

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 8 May 2014

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

Bills

CHILD SEX OFFENDERS REGISTRATION (CONTROL ORDERS AND OTHER MEASURES) 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) (10:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006. 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) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006 requires child sex offenders to register with the Commissioner of Police, depending on the offence or offences for which the registrable offender has been convicted. Registration is mandatory for eight or 15 years or life, or for a discretionary period specified in a court order.

Under the act, these registrable offenders are required to make an initial report to SAPOL of certain personal information, must report annually and must update SAPOL when certain personal information changes. Registrable offenders are precluded from undertaking child-related work. Amendments to the act passed by the parliament in 2013 tightened the reporting requirements and provided SAPOL with increased powers to monitor registrable offenders and assess their compliance with the act.

Although child sex offenders are subjected to the reporting requirements under the act, the act was designed as a monitoring tool. While under the act a registrable offender is precluded from engaging in child-related work, there are few other limitations placed upon them.

The Child Sex Offenders Registration (Control Orders and Other Measures) Bill—in other words, this bill—inserts a new part into the act, such that SAPOL will be able to apply to the Magistrates Court for a new type of order, called a control order, to be made against any registrable offender. Under the bill, a control order made by the Magistrates Court will place restrictions and prohibitions upon a registrable offender. For example, a control order could, amongst other things, prohibit a registrable offender from associating with or communicating with a specified person or persons of a specified class, such as children under a certain age, and the control order could prohibit a person from being in the vicinity of a specified place or premises of a specified class, such as a school. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation into *Hansard* without reading it.

Leave granted.

These new laws are in addition to current provisions contained in the *Summary Procedure Act 1921* (the SP Act) concerning paedophile restraining orders.

The Bill inserts new provisions in the CSOR Act such that on application by SAPOL, the Magistrates Court may make a Control Order against any adult registrable offender if the court is satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the registrable offender poses a risk to the safety and well-being of one or more children, or children generally, and that the making of the order will reduce that risk.

In making the Control Order, the Magistrates Court must take into account the circumstances and seriousness of each offence in relation to which the person is a registrable offender, including the age of the registrable

offender when those offences were committed, the age of each victim of the offences when they were committed and the difference in age between the registrable offender and each victim.

The Magistrates Court must also take into account the period of time since each offence was committed, the registrable offender's total criminal record, the effect of the order sought on the registrable offender in comparison with the level of the risk that a further registrable offence may be committed by the person, whether the registrable offender has breached the CSOR Act or breached a paedophile restraining order, a child protection restraining order or a registered foreign restraining order under the SP Act and the personal circumstances of the registrable offender, such as age, accommodation, employment, physical and mental condition and integration into the community.

Under the Bill, a Control Order may prohibit or restrict any conduct including associating with, or communicating with, a specified person or persons of a specified class (such as children under a certain age), being present at, or being in the vicinity of, a specified place or premises or a place or premises of a specified class (such as a school), undertaking specified employment or employment of a specified kind or other conduct of a specified kind (such as accessing or using the internet or a computer).

The Magistrates Court will be able to make interim Control Orders and will be able to vary or revoke a Control Order. In addition, the Magistrates Court may make a Control Order without being satisfied of the matters I have spelt out if the Commissioner of Police and the registrable offender consent to the making of the order and it is in the interest of justice to make the order.

In considering whether it is in the interest of justice to make the order without being satisfied of the matters set out above, the Magistrate Court may have regard to whether the registrable offender received legal advice, has an intellectual disability, is illiterate or not literate in the English language, is the subject of a guardianship order or may not, for some other reason, understand the effect of consenting to the order.

Under the Bill if the Magistrates Court makes or varies a Control Order (or an interim Control Order) and the registrable offender is not present in Court at the time, then the Commissioner must cause a copy of the order to be served on the registrable offender.

A Control Order (or a variation of a Control Order) does not take effect until it is served. Under the Bill, a police officer can require the registrable offender to remain at a particular place for so long as may be necessary for the order to be served.

If a registrable offender refuses or fails to comply with the requirement, or the officer has reasonable grounds to believe that the requirement will not be complied with, the police officer may arrest and detain the registrable offender in custody (without warrant) for so long as may be necessary for the order to be served or 2 hours or such longer period as is approved by the Court, whichever is the lesser.

A Control Order will only remain in force for a maximum of five years or a lesser period as specified in the Control Order and a breach of a Control Order is a criminal offence with a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment.

The Bill also makes a number of minor amendments to the CSOR Act to provide further clarity concerning a number of other provisions.

When the CSOR Act was last amended in 2013, reporting timeframes were reduced and tightened. However, in error, section 18 of the CSOR Act was not amended. As such, the Bill amends section 18(1)(a) to reflect the tightened timeframes.

Section 66L was inserted into the CSOR Act and states as follows:

66L—Information to be provided to parents and guardians

A registrable offender who—

- (a) generally resides in the same household as that in which a child generally resides; or
 - (b) stays overnight in a household in which a child is also staying overnight,
- must tell a parent or guardian of the child who generally resides in the same household as the child—
- (c) that he or she is a registrable offender under this Act; and
 - (d) what the offence or offences were that resulted in him or her becoming a registrable offender.

Maximum penalty: \$25,000 or imprisonment for 5 years.

It is Government's view that this information should be provided by the registrable offender prior to staying overnight or generally residing in the same household as a child and as such, the Bill makes amendments to section 66L to require this.

Furthermore, it was Government's intention that each parent or guardian who resides with the child be informed. As such, the Bill amends section 66L to ensure this is clear.

Under section 66F of the CSOR Act the Commissioner of Police is able to publish certain details about a missing registrable offender on a website. The section does not specifically state that the Commissioner of Police can publish the fact that a person is a registrable offender under the CSOR Act, although it is clearly implied. For clarity, the Bill makes an amendment to section 66F to make this abundantly clear.

Under section 66J of the CSOR Act the Attorney-General is able to give a person consent to re-publish identifying information published by the Commissioner of Police on the website. Given the sensitivity of the information, and the fact that re-publication in the absence of consent is an offence, conditions should be attached to the consent.

Therefore, the Bill amends section 66J to provide for such.

In addition, consent to re-publish should not be given unless the Attorney-General takes into account those same matters that the Commissioner takes into account when the Commissioner makes a decision to publish. As such, the Bill amends section 66J to reflect this.

When the Commissioner makes a decision to publish the personal information on the website the Commissioner is protected from any civil or criminal liability or from any claim of a breach of confidentiality or secrecy imposed by law. The Attorney-General who gives consent for the information to be re-published elsewhere should be afforded the same protection. As such, the Bill amends section 66J to provide this protection.

In addition, if the Commissioner of Police removes the information from his website (for example, because the person is no longer missing or no longer under any reporting obligations under the CSOR Act) it is only fair that persons who have re-published the information also remove it. The Bill therefore makes an amendment to section 66J to provide for such removal.

The CSOR Act was amended in 2013 such that the definition of 'child-related work' from which registrable offenders are banned was expanded to include taxi and hire-car drivers. However, advice was received that the section did not make it beyond doubt that the ban extends to these roles entirely rather than to when the role involves contact with children.

As such, the Bill amends section 64 of the CSOR Act to make it expressly clear that registrable offenders cannot apply for employment, or be employed, as taxi drivers or hire-car drivers, regardless of whether they will have contact with children.

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 *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006*

4—Amendment of section 9—Child sex offender registration order

This clause proposes to change the matters of which a court must be satisfied when making an order under section 9 requiring a person to comply with the reporting obligations of the Act. The clause substitutes the words 'safety and well-being' for 'sexual safety' so that the court must be satisfied that a person poses a risk to the safety and well-being of any child or children before making an order. This wording is used elsewhere in the CSOR Act so the change is being made for consistency.

5—Amendment of section 18—Change of travel plans while out of South Australia to be given

This clause proposes to reduce the period of extended stay outside South Australia that activates the requirement of the section to report the extended stay to the Commissioner of Police.

6—Amendment of section 64—Interpretation

This clause proposes to include work in connection with taxi services and hire care services as *child-related work* whether or not the work involves contact with a child. Currently taxi and hire care services are *child-related work* only if they involve contact with a child. Under section 65, it is an offence for a registrable offender to apply for or engage in *child-related work*.

7—Amendment of section 66F—Commissioner may publish personal details of certain registrable offenders

This clause proposes to clarify that information published by the Commissioner under the section (whether before or after the commencement of this subsection) may specify that the person to whom it relates is a registrable offender.

8—Amendment of section 66J—Publication, display and distribution of identifying information

This clause proposes a number of amendments to the offence of publishing, distributing or displaying (without having first obtained the written approval of the Minister) any information that is identifiable as the personal details of a person published by the Commissioner under section 66F.

