I would like to sincerely thank the people of Hartley for their support. I would also like to thank my family for their tireless work behind the scenes. To the charities, community groups like Probus, Lions and Rotary, the sporting clubs, the churches, and many others who have supported me, to my campaign manager, Sue Lawrie, the relentless lioness of the state Liberal Party, who is with us here today, and to those who helped me with my campaign: without your work and support, this would not be possible.

I am proud to stand here and say that my volunteers and I door knocked every street in Hartley, with no union alliance. I am proud to represent Hartley in this parliament, to make this state once again prosperous and to make South Australia even greater. I pledge myself completely and wholly to the people and institutions of Hartley so long as they deem me fortunate enough to represent them.

In closing, I would like to thank those who made it possible for me to have the privilege and honour of representing the people of Hartley in the South Australian parliament. I thank God. I thank my sister, Therese, who yesterday graduated from the University of Adelaide with her Graduate Diploma in Nursing. I thank my girlfriend Charissa for her love and her support and, of course, my parents and both of our families for the long road they have supported us along, and for the love and support that they have given us. As you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and other members before me know, public life can certainly be demanding on our families and friends, and I would like to thank them for their ongoing love and support of my pursuit to make Hartley and this state great.

I thank the members of my party and my financial donors for the trust they place in us. Further, I thank some state and federal members of parliament for their assistance during my political career, primarily the member for Dunstan. While some would like to remain anonymous—and I will respect that, they know who they are—I would also like to mention the federal member for Sturt, the Hon. Christopher Pyne, as Hartley is completely within the federal electorate of Sturt. I acknowledge the Hons Simon Birmingham and Rob Lucas, and the members for Bragg, Morialta and Unley.

Finally, I pledge to represent this place and the people of Hartley with a sense of duty, honour, gratitude and humility. I will stay hungry for the people of Hartley and hungry for the people of South Australia. I will be fighting for an economic recovery of this state from this place with a long-term view, with youth and drive, with diversity and openness, with an appetite for calculated risk and an aspiration for reinvention. I will continually ask what I can do for this state and what I can do for Hartley, and the job will not be done unless all that can be done has been done. I will help lead this state with good conscience. And may history, Deputy Speaker, be the ultimate, the final judge of our deeds.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to acknowledge the presence in the chamber today the federal members for Kingston and Blaxland. We welcome them and hope they have enjoyed their time with us so far and that they will continue to enjoy their time with us today. I also spy the former member for Kaurna, the Hon. John Hill, and I welcome him back. I hope he also enjoys his time this afternoon.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Kaurna, I remind the house that this is the member's first speech and I ask that members accord him the customary courtesies for the occasion.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16:53): Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker. I congratulate you on your election; it is a fine choice for this chamber to make. I also congratulate the Speaker on his election to high office; I note his particular reluctance in taking up the role. I commend His Excellency on a fantastic speech yesterday, setting out the ambitious agenda of this fourth-term Labor government. Of course, I congratulate the Premier on his tremendous and historic victory in the March election.

We all bring to this place the products of our experience and our values. For my part, one of the great influences on my life is that I have been fortunate enough to grow up in a family full of teachers. My mother, uncle, aunt, late grandmother and more have been teachers. That is many Christmas dinners discussing public versus private, class sizes, teaching methodology, good and bad parents, but also some inspiring stories about how lives have been turned around. For my whole life, it has instilled in me the value of education, its transformative abilities for young people, how it really can change lives and fortunes, and also valuing the important role that teachers perform in our state.

No child born in this state deserves to live the rest of their life in poverty. Each child has the potential to make huge contributions to our community, but realistically the circumstances a child is raised in—their family income, family health and location—determine so much about the rest of their lives. What can change that pre-set path is a good education. Giving that child from Aldinga, Davoren

Park or Whyalla inspiring, committed teachers can help children have opportunities and reach their potential.

So, this means we need schools in Seaford, Aldinga and everywhere across the state that are as good as Burnside and North Adelaide. It means there needs to be more support for schools to cater for special needs children. The area that I represent in this parliament is a young, growing part of Adelaide, with children from many different backgrounds. My passion in public life is to have the government support them so that they can have the same opportunities as if they lived anywhere else in this state or in the country.

For my own part, I was lucky enough to be taught at some very good public schools with some excellent teachers who kindled my interest in the world, in learning, and of course in a bit of argument at times. But the truth is that the public schools I attended were ones where the best teachers flocked to try and get in, and where there were not as many disadvantaged students needing more attention, such as guardians of the state and people from disadvantaged backgrounds.

I am therefore proud to be a member of this Labor government that is embarking upon a major reform program for our schools, ensuring every classroom has the resources it needs to achieve socially just outcomes and to prepare students for the jobs and challenges of tomorrow. Time and time again we have seen it is only the Labor Party that can be relied on to provide education where a bank balance is not the main requirement.

In fact, it was education policy that brought me into the fold of the Labor Party. Sixteen years ago, John Howard had just won re-election, and on top of cutting health and bringing in a more regressive tax system, his program was to dramatically cut funding to universities and to allow entry on the basis of who has the richer parents rather than who has the best ability. I could not then and I still cannot see why a student with bad marks but rich pockets could jump the queue for law or medicine degrees over a student with higher marks but without a wealthy family. That is what made me join the Labor Party, which I have continued in until today.

When I went to university to study law, I was then proud to join campaigns for better services on campus, particularly for students with limited means. I was proud to have contributed to the student union at Flinders University, which despite its name is actually not the campaigning arm but runs services like employment services and welfare services, which were vital for so many students in the southern suburbs.

Quality universities, quality TAFEs and quality trades training are very much needed so that young people and older people who are retraining can get access to new skills for new jobs. Over the course of the election campaign, I have met a number of people in my electorate who are facing unemployment or underemployment. Without doubt, it causes a huge burden for those families. The connections between unemployment and diminishing physical and mental health are very well-known. On this side of the house, we will always understand the importance of a well-paying job to the self-worth of an individual and the devastation of not having one. We will always do everything we can to fight for South Australian jobs and to support the people who are looking for jobs.

When I previously worked in the South Australian government in 2008, we faced the unfortunate situation of the Mitsubishi closure at Tonsley. As well as ensuring we supported the workers and the suppliers impacted, the government faced a choice: did we let the market take its course (and the site would very likely become a big warehouse with few jobs) or did the government take action, buy the site and help transform it into more jobs in the south? Of course, we chose the latter path. We went to Mitsubishi in Tokyo to persuade them to sell it to the government and now we have new training and new jobs moving into that site. It means more jobs for the southern suburbs, close to where people live. It is just one example of the fact that I am proud to be a member of a party that will stand by workers and stand by their jobs.

South Australia is not the biggest, not the richest, not the oldest state, so what do we want for ourselves in the future? In my view we should not be aiming to be the best at everything, but we can be the best at what we do and, most importantly, we need to continue to have the best lifestyle of anywhere in the world. That is what I will be aiming for as long as I have the privilege to serve in this place.

We should not look upon other states with jealousy but we should take the best ideas from the whole world. The unique feature of South Australia, and particularly Adelaide, is its size and

location. We have a capital large enough to compete with the rest of the world but it is small enough to be easy to live in. We are located close enough to the larger eastern states but with enough space that we live surrounded by some of the best wineries and beaches and national parks that you could wish to find.

Historically our city's base has been built on a huge number of manufacturing jobs. Many people question where our jobs and growth will come from with manufacturing facing problems with cheaper labour from other countries. Despite the troubles that manufacturing has faced over the last 20 or 30 years, other sectors—and particularly service sectors—are growing continuously in this state.

Industries such as education, health, finance, tourism and technology are growing and, despite what some people may think, these are actually services we can export to other states and other countries, not to mention the huge opportunities ahead for South Australia in agribusiness, mining services and advanced manufacturing. There is a lot of growth to be optimistic about as long as business, the government and the community work together.

One part of that is to encourage more wealthy South Australians to invest in our local entrepreneurship, unlocking capital available for the next generation's prosperity. I join this long-term and successful government as a new MP and as a younger member of parliament. I think I am the third-youngest in the current parliament. I therefore hope (subject to the views of my electors) to serve this state and parliament for some time to come—although I am sure people opposite will have different views about that.

My drive is to use my time here focusing on not just the urgent and immediate but also the long-term and important opportunities and challenges for the future. First and foremost of our future challenges as a state is how we will manage the growing number of older South Australians. Over past decades we have had hundreds and thousands of baby boomers in the workforce, paying taxes, raising families and contributing to the care of others. In future years these hardworking South Australians will understandably retire, despite the best wishes of the federal Treasurer, leaving the workforce.

For instance, many doctors and nurses will retire from our public hospitals and they are going to be replaced with many more patients. Health is at risk of gobbling up the entire state budget within decades, and South Australia's population profile is such that we will face this challenge before most other states. In my view, we need to face this issue seriously and positively across all areas of government. We need to redefine the way that we think about ageing and the contribution that older people can make to our society. We will need to grow our population of younger people so that there is less of a gap in the working population, and we also need to forge new, diversified arrangements with Canberra to address the chronic vertical fiscal imbalance caused by our current reliance on one tax which is at the whim of consumer sentiment.

If we do this well South Australia can become a centre of excellence in meeting the challenge of an ageing population. What we must not do is embark upon a major program of austerity measures, as Tony Abbott's government has under way in Canberra. This population change is not an excuse for the same small government arguments conservatives have trotted out for a century: lower benefits, lower wages and cuts in services.

I come to this parliament as an advocate for health services and particularly for preventive health services. Despite enjoying my studies in law at university I have spent most of the past decades working in health policy, both in government and recently as an associate director at Deloitte Access Economics. I have appreciated the opportunity to work with many committed people who dedicate their lives to improving people's health—doctors, nurses, academics, managers and allied health professionals.

I will always be a supporter of sensible, preventive health measures. We spend billions of dollars a year on the world's best hospital care, with constantly changing; new drugs; technology and interventions available. However, many of the most common and expensive calls on the health system are preventable—and prevention is much cheaper. I have spent a number of years working on tobacco policy, encouraging more people to stop smoking cigarettes, which are the nation's leading killer.

I am very glad my grandmother Ruth is here today. She regularly smoked for most of her life. In fact, when my father was a boy, he would insert matchsticks into her cigarettes to get them to explode to try to get her to quit that way. Unfortunately, that did not work, but I am happy to say that my grandmother has kicked the addiction through a lot of guts and determination over recent years. I think that anybody who can do that is an inspiration, and I congratulate her.

Working for Nicola Roxon, I was privileged to be part of the team that took on big tobacco companies and introduced plain packaging—a great Labor reform and the first in the world. We were the first place to fully eliminate advertising for tobacco products. It is the only legal product for sale that has no safe way to use it, so why should there be advertising for it?

The big tobacco companies fought us all the way with massive public advertising campaigns. When I served as chief of staff to Nicola, who was attorney-general, the tobacco companies took us all the way to the High Court with their huge legal budget, and we won. In this place, I will continue the fight against smoking and keep pushing for a better healthcare system—a system Labor built and Labor will defend.

One of the most important lessons of my career thus far has been that many great achievements do not come without significant opposition at times, often from vested interests protecting their own patch against the interests of the vast majority. Both in working on plain packaging but also on the new Royal Adelaide proposal for my predecessor—the previous member for Kaurana John Hill, whom we are privileged to see here today—I was lucky to work on projects and with politicians that truly left a mark.