The clause proposes to amend subsection (1) such that the publishing, distribution or display of such information may only be done in accordance with the approval of the Minister, which may be subject to such conditions

as the Minister thinks fit. In determining whether or not to grant an approval, or the conditions to attach to an approval, the Minister may take into account the matters specified in section 66G(2) (as if the references to the Commissioner in section 66G(2)(f) and (h) were references to the Minister).

The clause proposes that no civil or criminal liability will attach to the Minister or the Crown by reason of a grant of approval where the Minister makes a grant of approval under the section in good faith.

The clause also proposes to require any person who has published identifying information on a website, or who is otherwise displaying such information, to take reasonable steps to remove the information in the event that the Commissioner of Police removes any or all of the personal details of a registrable offender from the website on which they are published under section 66F.

9—Insertion of Part 5C

This clause inserts new Part 5C as follows:

Part 5C—Control Orders

66JA—Court may make control order

This clause provides for the Magistrates Court to make control orders against a registrable offender on the application of the Commissioner of Police. The Court must be satisfied (on the balance of probabilities) that the registrable offender poses a risk to the safety and well-being of a child or children and that a control order will reduce that risk. Subclause (2) lists the matters to which the Court must have regard in deciding whether to make a control order and what the terms of a control order should be.

The Court may make a control order without being satisfied of the relevant matters if the Commissioner of Police and the registrable offender consent to the making of the order and it is in the interests of justice to make the order without being satisfied of those matters.

66JB—Terms of control order

A control order may prohibit or restrict any conduct, including associating with, or communicating with, a specified person or persons of a specified class, being present at, or being in the vicinity of, a specified place or premises or type of place or premises or undertaking specified employment or employment of a specified kind. A control order may also prohibit or restrict other conduct specified in the order.

If the Court makes or varies a control order in relation to a person, it must take all reasonable steps to explain to the person the terms of the order including the person's obligations and the consequences of failing to comply with the order.

66JC—Interim control orders

This clause provides that the Magistrates Court may, when considering an application for a control order, make an interim control order if the Court is satisfied that it is appropriate to do so in all of the circumstances.

66JD—Duration of control order

A control order remains in force for 5 years unless the Court fixes a shorter period. An interim control order remains in force for the period specified by the Court in making the order, or until further order of the Court.

66JE—Variation and revocation of control order

This clause provides for the Magistrates Court to vary or revoke a control order or interim control order on application by the Commissioner of Police or the person subject to the control order. The Court is only to consider an application if there has been a material change in circumstances relating to the registrable offender, the control order or the interim control order and it is in the interests of justice to consider the application.

66JF—Offence to contravene or fail to comply with control order

A person who, knowingly or recklessly, contravenes or fails to comply with a control order or interim control order is guilty of an offence which is punishable by a maximum penalty of imprisonment for 5 years.

66JG—Service of order

This clause requires the service of a control order on a person who is not present in court when the Court imposes a control order or interim control order in relation to the person, or varies or revokes a control order or interim control order on the application of the Commissioner of Police in relation to the person. An order imposing or varying a control order or interim control order that is required to be served under the clause will not take effect until the order is served on the person. The clause further provides that, for the purposes of serving a control order or interim control order on a person, the Commissioner of Police may require the person to remain at a particular place for so long as may be necessary for the order to be served. If the person does not, or will not in the reasonable belief of a police officer, comply with the requirement to remain at a place for service, then a police officer may detain the person for as long as is required for service

of the order, up to a maximum period of 2 hours (which may be extended up to 8 hours by the Magistrates Court on application).

10—Amendment of section 66L—Information to be provided to parents and guardians

This clause proposes to amend section 66L to require a registrable offender who proposes to reside or stay overnight in a household where a child resides or will stay overnight, to tell a parent or guardian of that child (who generally resides in the same household as the child) that he or she is a registrable offender. This requirement will apply before the registrable offender may reside or stay in the household.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

COMMISSIONER FOR KANGAROO ISLAND 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) (10:35): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to establish a commissioner for Kangaroo Island and to provide for the development of management plans in relation to the coordination and delivery of infrastructure and services on Kangaroo Island and other matters relating to Kangaroo Island and for other purposes. 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) (10:36): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

South Australia's Strategic Plan says:

Goal: We are known world-wide as a great place to live and visit.

Target 4: Tourism industry

Increase visitor expenditure in South Australia's total tourism industry to \$8 billion and on Kangaroo Island to \$180 million by 2020.

Target 40: Food industry

Grow the contribution made by the South Australian food industry to \$20 billion by 2020.

Vision—Skilled and Sustainable Workforce: We value the contribution our regions make to our economic prosperity, home to agriculture, forestry and fishing industries as well as an expanding mining industry. These industries together contributed \$6 billion to our economy in 2009-10. We want our regional communities to thrive through sustained growth while reaping the economic and social benefits of their hard work.

The seventh area of Government strategic priorities is, 'Clean green food as our competitive edge.' These statements have obvious relevance to the development of Kangaroo Island. I seek leave to insert the remainder of the second reading explanation into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Kangaroo Island's international tourist recognition ranks with Barrier Reef, Uluru and the Sydney Opera House. The Economic Development Board recognises the opportunity this presents for South Australia. Additionally, building the Kangaroo Island brand on the back of the significant tourist recognition will help build the Island's emerging reputation as a premium agricultural producer. The Board also reviewed the significant economic and social sustainability issues facing Kangaroo Island in consultation with business and the local community. The Board examined issues including infrastructure pressures around electrical power capacity, distribution and reliability, waste, roads and the airport, as well as the costs of gaining access to Kangaroo Island for tourism and agriculture. This led to the *Paradise Girt by Sea* report that was based on the results of consultation and made recommendations on future strategies and directions for sustainable economic and social development for Kangaroo Island. The report proposed a co-ordinated and strategic response based around two headline targets:

- (1) to double tourist income within a decade; and
- (2) to double farm-gate income within a decade.

The Government announced a suite of measures from existing resources on 24 and 25 July 2011 totalling \$18 million that focussed on key infrastructure improvements to harness the full potential of Kangaroo Island.

These included:

- \$8 million over four years to improve key roads
- \$5 million towards the development of a trail for a five day walk expected to generate 52 jobs
- \$1.7 million for stage 2 of the Seal Bay boardwalk upgrade
- \$1.2 million from the Regional Development Infrastructure Fund to Kangaroo Island Sealink, to help with the construction of a new passenger terminal at Penneshaw.

In addition, following a recommendation in the Report, the Kangaroo Island Futures Authority was established. In November 2011, the first meeting of the Kangaroo Island Futures Authority Advisory Board was held. The establishment of this Board was approved by Cabinet and was done on the recommendation of the Economic Development Board. The board reports to the Deputy Premier and is chaired by Raymond Spencer, Chair of the Economic Development Board.

Many State Government Departments and bodies deliver services to Kangaroo Island. They include Regional Development, Tourism, Local Government Relations, Environment and Natural Resources, Education and Further Education, Fisheries and Primary Industry, Native Vegetation, SA Water, Transport and National Parks.

The delivery of State Government services suffers from three interrelated major problems from a Kangaroo Island perspective:

- (1) There is a lack of critical mass in any of these agencies that can be devoted to Kangaroo Island issues; and
- (2) The delivery of services tends to be Adelaide or mainland focused; and
- (3) There is a lack of any one or more networks joining up services with a Kangaroo Island focus.

The situation is exacerbated by the fact that there is a small population (c 4,000) meaning that local government struggles financially to deliver the necessary services, and there is tenuous critical infrastructure provision, notably electricity and sea transport.

The preferred solution to focus Government to better deliver for Kangaroo Island is the creation of a single Kangaroo Island authority that sits above the various State Government bodies responsible for service delivery and is not answerable to them, but rather to a Minister (however titled) responsible for Kangaroo Island. This authority will not replace local government but rather sit alongside it. The proposed authority is not an entire alternative governance model—local government must continue to function as a local democratic institution and as a recipient and administrator of Commonwealth Government grants.

There are many examples of governance and other legislated models that have been deployed in an attempt to achieve co-ordinated and timely delivery of government services, including to a particular region. They range from funding agreement schemes to management plans implemented by local and regional boards, precinct-specific statutory corporations to undertake and co-ordinate development work to statutory authorities with responsibilities and powers to develop regional plans for the delivery of services and monitor and drive the implementation of those plans. Several models have been considered to better support Kangaroo Island. The model of a statutory co-ordinating authority was considered most suitable to help achieve our goals and support Kangaroo Island.