Our new hospital that is being built right now on North Terrace helps us to secure the future of health care in this state, but to go ahead with such an ambitious project took a lot of guts and caused a lot of short-term political pain. John saw the problems of the future ahead and the case for change, and pursued what has now become the biggest project our city has ever seen, which will significantly improve health care for our state. This is the hospital that Premier Weatherill will open in two years' time, and it will stand as a truly Labor achievement. There is not one ounce of bipartisan support from the opposition for this hospital, so it will always be known as Labor's hospital.

The lesson I have taken away is that, while there are some times when it is important to reach consensus or compromise, there are some policies, ideas and programs that are worth fighting for in their original, unblemished form. We are not here to be bureaucrats. It is often healthy to debate and pursue unequivocally matters that benefit the vast majority of people rather than seek solutions to keep vested interests quiet.

Some of my former federal colleagues and a fair few of my constituents, while supportive of my endeavours, are not quite sold on the future of state parliaments. So, why did I put my hand up to be here? The reason is that I believe state governments have a much greater ability to connect with people's lives. In Canberra, the vastness and complexity of the task makes it almost impossible to have hands-on knowledge of individual services, let alone the issues faced by different communities across our large country—apologies to the member for Kingston and the member for Blaxland here today.

Here in Adelaide, I have seen that daily services are not abstract concepts. In a state the size of South Australia, ministers can have a connection with the communities they represent. You get to know the hospitals, the schools and the roads. The other benefit is that state government truly runs services, not just manages a series of contracts with service providers and other governments. That significantly increases the opportunity for committed ministers to achieve reform that not only works on paper but works on the ground.

South Australia can also be the breeding ground for social and government reforms that can lead the nation and our world. As we well know, South Australia has led the reform of democratic processes, including being the second place in the world to bring the franchise to women—something we should all be proud of. Almost 120 years on from that achievement, I hope we can continue to update and progress our institutions.

Another benefit of state governments is having electorates small enough that you can genuinely get involved and get to know the community quite well. I am honoured to represent in this parliament the electorate of Kaurana, comprising suburbs across 20 kilometres of Adelaide's southern coastline. While I am sure all members in this house will argue strongly that their electorate is the

greatest, the people who live in my electorate know that you are all having us on. In fact, we often see members of this house coming down to enjoy their holidays in my electorate, in the suburbs that we live in like Port Willunga, Aldinga, Port Noarlunga and Moana.

The people of Kaurna are a unique mix of long-time residents, surfers, new families in their first-ever home, empty nesters escaping the rat race, people doing it tough in community housing and people flocking from the cold of the UK to the warmth of our stunning beaches. What were once paddocks around Seaford and Aldinga are now established suburbs. I have really enjoyed getting to know many residents who have worked hard to build a better community.

I have met people like Toff and Cara West who were inspired to turn a disused general store in Aldinga into a buzzing local bakery; Rosa Garrett who started a small cupcake business to buy the go-kart that her son desperately wants; Steve McInnes whose hard work has revived the Port Noarlunga RSL into a thriving community centre not just for veterans; Leanne Kutsbach who could not find a good online resource for parents in her area, so she worked for years to start her own in a new NGO. There are so many more: surf lifesavers, CFS, SES and other volunteers.

Given both the growth of my area and the distance from the central business district, connections to the city, both physical and online, are vital. To give an idea of the scale, Aldinga Beach is a massive 40 kilometres as the crow flies from where we stand—the same or greater distance as Gawler is in the opposite direction. The consequence of successive governments establishing housing so far from the city is that we must continue to invest in the infrastructure to support the quality of life for the people who live there. The soon-to-be opened Southern Expressway duplication is a practical but also a symbolic change for the south.

The short-sighted one-way expressway built by the previous Liberal government continues to be seen as a laughing stock for Adelaide, interstate and internationally. It was also a signal to the south that the government only ever viewed it as a commuter area. It did not entertain the possibility that people from the city would want to work in the south or that tourists would travel to beaches or McLaren Vale. It was a signal to people in the south that they were only good enough for half a road, with no capacity built in for a future expansion. It was the worst in public policy. Within months, the Premier will open the new road with more opportunities for jobs and tourism in the south and more time for people to spend with their families, and not commuting.

The Seaford rail line is another great achievement of state and federal Labor. It is now open with two new stations, our first electric trains in South Australia and limited stop services starting next month for which I commend the current and previous transport ministers. The new infrastructure, with final works having just been completed, will soon become the benchmark for a higher standard of public transport in this city.

Public transport is vital for the future of our state, allowing huge movements of people that we need to make in and out of the city as our city grows and our roads become busier and busier. There are further works that this government has planned that will improve the lives of people in my electorate. These include new ambulance stations at Seaford and Noarlunga, an upgrade to Noarlunga Hospital, faster services on the Seaford line and a new dog park in either Seaford or Aldinga.

The significance is not lost on me that I represent the electorate named Kaurna, named of course after the traditional owners of the land that we stand on. The land of my electorate is also home to many traditional Kaurna sites. Without doubt, the European settlement of South Australia has been absolutely devastating for Aboriginal people and many thousands of lives have been ruined from the decisions taken by our predecessors in this chamber. For as long as I am here I hope to contribute to rebuilding that damage, assisting in the painstaking task of rebuilding what was so systematically damaged.

Being elected to parliament is a tremendous honour and privilege and only happens with the support of a great number of people. The very least I can do is honour some of those people in this chamber today. My parents—Michael and Fiona—have given me the best possible foundation in life, particularly a life in public service. I inherited dad's unbridled loyalty to the cause of our party and perhaps his ability to stage a good argument. From Mum I have inherited her good sense of social justice and her belief in the power of committed people to transform lives and communities. Thank you for sacrificing so much for your children. We never wanted for anything.