The chosen vehicle is a Commissioner for Kangaroo Island. The Commissioner will be a statutory officer responsible for co-ordinating and using existing public servants and programs in existing Departments but with a regionalisation of policy formation and service delivery in accordance with a set of statutory functions. The Commissioner will have the power to establish local advisory boards as he or she sees fit. A principal function of the Commissioner will be to assist in any way with improving the local economy of Kangaroo Island, be it in the marketing of products, the development of the tourism economy or in any other way.

The Commissioner's principal administrative responsibility will be to develop management plans dealing with the delivery of Government projects and services to Kangaroo Island. These management plans must be the subject of detailed consultation with affected Departments, must accord with the legislated set of statutory functions, will be informed by local input, perhaps by local advisory boards (for which provision is made), and will be instruments approved by the Governor in Council and published in the Government Gazette. The Commissioner will be required to consult with the relevant Government departmental heads and the Minister will be responsible for solving any impasse. The Commissioner will also be required to set out strategies for consulting and engaging with any person or body (governmental or not) whose co-operation is required for the effective implementation of the proposals. At nominated commencement, these management plans will bind Government, but they will not have the status of Regulations, nor will they be disallowable.

The statutory principles that govern the functioning of the Commissioner will be:

- (a) *to improve the management, co-ordination and delivery of infrastructure and services provided by government agencies on Kangaroo Island; and*
- (b) *to assist with improving the local economy on Kangaroo Island by, for example, assisting with the marketing of the Island or products from the Island and helping to create employment and other opportunities from tourism or other industry development programs on the Island; and*

- (c) *to prepare, and keep under review, management plans and consistently with the functions of the Commissioner; and*
- (d) *any other functions conferred on the Commissioner by or under this or any other Act or by the Minister.*

To achieve these functions, the Commissioner will have the following powers and obligations (expressed in general terms):

- (1) the power to require provision of information and assistance from relevant government agencies in a specified manner and within a specified timeframe;
- (2) the obligation to report regularly to the Minister on the delivery of government services and progress towards achieving specified targets in accordance with gazetted management plans;
- (3) the obligation to seek the views of affected Ministers, affected local advisory boards and affected local government authorities on draft management plans;
- (4) the power to report the failure to provide requested information or assistance, and any unreasonable or unjustifiable failure to act consistently with a management plan in force, to the Minister responsible for the Act and, ultimately, the Premier, with the option of presenting copies of the report to the Parliament. This extends to the actions of any person or body, whether a government body or not, whose actions have frustrated or otherwise affected the implementation of a management plan.

The Commissioner will be obliged to make an annual report to Parliament.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause defines certain terms used in the measure. In particular, a *State authority* is defined as—

- (a) a person who holds an office established by an Act; or
- (b) an administrative unit; or
- (c) a council; or
- (d) a regional development assessment panel or a council development assessment panel; or
- (e) any incorporated or unincorporated body—
 - (i) established for a public purpose by an Act; or
 - (ii) established for a public purpose under an Act (other than an Act providing for the incorporation of companies or associations, co-operatives, societies or other voluntary organisations); or
 - (iii) established or subject to control or direction by the Governor, a Minister of the Crown or any instrumentality or agency of the Crown or a council (whether or not established by or under an Act or an enactment); or
- (f) a person or body declared by the regulations to be an authority to which this Act applies, (but doesn't include a body or entity excluded by the regulations).

4—Interaction with other Acts

This clause provides that the measure applies in addition to other Acts and doesn't derogate from them.

5—Act binds Crown

The measure binds the Crown.

Part 2—Commissioner for Kangaroo Island

6—Appointment of Commissioner

This clause provides for the appointment of the Commissioner.

7—Terms and conditions of appointment

This clause provides 5 year terms of appointment for the Commissioner and sets out the other terms and conditions of the appointment.

8—Functions of Commissioner

The functions of the Commissioner are—

- (a) to improve the management, co-ordination and delivery of infrastructure and services provided by State agencies on Kangaroo Island;
- (b) to assist with improving the local economy on Kangaroo Island;
- (c) to prepare, and keep under review, management plans in accordance with the provisions of Par 4 (and consistently with the functions of the Commissioner referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b));
- (d) any other functions conferred on the Commissioner by or under this or any other Act or by the Minister.

9—Provision of information

This clause gives the Commissioner power to require information relevant to the performance of the Commissioner's functions from State authorities and imposes certain obligations on State authorities in relation to contracts of a prescribed kind.

10—Ministerial direction

The Minister may issue directions to the Commissioner (but the direction must then be included in the annual report of the Commissioner).

11—Appointment of acting Commissioner

The Minister may appoint an acting Commissioner.

12—Honesty and accountability

The Commissioner and any acting Commissioner are to be senior officials for the purposes of the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995*.

13—Staff

This clause provides for staff for the Commissioner (by agreement with a Minister).

14—Delegation

This clause provides a delegation power for the Commissioner.

Part 3—Local advisory boards

15—Establishment of local advisory boards

The Commissioner may establish local advisory boards.

16—Functions of local advisory board

A local advisory board's function is to provide advice to the Commissioner on any matter referred by the Commissioner and, in particular, on—

- (a) the preparation of management plans, and any amendments to such plans, relevant to the matter so referred; and
- (b) the effectiveness of the management plans in relation to the matter so referred.

Part 4—Management plans

17—Preparation of management plans and amendments

The Commissioner is to prepare, and keep under review, management plans setting out—

- (a) the proposals of the Commissioner in relation to the provision of infrastructure, the effective delivery of services and other matters relating to Kangaroo Island; and
- (b) the priorities that the Commissioner recommends be pursued in order to implement the proposals; and
- (c) strategies for consulting and engaging with persons or bodies whose co-operation is required for the effective implementation of the proposals.

This clause sets out the procedure for the preparation and variation of management plans by the Commissioner (including approval and consultation requirements in relation to proposed plans).

18—Effect of management plans

If a management plan is approved by the Governor, a State authority must endeavour, as far as practicable, to act consistently with the management plan. If the Commissioner is reasonably satisfied that a government agency has failed to act consistently, or to co-operate, with a management plan or that the actions of any other person or body have frustrated proposals included in a management plan or are otherwise likely to affect the implementation of a management plan, it may be reported to the Minister, the Premier and to Parliament.

Part 5—Miscellaneous

19—Annual report

The Commissioner must provide an annual report to the Minister, who must table the report in Parliament.

20—Regulations

This clause provides a regulation making power.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gardner.

CRIMINAL LAW (SENTENCING) (SUSPENDED SENTENCES) 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) (10:38): Obtained leave to introduce 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) (10:39): I move:

That this bill now be read a second time.

During the 2014 election the government announced that reckless violent thugs who receive a sentence of imprisonment of two years or more would not be able to receive a fully suspended sentence. The Criminal Law (Sentencing) (Suspended Sentences) Amendment Bill 2014 amends the Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 to ensure that any serious violent offender, being a person who is convicted of manslaughter or causing serious harm who is sentenced to a term of imprisonment of longer than two years, spends time behind bars.

To achieve this the bill removes the capacity of the court to fully suspend the sentence of any such offender. The bill amends the sentencing act such that when an adult is convicted of manslaughter or of causing serious harm and is sentenced to two years' or more imprisonment, if the court finds good reason to suspend the sentence, the sentencing court can only partially suspend the sentence.

The aim of this reform is to restrict the ability of a sentencing court to wholly suspend a sentence of imprisonment and to ensure that serious violent offenders in receipt of a sentence of imprisonment of two years or more actually serve some time in prison. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

During the 2014 election, the Government announced that reckless violent thugs who receive a sentence of imprisonment of two years or more would not be able to receive a fully suspended sentence.

The *Criminal Law (Sentencing) (Suspended Sentences) Amendment Bill 2014* (the Bill) amends the *Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988* (the Sentencing Act) to ensure that any serious violent offender (being a person who is convicted of manslaughter or causing serious harm) who is sentenced to a term of imprisonment of longer than two years, spends time behind bars. To achieve this, the Bill removes the capacity of a court to fully suspend the sentence of any such offender. The Bill amends the Sentencing Act such that, when an adult is convicted of manslaughter or causing serious harm and is sentenced to two years or more imprisonment, if the court finds good reason to suspend the sentence, the sentencing court can only partially suspend the sentence.

The aim of this reform is to restrict the ability of a sentencing court to wholly suspend a sentence of imprisonment and to ensure that serious violent offenders in receipt of a sentence of imprisonment of two years or more actually serve some time in prison.