I am certainly proud of my father who is now the mayor of Mitcham and my mother who is completing a doctorate in education. I am also lucky to have the love and support of my sister, Johanna, and my brother, Timothy. I daresay I will not be the last of the Pictons to serve in this place one day. I thank my grandmother Ruth, who I mentioned earlier and who is here today, and also my late grandmother Denise who was one of my family's teachers that I mentioned earlier—an inspiring lifetime learner, always encouraging her grandchildren to discover more about the world. I think she would have been very excited today.

I thank my fiancée, Connie, for so very much but in particular for letting me disrupt our lives a fair bit so I could pursue this goal. I promise I will now turn some attention to our upcoming wedding preparations.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope so!

Mr Pederick: Just a little bit!

Mr PICTON: Just a little bit.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He didn't say how much!

Mr PICTON: She has it all under control.

An honourable member interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You cynic!

Mr PICTON: While my family tree stretches very far back in Australia to Clare in the 1890s or New South Wales at the start of that colony, Connie's family is a story of post-war migration—forging small businesses and building new lives for families. SA has always been made more rich by the people who come to our state with commitment and drive. I thank you, Connie, for welcoming me into your family—and Sam as well, who is here—I have enjoyed a better understanding of your culture and traditions that Connie and I will then pass on to our children one day.

Of course, I thank my predecessor as the member for Kurna, John Hill (who is here today) for his very strong support, and his wife Andrea. I also thank Nicola Roxon who is my previous boss, who could not be here today. More wise, supporting and passionate leaders you would be hard pressed to find. But whenever I face a dilemma on what path to take in this new job, I will be able to think, 'What would John or Nicola have done?' and I know that that will lead me on the right path. I wish you both the best in your retirement from parliament but of course, I know, not from your working life.

I would particularly like to thank Amanda Rishworth, the very hard-working member for Kingston. She is an exemplar local MP and she has strongly supported me over the course of this campaign. It is a credit to her that dozens of people said to us over the course of the election, 'Look, I think you're a good bloke and I'm sure you will do a good job, but I'm just not sure—I think you'll have a tough chance up against that Amanda woman.' So, thank you, Amanda, for your support over the years and particularly in the campaign.

I would also like to thank many of the friends and supporters who have helped me to get here: Peter Malinauskas, Don and Nimfa Farrell (who are here today), Alex Dighton, Brer Adams, Xanthe Kleinig, Owen Torpy, Laura Ryan, Nick Champion, Sonia Romeo, Liam O'Brien, Carla De Campo, Danielle Galessi, Sophie Green, Joel Catchlove, Sam Rodgers, Catherine Hockley, Tony Sherbon, Adrian O'Dea, Sean Berg (who is here today), Luke and Renee Toy, Nadia Clancy, Dominic Stefanson (who is here today), Katana Smith and many others. And also many members of this house, including the Premier, the Treasurer, the Deputy Premier, Transport Minister, Social Housing Minister, Health Minister, and the members for Little Para, Taylor, Elder and Reynell, just to name a few.

I also thank my supporters locally in the Kurna electorate for all their hard work, in particular my steadfast campaign manager Emmanuel Cusack who ran a well-crafted and sophisticated campaign. I thank you very much. I also thank my campaign team which happily included so many of my friends: Matt Clemow, Michael Bezuidenhout, Stephanie Ghellar, Gemma Paech, Matthew Walton, Aaron Hill, Melissa Westbrook, Anika Wells, Finn McCarthy, Jesse Northfield, Necia Pascale, Matt Di Caterina, Josh Hage, Deb Pow, Eileen Baldwin, Graham Knill, Frank Busitill, Tim Ryan, Christine Duke, Lorna Clarke, and the hundred-odd other people who helped out in the

community in a whole bunch of ways—whether it be from letterboxing, to phone calls, or moral support—many of whom had never campaigned in an election before.

We ran a strong campaign that included doorknocking thousands, phoning thousands and countless letterboxing, as well as holding dozens of street corner and shopping centre meetings across the electorate. I think it was a tremendous honour and privilege to have done that and to meet so many thousands of people.

Above all, I thank the people of Kaurna for your support. I look forward to working hard for both my electorate and the people of South Australia, both helping the state to rise to opportunities and to meet our challenges. I hope to be a passionate advocate for our state, and to stand up for people without the wealth and privilege to have a voice for themselves. And, of course, I aim to meet the expectations of those who have put so much faith in me. Thank you.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, before I call on the member for Bright I would like to remind the house that this is the member's first speech, and I would ask all members to accord him the customary courtesies on this very important occasion. The member for Bright.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (17:19): Deputy Speaker, parliamentary colleagues, friends and family in the galleries, it is a great honour to rise this afternoon to deliver my maiden speech in this parliament. Deputy Speaker, warm congratulations on your election to the chair of this house, an important job that I am sure you will deliver with impartiality and dignity.

As this is the Address in Reply, it is important to pay tribute to the service of His Excellency the Governor, who attended parliament yesterday and conducted himself with the usual dignity which he has become known for. As His Excellency is reaching the end of his term in that office, it is important for us to recognise his great service to this state. I believe that His Excellency has fulfilled his role with aplomb, and I have been particularly taken with his passion for helping the young people of South Australia. In my role as a national director of the Duke of Edinburgh's Award in Australia I regularly attend gold award ceremonies at Government House, and I have observed the authentic commitment of the Governor in his role as patron of the Duke of Edinburgh's Award in South Australia. He will be greatly missed when he leaves that office.