This reform applies to persons who are convicted of causing serious harm contrary to section 23 of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* (the CLC Act). Section 23 provides as follows:

23—Causing serious harm

- (1) *A person who causes serious harm to another, intending to cause serious harm, is guilty of an offence.*

Maximum Penalty:

- (a) *for a basic offence—imprisonment for 20 years;*
 (b) *for an aggravated offence—imprisonment for 25 years.*
- (2) *If, however, the victim in a particular case suffers such serious harm that a penalty exceeding the maximum prescribed in subsection (1) is warranted, the court may, on application by the Director of Public Prosecutions, impose a penalty exceeding the prescribed maximum.*
- (3) *A person who causes serious harm to another, and is reckless in doing so, is guilty of an offence.*

Maximum Penalty:

- (a) *for a basic offence—imprisonment for 15 years;*
 (b) *for an aggravated offence—imprisonment for 19 years.*

This reform also applies to persons who are convicted of manslaughter contrary to section 13 of the CLC Act. Section 13 provides as follows:

- (1) *Any person who is convicted of manslaughter shall be liable to be imprisoned for life or to pay such fine as the court awards or to both such imprisonment and fine.*

The amendments to the Sentencing Act made by the Bill provide that, if a sentence of imprisonment of two years or greater is imposed on a person convicted of an offence against section 13 (manslaughter) or section 23 (cause serious harm) of the CLC Act, then the sentencing court cannot fully suspend that sentence of imprisonment. If the sentencing court finds good reason to suspend, the only option available to the sentencing court is to partially suspend the sentence of imprisonment.

The Bill also provides that section 18A of the Sentencing Act cannot be applied when sentencing a person for the offences of manslaughter and causing serious harm. Section 18A provides that, if a person is found guilty by a court of a number of offences, the court may sentence the person to the one penalty for all or some of those offences. However, in doing so, the sentence cannot exceed the total of the maximum penalties that could be imposed in respect of each of the offences to which the sentence relates.

The amendment means that, if a court is sentencing a person for numerous offences, including manslaughter or causing serious harm, and if the court is minded to use section 18A, then, in order to maintain the policy of the Bill, section 18A may not be used in such a way as to wholly suspend the entire sentence but the court must nominate a single penalty for the offences of causing serious harm or manslaughter, but may provide for a single section 18A penalty for the other offences combined in whole or in part.

Under this reform, the current sentencing process is mainly undisturbed in that the court must first decide on an appropriate sentence and, secondly, decide on an appropriate non-parole period (if any).

If a sentence of imprisonment is imposed, the sentencing court considers whether good reasons exist to suspend the sentence. If the court finds good reason to suspend, if the sentence of imprisonment is greater than two years, and if the conviction is for either manslaughter or cause serious harm, then the only option available to the court will be to partially suspend the sentence.

Once the decision is made to partially suspend the sentence, the final step is for the court to decide the portion of the sentence that must be served in prison.

Under the Bill, when a sentence of imprisonment is partially suspended, any specified period of time that a defendant is directed to serve must be less than the non-parole period.

If the partially suspended sentence is revoked on breach of a bond, and an order is made that the suspended portion of the sentence be carried into effect, the existing provisions in the Sentencing Act concerning non-parole periods again come into operation and, in addition, the court may also order that any time served be taken into account when fixing the non-parole period.

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 18A—Sentencing for multiple offenders

Currently, this section allows for a court to sentence a person who is found guilty of a number of offences to the 1 penalty for all or some of the offences. It is proposed to amend the section so as to exclude from any such global sentence the sentence for a prescribed designated offence (within the meaning of section 38).

5—Amendment of section 38—Suspension of imprisonment on defendant entering into bond

The amendments to section 38 involve some restructuring of certain provisions in the section. The changes implemented by the amendments involve providing that a defendant sentenced as an adult to imprisonment of 2 years or more for a prescribed designated offence cannot have that sentence suspended. Provision is also made (in new section 38(2b)) for the sentencing court to partially suspend the sentence of such a defendant.

6—Amendment of section 58—Orders that court may make on breach of bond

The amendments to section 58 relate to the proposed amendment to section 38(2b). The first amendment provides that where a court revokes the suspension of a sentence of imprisonment, in the case of a probationer whose sentence of imprisonment was partially suspended under section 38(2b), the court may fix or extend a non-parole period, even if the term of the sentence now to be served in custody is less than 1 year, taking into account the time spent in custody by the probationer before being released on the bond.

The amendment to subsection (4)(c) clarifies, in relation to a probationer whose sentence was partially suspended under section 38(2a) or (2b), that a court revoking the suspension may direct that any part of the sentence that the probationer has not served in custody be cumulative on any other sentence, or sentences, of imprisonment then being served, or to be served, by the probationer.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Speirs.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 7 May 2014.)

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) (10:41): I open this Address in Reply by thanking His Excellency for his speech and for opening the parliament, and congratulate you, sir, on being re-elected by this house to defend the ancient rights and privileges of the house. It is good to see you back in the chair.

I would like to thank the people of the electorate of Playford, the suburbs of Ingle Farm, Para Hills, Pooraka, Para Hills West, Walkley Heights, Valley View, and Para Vista for their confidence in me and for re-electing me to this house for a fifth time. It is an honour to represent the people of Playford in this place. This is the electorate I have lived in and, with my wife, raised my family in for the last 20 years.

As part of this Address in Reply speech I also thank the many people who assisted me in the last election. It is always difficult, having new responsibilities as a minister, to put the time into the electorate, and the people and your supporters in that electorate, that you would like. That work is largely being carried on by the staff in my electorate office. I would like to particularly thank Mary Kasperski and Diana Ly for the hard work they have done, particularly leading up to the election.

I would also like to thank the volunteers in my electorate. I would particularly like to mention councillor Jana Isemonger (who was here on Tuesday and had lunch), who not only does a couple of hours at a polling booth but, in fact, gets to the polling booth at six in the morning and stays there until 10 o'clock at night. She does not leave the Para Hills West polling booth, where she always sets up. She works incredibly hard. It is people like her who keep the Labor Party going.

I would like to congratulate new members on their election to this place, and I look forward to the maiden speeches they will be making. There is one new member in particular, not of this house but in the other place, who I would like to talk about this morning: that is, the Hon. Tung The Ngo. Tung and I first met at the famous Vietnam Restaurant run by Mr Din and his daughter Linda on Addison Road at Pennington—a great place. Tung and I first met there about 20 years ago.

Since then Tung became involved in the Labor Party. He ran for Port Adelaide Enfield Council—I think it was actually only Enfield council at the first election, before the two were

amalgamated—and ran a campaign. Michael Brander from the racist National Front (or whatever the party is called) was running in those council elections at the same time.

Tung decided to stand up for the Vietnamese people of Enfield and put forward his name and, as a relatively young man, won that election with a stunning result and in fact was re-elected over and over again to represent the people. Sometimes within the days of the new PR electoral system in local government he not only got a quota for himself but in fact got two quotas, so his votes got himself and the next person up elected just on first preferences, which is quite extraordinary in local government elections.

Tung worked in my electorate office and then went on to work in my ministerial office. With Tung in my electorate office it became a sort of 'go to' place for Vietnamese around South Australia. They would come to my office because we had a Vietnamese speaker in the office and Tung worked very hard, not only for the Vietnamese community but also for the many communities of non-English speaking background, who knew they had a friend in Tung and someone who could serve them. Tung will take those networks and that work ethic into the Legislative Council and be a wonderful advocate.

Tung has not made his maiden speech yet, so I will not spoil it, but people would know that Tung came to Australia as a refugee with his sister. The boat they were on was attacked by pirates and he and his family were left to die, drifting in, I think, the South China Sea before they were picked up and rescued. It was about to go dark and the boat was going to sink—quite an extraordinary story of courage is Tung's story. It says great things about the sort of society we live in that people like Tung, first generation migrants, are elected to this place.

I think our state is certainly served very well by having people like Tung who are willing to put up their hands to be elected. Tung is universally loved. He worked in my ministerial office and made the transition very well from the electorate office to the ministerial office, working on some of the largest and most complex projects that the state has ever undertaken. He managed, as my adviser, the forward sale of the forestry rotations in the South-East, a very complex and very politically difficult project, which Tung did with aplomb and got us to a situation where we were able to negotiate with people who obviously were opposed to the sale but nonetheless were prepared to speak to the government about what conditions we could place on the sale to make sure the interests of the local communities of the South-East could be protected. That was largely because of Tung's hard work and because he had the trust of those people.

Tung also worked on the sale of the SA Lotteries licence—so, some significant projects—and he came with me when I went into the health portfolio. He was very much a 'go to' man in both my electorate and my ministerial offices, and Tung will be an ornament to the Legislative Council. I wish him very well and cannot say how pleased I am to see Tung elected.

I also thank and acknowledge Annabel Digance, Katrine Hildyard, Jon Gee, Dana Wortley and the other new members on this side of the chamber.

The SPEAKER: Of course it would be better if—

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: —if I acknowledged them by their electorates?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Certainly, sir. I apologise, but I can't remember their electorates at this time of the morning.

The SPEAKER: That's why you wouldn't make a Speaker.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I congratulate them and members opposite. It is an enormous privilege to be elected to this place. In closing, I do need to use this as an opportunity to talk about what the implications might be for our public hospitals should the commonwealth government proceed with its plans as outlined in the Commission of Audit report released last week, particularly with regard to bulk-billing and Medicare. What the Commission of Audit is foreshadowing and what the commonwealth government (in a sneaky way) has been softening up the Australian public for, for a couple of months now, is the dismantling of Medicare in this country. That is going to have enormous repercussions for our public hospital system, because of course, it is a truism that early intervention is critical when it comes to good medical care.

The longer people with an illness do not visit the doctor and do not seek treatment, the more serious the illness becomes, and then, of course, the more radical and costly the interventions have to be in order to get that person well again, often involving lengthy stays in quite expensive public hospitals. What I cannot understand is why this seems to be a mystery to the commonwealth government and, indeed, to members opposite.

We all know that the critical part of our hospital system—our health system in this country—is bulk-billing. The fact is that people can go and see their GP and more often than not, if they choose their GP carefully, they will be bulk-billed. In fact, almost all GP clinics definitely bulk-bill those with concession cards—it is very unusual for them to not do that at least. Charging people to go and see their GPs will deter people from going to their GPs, and that will have a two-fold effect. Firstly, it will deter people from seeking treatment—they will delay seeking treatment—and, of course, they will become more ill. To get them better is going to take longer, it will be more costly, and often it will mean an admission to an acute bed in one of our hospitals.

The second impact will be that people, not wanting to be charged, will go to one of our free emergency departments, and the modelling that my department, the Department of Health has done, shows that even with a relatively small shift, a 2 per cent shift in people from previously free GPs into our free emergency departments, will massively blow out waiting times—five-fold we expect. So, from an average at the moment of 20 minutes, to just under 100 minutes, particularly in those triage categories of three, four and five, where people would normally be seen by a GP we are going to see enormous pressure and lengthy waiting times in our emergency departments. Our hardworking doctors and nurses in our emergency departments will have to bear the brunt of this GP tax which the Australian public are being softened up for.

When we were initially being softened up, what was being talked about was a \$6 charge, and commentators and the federal government were saying that \$6 is really not that much money. Of course, what we have seen from the Commission of Audit is not just a \$6 charge for visiting the GP, but a \$15 charge to visit the GP and then further charges for any tests or X-rays that you need done on top of the \$15. If you have a relatively straightforward chest infection—we are coming into winter and the number of people with chest infections will increase (as it always does) at this time of year—even with a simple chest infection, you could be looking at a charge of about \$130.

At the moment, the most you will pay is what you need to pay for your PBS prescriptions (by the time you have seen the doctor)—\$15. If the doctor orders an X-ray, another \$15. If the doctor orders a blood test—another \$15. If the doctor writes out a script, the charge for the script goes up because of the changes that are being foreshadowed to the PBS, and then you go back to the doctor for follow-up—another \$15. You are talking about a charge of almost \$130 for a reasonably straightforward chest infection.

For families with multiple children, for pensioners, for people on low wages, \$130 charge is going to be a significant disincentive for people going to see their GP and getting treated for those chest infections early. Instead, what is going to happen is they will hold off until they become so sick that an ambulance has to be called for and they have to be taken to the emergency department and treated for very serious illnesses like pneumonia. We are talking about the elderly and the most vulnerable South Australians having to go into hospital and being picked up by the public hospital system because they are being let down by the federal Liberal government which is seeking to dismantle one of the things that makes Australia unique, that is, a universal health care system and Medicare. I think that is an absolute disgrace.

The opposition is silent on this topic. We are always hearing the Hon. Rob Lucas come out and whinge about every single dollar which this government has invested into our public hospital system. He is never happy. A little bit of him dies every time a dollar is spent investing in our public hospital system and making sure South Australians get the sort of public health system that they deserve.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Obviously, a little bit of the member for Morialta dies every time that this government invests a dollar into our public hospital.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir. I take offence at what the minister has just claimed, and ask him to withdraw it.

The SPEAKER: I rule against the member for Morialta. It is just part of the tiresome argy-bargy of this chamber and politics, and he should not take offence at it.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: And, of course, you never engaged in it, sir, when you sat on the front bench.

The SPEAKER: Never.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I guess you are reaping what you sowed, sir. What we are seeing here from the opposition is absolutely nothing on this important point which is going to have a significant—

Mr Tarzia: What about Modbury Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I'm more than happy, member for Hartley, to talk at length about the enormous investments this government has made at Modbury Hospital—how you have a completely revamped emergency department. Let's hear the opposition talk about Modbury Hospital. I know the member for Hartley is a bit young and a bit wet behind the ears, but maybe he should talk to some of his colleagues who have been around a little longer, like the Hon. Rob Lucas, who sat around the cabinet table and who privatised Modbury Hospital.

They didn't want Modbury Hospital in public hands. They privatised Modbury Hospital. Here we have the member for Hartley calling out, 'What about Modbury?' If the member for Hartley or any member of the opposition wants a debate about Modbury Hospital and a comparison between Labor's commitment to Modbury Hospital and the Liberal party's commitment to Modbury Hospital, bring it on.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: What we hear is the bleating of members opposite because they cannot handle the truth. The members opposite are not interested in our public hospitals. They are the hospital haters—the hospital haters who—

Mr GARDNER: 127 again. I must put on the record that I, and I am sure others, take offence at being described as 'haters'.

The SPEAKER: The ability to make points of order is not an opportunity to make an impromptu speech or to issue a denial that one is a hospital hater. I suspect that neither the member for Morialta nor anyone on the opposition benches is a hospital hater. Be that as it may, I would ask members of the opposition to restrain their offence until it is their opportunity to make a contribution to the Address in Reply. I would also ask the Minister for Health to refrain from epithets such as 'hospital hater'. Minister for Health.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Sir, you hate what I say but you will defend to the death my right to say it. Thank you, sir. It would be nice, just once, hearing, instead of the whingeing and whining and bleating of the opposition, and members like Rob Lucas, about the investments this government has made into our hospital. Instead of hearing that day after day, it would be lovely to hear just once—just once—from the opposition something about what their federal Liberal colleagues have planned for public health in this country and what it might mean for public hospitals in South Australia, what it might mean for emergency departments, what it might mean for elective surgery waiting lists, what it might mean for our occupancy of public hospital beds. It would be nice if just once Mr Lucas and his colleagues opposite had something constructive to say about these points and actually showed a bit of interest in health policy rather than what we have been dished up and what we were dished up prior to the last election.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:00): I rise to support the motion to accept the draft address of His Excellency Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce. In doing so, I wish to place on the record my appreciation for our Governor's service to South Australia, his duties to executive council and patronage of numerous charities, which he has undertaken over a number of years and which is expected to conclude later this year. I also extend and record my appreciation to Mrs Liz Scarce, who has attended countless civic events and undertaken her duties in support of the role of Governor for all South Australians both in the grounds of Government House and across the state.

The electorate of Bragg honours the work of father and son team, Sir William and Sir Lawrence Bragg, who were duly recognised with a Nobel Prize in the field of science. As the re-elected member for Bragg I wish to thank my constituency for the strong support that they gave me during the recent election. My re-election is something that I am very proud of and I undertake, to my electorate, to continue to represent them all to the best of my ability with pride, enthusiasm and resolve.

I congratulate all new members on their election to our parliament. You are from diverse backgrounds, and if you maintain the zeal of the aspirations reflected in your maiden speeches I expect you will serve our parliament with distinction. Regrettably, you will find that some of these aspirations will be crushed by the decisions of the government, but do not let that deter you.

Like many South Australians I was pleased to hear of the government's commitment, via the address from His Excellency, on the question of mental health. It was pleasing to me to read that there was a commitment. There was clearly an understanding that this was a large area of high need and that there was need for further mental health reform. There was a claim that there had been significant steps already taken to support those in our community with mental health and their families. I dispute that, but, nevertheless, they did claim to have spent \$330 million to invest in a new modern mental health system.

Their promise, as outlined in His Excellency's address, was to establish a new independent health commission apparently to better coordinate integrated services critical to South Australians who suffer from mental health, and that they will be given a task to develop the next phase of mental health reform. Secondly, having acknowledged the growing problem in this area the government would:

Expand existing efforts to implement the positive psychology approach that Martin Seligman has introduced to South Australia.

There is no detail of this. I expect that it is a practice of high standard in dealing with psychiatric care which does not require the imprimatur of this parliament or, indeed, the government. I would have thought that if he had some good ideas that that would have been taken up by the people working in mental health and would already have been implemented. However, I will come back to the appointment of a commission in due course.