Deputy Speaker, my hope is that I come to this role with humility and that I will be a strong advocate and dignified ambassador for all the people who live within Bright no matter who they chose to cast their vote for in the March 2014 election. My arrival in this parliament is the result of a great team effort, and I am the mere messenger boy for a ground swell of grassroots community action which has bubbled up across that electorate over the last 18 months and which has carried me into parliament as a spokesperson for a community that wants to be taken seriously, that wants to be listened to, and that wants to be involved. Genuine and ongoing engagement with my community will underpin everything I do while in this place, and I will never forget that first and foremost I am here to serve the people of Bright.

There are many people to thank. So many people got involved in this campaign. Most were not political, most had never been involved in politics before, most were campaign virgins not knowing what they were getting themselves in for, but they believed that things could be done differently in our local community and across South Australia, so they got on board and commenced a journey towards the election. In person, I want to thank Fran Southern, my tireless campaign manager and her husband Dennis, my always there campaign secretary Helen Dwyer whose endless energy and boundless optimism kept us going, my doorknocking companions, Jenny Burroughs, Ben Farmer, Annabel Morris, Aric Pierce, Jan Smith, Marco Wenzel and Stuart Sampson. We climbed the hills of Hallett Cove, got sunburnt (very easy to do with my skin), were chased by dogs, and even had an incredibly close encounter with a brown snake in Hallett Cove.

I need to thank my armies of letterboxers, who covered the electorate many times over, and the people who dodged traffic on Brighton Road to put up posters, always put up within council guidelines. Then, there are the hundreds who donned their aqua T-shirts and came out on election day with a youthful energy and 1,000 smiles that are so foreign to the way of doing politics in this state that we simply charmed the undecided voters into coming our way. At this point, I cannot help but mention the Mitchell family—Lorraine, Dave, Suzy, Jon, Lisa, Pete, Tim and Josh, who spent all

day—yes, all day—on the Hallett Cove south booth and delivered me the biggest swing in the seat. They are here today in the gallery—thank you.

Within the Liberal Party I would like to thank our leader, the member the Dunstan, for his many visits to the electorate, our deputy leader, the member for Bragg, for her constant help with the public transport apocalypse which befell the innocent people of Bright, my neighbour to the north, the member for Morphett, and the Hon. Terry Stephens MLC for his unwavering support and encouragement. I also need to mention Penny Pratt who looked after me throughout the election campaign and who was an endless support. Also, to the Hon. Stephen Wade MLC and Senator Simon Birmingham for their ongoing support.

To the member for Mitchell, my eastern neighbour who joins me in this place, thank you for coordinating your campaign with mine and working with me across our shared communities. I look forward to our friendship and working relationship continuing for many years to come. I need to thank my co-councillor in coastal ward, Cheryl Connor, and the mayor of Marion, Felicity-ann Lewis, for their support and mentoring along the way. Cheryl's passion and knowledge of Hallett Cove taught me so much about my community during my three years representing it on Marion council.

Thanks also to my best mate Luke Ritchie, who has been there for me day in and day out since we started this crazy journey. Thank you to my parents-in-law, Trudy and Steve Brazil, and my sister-in-law, Gemma, who did not expect a politician to be sitting at their dining room table once a week. To Hannah, my darling wife, my lover, my encourager, my soul mate and best friend, who arranged our amazing wedding during an election year and has shuddered through more Liberal Party functions than anyone should be allowed to attend in a lifetime, who told me to get a grip when I wanted to pack it all in and who drove me across the winning line, I could not have done this without your down to earth caring support.

I pay tribute to my predecessor in the seat of Bright, the Hon. Chloe Fox, who served here for eight years. Perhaps it is the sea air and the sound of waves that keeps us mellow, but the election campaign in Bright was a good one. It was civilised and, unlike so many other campaigns in the recent state election, it did not get personal, it did not get dirty and it did not leave local people shaking their heads in disdain at the political class. All power to Chloe Fox for doing the right thing; I respect her for it. She was a thoroughly decent opponent.

I am biased, of course—and we have heard lots of this in maiden speeches—but I really do believe that the seat of Bright is the most beautiful of the Adelaide metropolitan seats. It is a series of individual coastal villages, each with its own distinct character, strong sense of community and specific needs. The electorate is divided in two, with a steep escarpment forming a topographical divide between the plains and the plateau. South of the escarpment we find Hallett Cove, our largest suburb, accounting for almost half of the electorate. Hallett Cove is lauded for its unique geological park, which draws tourists from across the world and school children from every corner of Adelaide. Locals love Hallett Cove's open space, its precious conservation park, sheep paddocks, Field River Valley and community parks around every corner.

Moving north, we have Marino scrambling across the hillside and Kingston Park, one of Adelaide's smallest suburbs, nestled in the cove by the beach. Here you will find the Tjilbruke monument and lookout commemorating one of Adelaide's most touching dreamtime stories. Across the road is Kingston House, built in 1840 by George Strickland Kingston, deputy surveyor-general to Colonel William Light. The house, which I can recommend for its excellent Sunday afternoon Devonshire teas, was also home to George's son Charles, who from 1893 to 1901 was a great reformist premier of South Australia.

Leaving Kingston Park and the rugged southern coastline behind, we move north onto the plains. Seacliff, Brighton, Hove and Somerton Park form a series of attractive beachside suburbs, each with a strong sense of community, an environmental bent and desire to preserve the heritage and lifestyle that draws so many people to the area. Surf life saving is a dominant community past-time. I would guess that there are more surf life savers living in Bright than in any other seat. We have three thriving surf clubs, which are lively hubs of community: Somerton has just celebrated reaching 1,000 members, making it the state's largest club; Brighton, my home club, is not far behind with 850 members; and Seacliff, smaller but no less important, with 500 members.

Surf life saving is a great way of life, combining community service with health and leisure, and I am sure it is a subject I will discuss more in future conversations in this place. In all my time in

Australia I have only lived in Bright, and at this point in my life I cannot imagine wanting to live anywhere else—it is truly a great place to call home.

I was not born in Australia; that much is obvious every time I open my mouth, and I hope the good folks in Hansard are able to get used to this unusual lilt. It is an accent birthed in lowland Scotland hued by a Northern Irish mother and softened by a decade in Australia. Much as I have tried to fake it saying 'G'day' and 'She'll be alright' and other Australianisms, my accent is going nowhere. And anyway, why should Senator Doug Cameron in the left have a monopoly on Scottish accents in Australia's parliaments?

I think it is incredibly important to pay attention to one's heritage. I am Australian but I am Scottish too; Australia is my home, but so is there. Australia is a melting pot of peoples who largely get along with one another in this fine egalitarian culture where the concept of mateship defines us and where, if you are willing to roll up your sleeves and do a bit of hard work, you will do well. We come here and we should assimilate, but we should remember and pay tribute to our roots, our heritage, and acknowledge that our lives began elsewhere, and that elsewhere place will inevitably have left its imprint on us. Whether it is our accent, our skin colour, our festivals and customs or simply our gratitude just to be here, migrants have stories and they are usually worth sharing.

I hail from south-west Scotland, an isolated rural area known as Galloway, which arcs around the rugged Irish Sea coastline and is lush, fertile farming country. Galloway is well known for its lowland dairy herds and for its upland sheep and beef cattle farms which cover the region's rolling hills. The rugged landscape is dappled with villages and occasional towns. Castles—some ruined, some not—solemnly stand watch over most communities, and the people—good, hardy folk—spend most of their time avoiding the next shower of rain, for in Galloway, if it does not rain today, you will talk about it for the next two weeks.

I grew up on my grandparents' farm spending all my spare time out in the land. If there is one thing I miss about living in Scotland it is being away from a rural community, but I know that I have carried that upbringing with me to Australia, and my desire to build strong, cohesive communities where people help each other out, where folks wave to each other as cars pass in the street, where we know what football team our neighbours support—that is what I want to be part of creating here in South Australia.

My sense of community was shaped at primary school. I went to a school with only 40 pupils. In my year, there were two boys and two girls. We sat facing each other across the table: the boys on one side, the girls on the other. My teachers, Mrs Barbara McNeil and Mr Harold McCracken, had a profound impact on my life, and probably never expected to be mentioned in an Australian parliament. They are good people who chose to be teachers for the right reasons and left a remarkable legacy in that little Scottish community where they taught for decades in the same school.

In 1996 I found myself beginning secondary school at Stranraer Academy, a pretty tough public school where 'Survival of the fittest' could realistically have been our school motto. Six years later when I graduated, a teacher turned to me and said, 'David, if you survive Stranraer Academy you'll do well anywhere.' It was a forlorn place which I was never really fond of, but where I made friends for life and where my interest in politics was sparked and nurtured by Mrs Dutton, a passionate socialist who made politics interesting and brought it all to life for me.

Mrs Dutton's politics never interested me very much though. By the time I ended up in her classroom, the Tony Blair landslide of 1997 had swept every Scottish Conservative out of every constituency in the country, and I was very much a lonely figure in my defence of centre right politics. While Mrs Dutton railed against Maggie Thatcher, I argued that her reformist zeal had pulled the UK from the edge of oblivion. Yet, Mrs Dutton was one of these great people who could have completely different opinions from you but who would still encourage you to cement your views, fight for them and build them up. I pay tribute to her today as being the single most influential person in my early political life.

My life's journey took a dramatic change of direction in 2002 when, at the behest of my parents, I found myself uprooted and moved to the other side of the world. My mum, who is in the gallery today, can attest—and I am sure she will with a vigorous nod—that I was a nightmare when we moved here—on cue, a nod.

I didn't want to be here. All I knew of Australia was what I had gleaned from my years of watching *Home and Away*, a staple part of any Scottish child's cultural diet. While I liked Alf Stewart, Sally, Pippa and all those good-looking Summer Bay locals, I was quite sure I did not want to be here, but here I was and I had to make a very distinct choice early in my time here either to go back to Scotland or throw myself into life in South Australia. I chose the latter and I have not looked back.

Moving your children to the other side of the world in search of better opportunities is something only considered by an enterprising type of people who are willing to put everything on the line to attain a hazy dream which is inevitably laced with uncertainty. I am indebted to my parents who left our green Scottish pastures—because the pastures were actually greener on that side—to step into the great unknown and commence a new life here in Australia. They both left successful small businesses and their families and friends in Scotland—an unimaginable sacrifice.

My mum's optimism and continual hard work, her enterprising spirit and her persistence in the face of financial difficulties, family struggles and the tyranny of distance blow my mind every time I consider them. My mum is my biggest personal inspiration and I will be forever grateful for all she has done for me.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr SPEIRS: Moving here was not my choice, but South Australia has given me endless opportunities, and I believe that there are fewer places in the world where someone could go from angry teenage migrant to member of parliament in just over a decade. I believe that says far more about the society in which we are blessed to live than it does about my own personal ability.

I have been blessed with this position, yet I am acutely aware that to whom much is given much is expected. I have a duty to represent the electorate of Bright and to advocate constantly for the needs of the people who live and work there. Our campaign to win Bright was long and it had depth. We put engaging with the community in a genuine way at the heart of everything we did. Our big conversation with Bright lasted 18 months and sought the views of locals on the things they loved about the community and the things that they would change, and then we asked for suggestions as to how we could work together to make those changes happen. That is the key, in my opinion: work with the community, talk to them, listen to them, turn up, have their backs, but do it together.