Unquestionably, the demand for services for those who are suffering poor mental health and support for their families is increasing. Depression alone has been described as the pandemic of the 21st century. Countless reports and spiralling statistics tell us this. One of the most damning, I suggest, is that the number of deaths by suicide in South Australia—representing, of course, a tragic waste of life—now doubles the number of deaths on our roads. Some 200 people a year are recorded as having taken their own lives, and we obviously hope to curb the deaths on our roads, which number about 100 a year.

There would not be a member in this house who has not had a family member, friend, neighbour or constituent who has suffered in this way. Untreated or under-treated, it so often results in harm to persons affected, and many spousal and family relationships are destroyed, children are neglected or abused and even strangers become victims of assault or offence.

Drug and alcohol addiction often features in the comorbidity of those presenting in need. We have heard about the consequences of a failure to provide adequate services in this area. Members, especially new members, will see—as we have, particularly in the time that we have been in the parliament—alarming newspaper reports and coronial reports and inquests and the resulting recommendations from inquests, court judgements, evidence, transcript and endless government reports and reviews, and they all tell the same story and they all plead for the same respite. So the government's commitment is welcome, but is it just another empty promise?

Let us consider what has happened over the last 12 years. Starting in 2002, the Rann government convened a drug summit, which I attended, as did other members of this house. I think it came up with some excellent recommendations. It clearly understood that it had a relationship with a number of people requiring mental health services. It appointed Monsignor David Cappelletti, a senior member of the Catholic Church, and commissioned him to prepare an audit of the demand for services that were current in mental health and to set out a plan, culminating in what has been described as the Stepping Up report. That confirmed the demand for multiple services and the need

for an extension of care services, including in the community, and in particular that that be offered to help address the increasing demand.

The government announced that it would rebuild a new Glenside Hospital, that it would co-locate drug and alcohol treatment at the new facility, that it would introduce a cultural centre, that, consistent with social inclusion, there would be retail amenities for patients and the public generally. So what happened? I think everyone would agree that those announcements, those initiatives, were a good start, but let us look at what happened. Under the stewardship of successive ministers—minister Stevens, minister Gago, minister Lomax-Smith, minister Hill and minister Snelling—this is what has happened:

1. The government sold off the three drug and alcohol treatment centres in metropolitan Adelaide before adequate replacement services had been installed.

2. They stripped services in the psychiatric wards in The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Modbury Hospital and the RAH North Terrace campus, downgrading acute beds to day and short-stay beds.

3. They announced the sale of 40 per cent of the Glenside campus, ostensibly necessary, they claimed, to pay for the new hospital. They did not ask the football community to pay, to sell off their assets to pay for the new stadium, but for mental health patients in this state, they demanded that it was necessary to sell off half their asset to provide for their capital upgrade.

4. They bulldozed two heritage buildings whilst under protest by local government. One was a heritage building under local government and the other by the public generally and the heritage community.

5. They destroyed the oval used by local schools, clubs and patients. The oval provided them with an open area of sanctuary, which they covered with mountains of dirt.

6. They tipped out many of the mature-age patients, who had been long-term patients, into facilities at Oakden and, with the fear and frightened response of relatives, out into the community generally before any—not any—of the promised facilities in aged care were in place.

7. They ignored the public outcry at the loss of open space and public amenity and chopped down numerous trees, repeatedly refusing over two years to answer questions in this house about what was going to be happening.

8. They dismissed the local council's concern about the felling of trees, lack of open space, unsafe and unmanageable traffic numbers, and proposed building heights.

9. They sold the central administration building, including the iconic heritage assets, to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet—they picked it up for just over a million, if I recall—and made it into a film hub.

10. They excluded the patients, families and visitors from access to the chapel on the campus and gave them the barren contemplation room. Where was Monsignor Cappo when that happened?

11. They ceased operation of the gardens and many of the programs that provided occupational therapy for patients and clients.

12. They utterly rejected the recommendations of the select committee of this parliament, chaired by the Hon. John Dawkins, recommending inter alia that there be a complete rewriting of the design of the new hospital as it clearly failed, on the evidence that it received, to reach the high world standards that were claimed.

13. They refused the advice of health professionals that the proposed model of care was also flawed against international standards.

14. They ignored the repeated complaints of nurses and health professionals who were concerned about the adverse impact that the development was having on their clients.

15. They threatened to introduce car parking fees to hospital staff and visitors, while the Film Corporation patrons got it for free.

16. They prioritised \$40 million to provide new accommodation for the Film Corporation before even starting to build the new hospital—priorities completely out of sync.

17. They hosted the then premier's goodbye party at a cost of tens of thousands of dollars, while mental health services were crying out desperately for funds.

18. They kept patients on the campus during construction. Why was it so bad to interfere with the sanctuary of those who were receiving services? Members might recall and new members might appreciate that the government rejected a rebuild of the Royal Adelaide Hospital partly on the grounds that it would cause distress to patients and disruption to staff. It was not good enough for those patients to put up with that, but mental health patients—who gives a toss about them? They can have a construction site going on for years next door to them.

19. They wasted the funds in progressing a preferential deal with a neighbouring landowner, which later fell over.

20. They placed patients and staff at risk when they built the new hospital without a sprinkler system. Many members will not realise that we have already had a fire in the brand new hospital, where a patient lit a fire which caught light to the mattress, and they discovered that there was no sprinkler system to protect them. It is concerning that those patients were then evacuated. They have been put into another area on the Glenside campus site while they retrofit the sprinkler system. I do not know how much that is going to cost, but I refer today to the cost and risk to human life as a result of the incompetence of this government.

Far from the beautiful world-class haven for the recovery of the mentally ill as displayed in the brochures, the plans and the publicity surrounding the announcement of this facility, what we have ended up with is a hospital crammed into the corner of the Glenside site, empty buildings left derelict on the property and an oval that is now covered in weeds. It is an absolute disgrace!

We have heard the reports, many of which have been published. After 12 years, we now have a situation where we have only 220 acute mental health beds in this state. That is a disgrace, and I refer to the Public Advocate's report to confirm that.

Mentally ill South Australians have been cruelly abandoned by this government. The condition which nurses and health professionals have to work in are an insult to the dedication of these professionals. Promises have been made with reform under the new Mental Health Act. We have had the appointment, under the Mental Health Act, of a new chief psychiatrist from New Zealand, whom I have met—she did not last long. I do not know where she is now.

We have had the government ultimately accepting, under protest, the Community Visitors program, which is to be a voice for patients and clients. We have had the Stepping Up report, a plan for mental health services, published by Monsignor Cappo. It was to cover mental health services from 2006 to 2012. Now we have had an announcement that the government is going to have a new commission to start looking at the next lot of the agenda. What has happened to the last two years?

We have had the Ernst & Young review, commissioned by the current Minister for Health, a review to stepped system care that was supposed to have been implemented by this government. Every year, we have had the Public Advocate highlighting the plight of vulnerable people, including those with mental health issues. It is one of the most disturbing reports to read in this parliament every year. I wonder whether these successive ministers even read it, because it seems they do not seem to care about what is important.

They certainly have announced more reviews, but clearly the public do not want more appointments or more bureaucrats; they want action. Unless we address the services of the inadequate 24-hour supported care services as part of the Step Up program, we will continue to have excessive demand on our acute beds. If the government is serious in this area, it will:

1. Announce that it will not further sell off the Glenside site and ensure that it is kept for the clearly growing demand, which the government acknowledges, for health services, including independent accommodation to assist those who move from acute care or, hopefully, do not get to acute care.

2. Extend the supported accommodation in the community and make available areas on the Glenside site.

3. Maintain acute services and accept that they are an important tool in the recovery of those in highest need.

4. Ensure any replacement is operating before the existing service is cut. That is critical, and it is only humane, in my view, to ensure that that occurs.

There are other areas that are in need of attention, which have been highlighted over a sustained period by the Public Advocate and others. One is that we provide mental health services to people in prison.

Some members have not been down to the Women's Prison, Yatala and to other areas of high security, and I urge those members to do so. There are people in there who have committed crimes, and they need to be rehabilitated because we need to appreciate that one day they will be released and that they are going to live in a street next to any one of us and that they need help. If they are in the Women's Prison because they have killed a child—often their own child—or their husband, they need help and assistance to be able to deal with the fact that they are separated from family and that they will be incarcerated, usually for a long time. We need to ensure that that help and assistance is there. There seems to be little charter or care for those who are in that category.

Let me highlight an even worse example of neglect by this government, and that is the practice of placing forensic mental health patients in prisons and not in hospitals. For members who are not familiar with the term, forensic mental health patients comprise those who have been found mentally incompetent to commit an offence or mentally unfit to stand trial. Pursuant to our law, a declaration is made to that effect and we treat them in another manner, as we should. Often, that requires that they are to be at James Nash House as part of their future treatment, custody or supervision, which is a dedicated forensic facility—but it is full, and it has been full for all the time that I have been in the parliament. There is a waiting list that varies from time to time between 20 and 30 persons who are waiting to get into this facility. These people are mentally unfit and they need help, and what happens to them in South Australia is shameful. What happens in South Australia is that they are placed in prison.

Why is it that other states are able to ensure that if they do not have adequate room in the dedicated forensic patient facilities like James Nash House, they are held in a hospital? That is what they do in other states. In this state, the minister has power to not only set the determinations for persons who are declared in this category, but also has the capacity to order that they be held in a prison. That is exactly what is happening in South Australia.

Why is this a problem? This is a problem because if you are in a prison and not in a hospital, you do not have nursing care. What does that mean? It means that you do not have trained people to look after you. So, we have reports, such as last year's Public Advocate report, which tells us—not that we need to be told, because we see it on the front page of the newspaper more often than not—that we find mentally ill forensic patients are held secure in their cells for up to 22 hours a day. We find stories of them being strapped to a barouche in a corridor, sometimes waiting for an admission in a hospital. That is what is being scandalously neglected by this government.

Unless the government are prepared to build a new facility—again, when they first got in, they said, 'Yes, good idea; we are going to build a new prison, we are going to build an extra facility for forensic mental health at Murray Bridge.' Well, that lasted five minutes; they cancelled it in the next budget, and we still do not have these services. But, in the meantime, at the very least provide humane services to ensure that they are treated with some dignity. They do it in other states and they should be able to do it here. It is no excuse; it is a deplorable neglect of those in need.

If the maturity of a civilised society is judged by the way we care for the most sick and vulnerable in our state, then this government needs to grow up very, very fast. I accept that there is competition for those in need and those that are vulnerable: the disabled, the disadvantaged, unemployed, homeless; it is a long list, and we do have a responsibility for them.

Let me remind members that in the 19th century, when we established this colony, the main treatment for the mentally ill was asylum, and if necessary, placement under restraint. The way we dealt with the unsociable behaviour of people with a mental illness, sometimes associated with drunkenness, was to hold them in the Adelaide Gaol. Temporary asylum was established first at Parkside and then on North Terrace in the Botanic Gardens—there are a few ruins there still today;

I mention it because it is History Month—and by 1870 the hospital, now known as the Glenside Campus of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, was opened.

By the early 20th century, over 1,000 patients were accommodated in this service. Certainly, it included a broader spectrum of the destitute and disabled, and the campus was much larger. In fact, they had a dairy herd, they had a silkworm industry, and they had gardens; now, of course, they are squashed into a corner. It seems that advances in psychiatric treatment in South Australia are back where we started. Our mentally ill are in prisons. It is a shameful indictment on this government, and I only hope that I am wrong in being sceptical that the promise of the appointment of a bureaucrat is going to solve this problem in the Governor's address.

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

Mr GEE (Napier) (11:24): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I would like to start by congratulating you on your election as Speaker and extend my congratulations to the Deputy Speaker on her election to the deputy speakership. I wish to acknowledge and show my respect to the Kurna people, the traditional custodians of this land where we meet, of their elders past and present, of those that were the first to put their footsteps upon this land, and those that continue to do so today.

I congratulate all the new members to this place on both sides of the chamber and also to those in the Legislative Council. In particular, I acknowledge Annabel Digance (member for Elder), a woman who has shown great persistence and has worked very hard to be here today. I also note the return of Tony Piccolo, Tom Kenyon and Paul Caica, who fought hard battles and proved once again that sheer hard work at the coalface works. Let me congratulate the other members on their re-election, Premier Jay Weatherill, and the member for Frome, Geoff Brock, on being able to provide stable government for the people of South Australia.

I come here today not only as a politician but as someone who finds great purpose in helping other people, fighting for our northern suburbs residents and the environment in which we live. I have lived in the northern suburbs since I was three in Para Hills, later in Salisbury and for the past 30-plus years in Craigmore in my own electorate.

I wish to start by thanking the electors of Napier who, after a short four-week campaign, elected me to represent them for the next four years. I received a negative swing of about 6 per cent against the 2010 results for Napier, but I again give thanks to the electors of Napier for giving me four years to get to know them better and represent them to the best of my ability. During the campaign I met many friends and associates who know me from my time working at Holden or through the Australian Manufacturing Workers Union. Many others whom I have known in the local community where our families have played and grown up together and shared life experiences, and also those I met at the local shops, hotels, sports and community venues, all gave me their encouragement and support. Now, when we meet again, I meet them in a different role as their representative in the Parliament of South Australia.

The electorate of Napier is about 25 kilometres from Adelaide and is very diverse. I am the fourth member for Napier following in the footsteps of Terry Hemmings, Annette Hurley and Michael O'Brien. Napier has within its boundaries the old suburbs of Davoren Park, Smithfield, Smithfield Plains and Elizabeth Downs, and also the newer areas of Munno Para, Craigmore and Blakeview. Napier also includes the tranquil and picturesque town of One Tree Hill and the surrounding rural areas of Bibaringa, Gould Creek, Humbug Scrub, Yattalunga and Uleybury. The electorate is completed by the urban fringe areas of Munno Para Downs, Kudla, Evanston Park and Evanston South.

My electorate contains a fairly young population, with only 16.3 per cent of people in my electorate aged over 60. One quarter of the families in my electorate contain only one parent and 45 per cent of the workers in my electorate work in blue-collar jobs as labourers, production workers, tradespeople, technicians, machine operators or drivers. These are the people I feel most comfortable with. My electorate has a large percentage of severely disadvantaged people, high levels of intergenerational unemployment and many residents suffering with mortgage stress and struggling with ever rising costs. There are many challenges and many battles to fight but I, and the residents, am hopeful for a future that delivers prosperity, jobs and training opportunities to the area.

I arrive at this place at a difficult time for the North, a time of uncertainty due to the recent announcement of General Motors to close its Holden operations in Australia. I will discuss that in more detail later. I was born in the UK in Middlesex near London to parents Gerald Leslie, known to his friends as Les, and my mother Olwyn to whom I am eternally grateful for all her love, advice, encouragement and support that she has given me, always with patience and understanding.

I am the middle child of three. My older brother, Bill, was born a year earlier and my younger sister, Samantha, was born some time later in Australia after Mum and Dad decided to migrate to Adelaide with hope of a new and exciting future in Australia. I often give silent thanks to my parents for having the courage to come to Australia as a young couple with my brother and I, leaving their families and their old lives behind.

My parents moved the family to Para Hills in 1963 after a short stay at the migrant hostel in Elder Park on the banks of the River Torrens. Many years later I learned that my parents had been offered many old houses in the suburbs close to Adelaide at a far lower cost than the brand new house in Para Hills that we called home.

I remember how my brother and I, along with our friends from Goodwin Court—also the children of migrant families—would meet up in front of one of our houses on Saturday mornings and head off across the open land, walking for hours and only returning before dark for dinner with tales of our adventures to share with Mum and Dad. Later in life, as a young father myself, I was always saddened that my own children and their friends were not able to have these same experiences without adult supervision. It seemed that their opportunities for adventure had become smaller and more dangerous over the years.

It is these memories and those associated with school and sport that kept me in the northern suburbs all my life. I attended Para Hills High School from the first year that it opened. I had spent the previous year at Salisbury East High awaiting the completion of the new Para Hills High. Since my election, I have started visiting all the schools in my electorate. I can see that things have changed a great deal and a great deal for the better. I spent more than two hours meeting students and teachers at Craigmore High School last week. Craigmore High is a school that has been much maligned in the past but is delivering great results. There are many other schools in my electorate and there is a need for more.

I am a strong believer that if you give someone access to a good education and a job, you are giving them the fundamentals that will set them up for life. I started my working life after leaving Para Hills High to become an apprentice chef. Although I chose not to pursue cooking as my choice of career it has given me much personal pleasure and remains one of my most enjoyable hobbies. I spent many years working in the fishing industry employed as a trawler fisherman and, again, I was able to put the skills I had learned in the kitchen to good use.

It was during this time that I first met Wendy. There are some things in life that we just know to be certain. I knew at that moment that I was going to spend my life with her. Some years later I did ask Wendy to marry me and I am delighted to tell you that we celebrated our 30th wedding anniversary just last year.