After many months of surveying and meeting people face-to-face, we established a range of clear priorities that I have committed to concentrating on now that I am elected. These include fixing Brighton Road, supporting seniors, building strong communities, protecting our precious coastline, building a public transport system that we can be proud of, and supporting small business to survive and thrive. These priorities capture the mood of Bright in 2014. They give my role as a local representative structure and purpose. I aim to build expertise and understanding of each of these priorities and work in partnership with my community to develop new ideas and drive improvements across them.

As well as serving Bright, I believe that I have a duty to pitch ideas into the broader South Australian policy debate. South Australia has never needed new ideas more than it does now. Our state is out of sync with the rest of the nation. Why are we the last to benefit from economic booms and the first to slump into recession? While other states begin to emerge from the economic anguish of the global financial crisis, South Australia remains sluggish. Our economy is weary and declining. Let's not kid ourselves: things are difficult here. Overall unemployment is soaring, youth unemployment is unimaginably high, our economic base is too narrow, our debt and deficit are scary, and there appears to be no plan to take us towards economic recovery.

One of the first emails I received when I was elected came from Naomi, an 18-year-old school leaver from Marino. Naomi finished school at the end of 2013 and she is currently studying fashion at TAFE. She ended her email by asking:

Please tell me why I should stay in SA? I am thinking of returning to the UK to study further, but this is upheaval. I would rather not. SA seems to be stale, very cliquish and not a very progressive state.

Yesterday His Excellency the Governor outlined the government's agenda for the coming term. He painted a rosy picture of vibrancy and excitement gripping the state and a transformation of our economic outlook. I can tell members that 18-year-old Naomi and many of her peers around the state have not been recipients of the great renaissance the government tells us is transforming South Australia. Sadly, for many young people in the southern and northern suburbs, that renaissance is

an unobtainable mirage. The time for a seismic shift in the state's economic policy is now. No more statements, charters, models and task forces espousing lofty goals. Let's stop telling people what we are going to do and actually do something. We need to look at our tax system, we need to grow our population, we need to completely re-look at the way this state is governed, and we need to identify the economic winners for this state and we need to back them.

I have been intrigued by the work of the Committee for Adelaide, which recently released its 'Agenda for Growth', a document which is refreshing to read because it canvasses some of the things that politicians too often shy away from, perhaps because of the four-year cycle and our belief that big ideas may not resonate in a conservative state (with a small C). The committee's 'Agenda for Growth' suggests that we should seek to resource the world, through energy, through food and through ideas. It identifies the things we are good at and it seeks to position them at the centre of our future growth.

There is so much to be said about growing South Australia's economy and fixing the way we govern this state, but most take a reformist passion and I have not seen that present in my time in South Australia, although I note that I moved to South Australia in November 2002 and I have never lived in this state under a Liberal government.

Some reforms that I believe need to be paid attention to include tax reform. In this state, we have to bite the bullet and use taxation policy as an instrument to increase our competitiveness. We have the highest business taxes in Australia and this is crippling our state. The development of new businesses and the growth of existing business is an incredibly exciting thing. It means enterprising people, often young people, putting their necks on the line to nurture and grow something new, something that will contribute to our economy and create jobs.

I believe that governments must clear away the hurdles from enterprising people, continually looking for ways to make it easier for businesses to get off the ground and grow. The most pressing reform on this front should be to ease the burden of payroll tax, but before we even do that we need to change its name. It should simply be called the 'jobs tax'. Payroll tax simply penalises businesses for creating jobs. Its perversity was not lost on a young woman who sat beside me at a meeting of the Hallett Cove Rotary Club a few weeks ago. She asked what I wanted to achieve if I got into parliament, and among the things I discussed was the need to make South Australia business-friendly. I mentioned the concept of payroll tax and she looked at me incredulously. 'A tax on jobs?' she questioned, 'That doesn't make sense'—and it doesn't.

We must look after our regions. The statistics show that our regions are the economic powerhouse of this state. I may represent a metropolitan electorate, but I know that this state does not end at Gepps Cross and that our farmers and producers in particular must be given the attention they deserve.

We need to radically reshape the way that this state does its governance, conducting political engagement in a way that acknowledges the people who have put us here and which genuinely respects their views and opinions, having an ongoing conversation with the community and embedding community engagement into our decision-making processes. We need our governments to acknowledge that community members who experience particular challenges day in and day out are best placed to suggest solutions to these, and we must listen and act upon their advice. This should be the norm rather than the exception.

Further governance reform is needed within local government in this state. As a former councillor and deputy mayor of the great City of Marion, I would be the first to advocate that this must happen. Local government has lost its way in South Australia, lacking capacity and focus. Strong, lean local authorities which are empowered and focused on growing the state's economy and building communities rather than getting in the way of progress are needed. During my time in the City of Marion, we trialled a model where we blended elected members with highly credentialed independent advisers. I would commend this model to the house.

These are just some of the things I believe our state should be actively pursuing. Admittedly, I am young and idealistic, but someone has to be. We must arrest the flight in this state; we have to stem the net interstate migration to keep our young, entrepreneurial, career-driven people here. When they leave, they take away their ideas, energy and capital. When I look at the current policy settings in the state government it seems that the government is taking on a Pied Piper role, willingly piping our young people away to other states. It is a tragedy.

These are difficult policy challenges but they have to be embraced and while this government distractedly dices and splices public service departments, churns out more bureaucratic red tape and burdens South Australia with new taxes and levies, another business is shutting its doors for the last time, another commuter gives up on our trains and another young person walks through the doors of Centrelink. South Australia is a great state; it is a brilliant place to live; it is a phenomenal place to bring up a family but people are leaving in droves. Let's arrest the flight and make South Australia a magnet for investment, entrepreneurial spirit and ideas.

For a moment I would like to turn my attention to an area which I believe is crying out for reform and that is the state's largest institution—our Public Service. Until January this year I spent five years working in the Public Service, most of that time spent within the cabinet office in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The irony of my dual positions of endorsed Liberal candidate and Premier's department employee was not lost on me or my colleagues but it was not something that created a conflict. I always undertook my duties with the integrity that is expected of public servants.

But now I am on the outside and since my election most of the issues presented to me by locals have been matters which have required my interaction with the Public Service. People come seeking their local MP's assistance when navigating bureaucracy and getting solutions to problems which seem complex to an outsider but which should be relatively simple for someone who has the experience of the machinery and practices of government. Yet now I am on the outside I find myself almost as disempowered as my constituents are.

It is as if I am peering in through unwashed windows trying to find out how to navigate the bureaucracy, leaping over the hurdles put in my way and crawling through a maze of sticky red tape. Simple requests become like a military obstacle course; a simple phone call is like wading through a swamp; navigating government websites get you bogged down in a quagmire of confusion, while actually reaching a decision-maker who can help you is like jumping a barbed-wire clad wall.

In the few short weeks since my election, as I battled to get answers to relatively simple requests on transport, justice, housing and sporting issues, I have become increasingly frustrated at the way this sector operates.

My conclusion is that the Public Service in general lacks any sort of empathy for those who it is trying to assist. That is a terrible generalisation to make but it is my personal experience, both from sitting within the ivory tower and now being trapped on the outside, looking up and desperately seeking help; seeking a Rapunzel to let down her hair and get me inside. Sadly, there are no Rapunzels in the leadership of the Public Service in South Australia.

I know so many good people working in the service but I see them worn down, broken and beaten as they attempt to break through layer upon layer of bureaucracy, exhausted by processes usually put in place as a backside-covering mechanism. When I worked in the service I spent far more time telling people up the chain of command what I was going to do rather than actually getting on and doing something. Morale is at rock bottom. There is a perception that people cannot progress their careers unless they have a Labor Party membership. Merit selection is a rare thing and jobs for the boys and girls reigns. The good people either leave or stop being good. It is a tragedy for our Public Service and a tragedy for our state.

What can we do about this? There have been attempts to drive reform. We have had the government reform commission, the Public Sector Performance Commission, the High Performance Framework, the Better Together community engagement framework—which I wrote—the Change@South Australia values and projects. The list goes on and on but they are not worth the paper they are written on unless we have a commitment from the top to change.

Empathy. Values. Engagement. Real change. It must be embodied by leaders from the top and driven into the Public Service through a massive culture change. We need leadership not management. We need action not briefings, and we need to empower individual public servants to find solutions for the issues being raised with them by members of the community.

Until the Public Service becomes a team of empowered individuals it cannot get better. There is a role here for the Public Service's political masters. The government of the day must allow public servants the freedom to innovate, to be creative, to take risks and, ultimately, to make mistakes

without fear of disproportionate retribution. This is also influenced by the horrendous politicisation of the service, in that people are employed through nepotism rather than merit.

I am hopeful that the new Minister for the Public Sector, who I believe I will have a good working relationship with and who, like me, has substantial Public Service experience, can drive an agenda which is more than just glossy reports and action groups, but which drives an entirely new generation of impartial, committed public servant leaders who are all about genuine engagement with the public they seek to serve. If we can achieve that, and if we can lead by example from within this parliament, we can transform the way that this state does its governance.

As I conclude, I would like to dwell for one moment on the ideas of faith in unseen things and of serving our community. These are fundamental tenets of Christianity, which transfers to the heritage of our nation and the foundation of this parliament.

I stand here today as a believing practising Christian in a Christian nation—not desiring to impose piety on this parliament, but instead pledging to conduct myself within the moral constraints of the Christian faith. I acknowledge the innate brokenness of humanity, and I know that I will not always get things right, but I hope that, through prayerful consideration and the support of my friends, family and colleagues, I can fulfil my calling to be in this place.

I believe that humanity is created for community, to develop community and to uphold community. I believe that the human race is made to build relationships and this means standing up for the most vulnerable in society, treating our neighbour as we would want to be treated and remembering that I am my brother's keeper, I am my sister's keeper.

In the book of Galatians, we are told that, as Christians, our love of others and, by extension, our desire for community is more important than anything else. The scriptures say that what matters most in life is not your achievements, not the wealth you accumulate, not your possessions but the love and support you demonstrate to humanity, the community you build and the service that you give.

On my journey from Hallett Cove Shopping Centre to Cove Sports and Community Club, from the Seaford train to the Brighton Surf Lifesaving Club, from the hills of Marino to the plains of Somerton Park, from the doorstep to the dinner table, I have come across a great many communities.

My role as their local member of parliament is to work hard to support, resource and back those communities, to strengthen that which I grew up with and learnt about in southern Scotland: that great sense of community. I hope that the sum of things that I do while in this house, whether my time here be long or short, when weighed up, will show that I used my role to nurture, to grow and to fasten that sense of community in Bright and in South Australia.

In 1994, the unifying British Labour leader and expected prime minister, John Smith, died suddenly of a heart attack, aged 55. On the evening before his death, he gave a keynote speech and concluded his address with a simple request uttered in his drab Scottish accent: 'The opportunity to serve our country—that is all we ask.'

May I paraphrase his words as I conclude my maiden speech. With the heartfelt gratefulness of someone who has been welcomed into a new country as if I had lived here all my life, I say: the opportunity to serve South Australia—that is all I ask.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we move on, I would just like to acknowledge the Hon. Wayne Matthew, the former member for Bright, who is also in the gallery today.

Parliamentary Committees

SESSIONAL COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of sessional committees.

STANDING COMMITTEES

The Legislative Council notified its appointment of standing committees.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Thursday 8 May 2014 at 10:30.