During a six-month closure of the fishing grounds, I applied for a position at Holden to earn a living until the fishing grounds opened and I could return to work as a fisherman. My six months at Holden's turned into 12 incredible years on the shop floor, involving myself in health and safety, social club, fire squad and as a representative of the Vehicle Builders Employees Federation. During this period, the duties and responsibilities of these positions were carried out before and after work and during breaks, and it was during this period that I joined the Australian Labor Party. In those early days at Holden, working on the factory floor, it was a dangerous place to work, it was a dirty place to work, it was a place where you could find yourself out the door without notice, other than with a blue slip, locally referred to as a DCM or 'Don't come Monday'.

Much has been said about working at Holden's in the good old days but the reality is that this is where you went to work if you could not get a job anywhere else. Being a shop steward or a safety rep. was risky back then and employment was tenuous but following the introduction of superannuation through the ACTU in 1985, and the 38-hour week and the award restructuring, Holden and the Federation of Vehicle Industry Unions worked together very closely to introduce massive workplace change and intensive training to the point where people were queuing up to get a job at Holden. It became the place you went to first, rather than work anywhere else. Those who

did the hard yards in the so-called 'good old days'—many are still there—truly have something to be proud of.

As I said earlier, the north is a great place experiencing some tough times. I have seen this firsthand, as a resident, as a proud union official for over 20 years, and as secretary of the AMWU vehicle division over the past five years: the joy as new shifts were added and the despair as jobs were shed.

The saddest day for the north and maybe for the state was 11 December 2013 when the announcement was made that car manufacturing would end at the Elizabeth plant. This was on the back of the Ford closure announcement, and then came the inevitable announcement from Toyota. Unlike the abstract styling of the Toyota badge or the blue oval used by Ford on all of its vehicles across the planet, you only get to have the Holden lion badge here in Australia.

An expensive advertising campaign released by GM to convince consumers that it was business as usual following its announcement to close its operations was dumped almost as quickly as it started, as sales of new cars almost stalled. I am hoping that the realisation of this by the GM management will leave the door ajar for some level of local vehicle production. GM protects its brands with great vigour.

The announcement that the car industry will be leaving Australia has hit the components sector very hard. Many members here today will have workers and small businesses in their electorates who will lose their jobs or that will close down. The worst case scenario could see 12,000 people become either unemployed or underemployed. As a member in the re-elected government, I stand ready to assist workers to retrain or transition to other industries. I am committed to ensuring that we do all we can for these workers.

Since that day in December, confidence in the north has dipped. People are concerned about their employment, their mortgages and their ability to pay their bills. People are saving more and buying less; attendance at the local footy and most other events has fallen. I stand here today to say the north is a great place: a place to live, to work and to play. The north has good infrastructure, a diverse and vibrant community, and a bright future through our young people.

The key to the success of the northern suburbs is the retention of Holden in some capacity or vehicle manufacturing on the Holden site, or a mix of industry and commercial businesses on the site. The Holden site must be retained for jobs and not real estate. This site must create employment and training opportunities for local people.

It is very important that the Playford Alive concept continues and provides local young people with opportunities to gain new skills while delivering projects that bring great benefit to the area through urban regeneration. These are the skills that will be required in the north to complete the many thousands of new homes that will be built in the area between Munno Para, Blakeview and Gawler to the north.

The area also needs investment in the public realm. When I lived in Para Hills, Elizabeth was the envy of the north. It had the drive-in, the skating rink, the pool hall and the best ovals and sporting facilities. We need Playford again to be the envy of the north, to have the best streets, the best ovals and the best playgrounds for our children to enjoy themselves on. This needs to be in all areas, not just the new suburbs, but in the older suburbs where residents love their local community and have strong memories of how things were.

My commitments over the next four years are to doorknock every house in the electorate and to stay in touch with all my schools and community groups, while lobbying for more school places. I am committed to lobbying for more frequent trains at Broadmeadows and Munno Para stations and continued investigation into the provision of a public bus service to the One Tree Hill area. I have also committed to lobby the City of Playford for more community events and improvements to the public realm.

I acknowledge my predecessor, Michael O'Brien, who served the electorate of Napier for 12 years. Michael conceived the idea long ago with others of the Playford Alive urban renewal project. Michael was instrumental in the introduction of super schools in South Australia, and the introduction of school fencing in South Australia. During Michael's time a lot of infrastructure was delivered, including a new police shopfront, a new fire station and a new ambulance station, and upgraded railway stations at Elizabeth and Munno Para.

In closing, I want to thank the many people who have supported me, given me advice or been great friends during my life. I cannot mention everyone but I have to start with my parents. My father Les worked as a toolmaker. He loved to read and he hated the cold. Australia was like a paradise for him. My mother Olwyn worked at the WRE complex at Penfield and later as a PA at R.M. Williams until her retirement. Mum and dad had so many friends with so many kids that it always felt like we had visitors, or we would be at someone else's place. It was like this until I left home.

My brother Bill had great success in retail music. I have always had great respect for him and his ex-wife Kay and their children, Jodie and Dani. My wonderful sister, Samantha, who has had many challenges to overcome in her life, has been totally committed to providing care to intellectually disabled people for over 30 years. I want to acknowledge Wendy's parents, Jack and Thelma, who welcomed me into their family, and also her sister Pam and brothers Brian and Richard, who stood in as best man at our wedding. They realised something was afoot when Wendy and I traded two cars in for one.

Jack was in the British forces which enabled Wendy the good fortune of living in countries such as Cyprus, Germany and Singapore, as well as receiving a private boarding school education in England. Wendy was a successful restaurateur and has already retired once. She was climbing the walls after a month and so returned to the workforce. I am very proud of Wendy and I thank her for enriching my life.

To our children, Robbie, Matthew and Julie-Anne, we wish you the best that life has to offer. Our beautiful daughter-in-law, Haley and our grandsons, Benjamin and Franklin: we love and adore you all.

It would not be possible to end up in this place without the support of many people. I want to start by thanking my campaign director Alex Coates—he deserves high praise—and also to Brenda Larnio and Sonya Smethurst, who provided support to us all. I thank my dear friends, John and Mischelle Camillo, Mick and Julie Sanderson, Paul McMahon, Frank Barbaro and David Fabbro.

I thank the Napier sub-branch, led by Glen Armstrong, for its support and assistance through the campaign. I thank everyone who letterboxed, erected corflutes or stood at a polling booth on election day, spreading the good word. I would especially like to thank my booth captains for making sure that everything ran smoothly.

I wish to acknowledge John Camillo AMWU, Bob Donnelly CEPU, Jason Hall FSU, Peter Malinauskas SDA, Ray Wyatt TWU, Scott Batchelor AMWU, and Dave Garland NUW. I also acknowledge federal senators Don Farrell and Alex Gallagher for their support.

I thank Nick Champion and Fiona Webber, also Reggie Martin, Matt Ellis, Sonia Romeo, Aemon and Emily Bourke, Josh Peak, Mathew Werfel, Rob Klose, Caleb Flight, Deb Black and Michael Puttner for their help and support.

Lastly, I want to give special thanks to the vehicle industry workers and shop stewards who have again given their support to me. To name a few: Heinz Joham, Darryl Waterman, Leanne Obanic, Graham Thompson, Geoff Dymott, Peter Gratz, Ian Ramsay, Murray Akehurst, Paul Waldron, Dennis Masters, Billy Doe, Sue Clayton, Rob Morris, Darren Pine, Darren Thorpe, Vince Cavallaro and Robert Alberton.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:45): Thank you, Mr Speaker. In my opening remarks, I would like to congratulate you on retaking the very significant post of Speaker. I certainly noted your reluctance on taking that position two days previously in this parliament. I would also like to acknowledge Madam Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, the member for Florey, for her rise to that position.

Ms Bedford: Meteoric.

Mr PEDERICK: Meteoric, I am reminded, by the member for Florey. Well done to you both. In addressing the Governor's speech, I will acknowledge it is a speech written by the government for the Governor. I think it is important for everyone to acknowledge that, not just in this place but in the wider community.

I would certainly like to acknowledge the great way in which the Governor delivered the speech, and acknowledge his service and his wife Liz's service to this state for so many years. Kevin and Liz, if they do not mind me calling them that, are great people who have been very welcoming to me as a member of parliament, as they have been, I am sure, to every member in this place.

I know that, in the brief times Kevin has been able to get some leave during his term as Governor, he has taken some of that in my electorate at Goolwa, where I know he enjoys golf as well as relaxation down there. I wish them all the best after his role as Governor finishes up later on this year, and I would really like to again acknowledge his great service to this state and that of his wife Liz.

I would like to acknowledge the new members of this place and every other member of parliament who has been re-elected. At the risk of being cut short, I would like to acknowledge the member for Schubert, Stephan Knoll; the member for Bright, David Speirs; the member for Hartley, Vincent Tarzia; the member for Mitchell, Corey Wingard; and the member for Mount Gambier, Troy Bell, for all being new members on this side of the house. I congratulate them on their successful candidacies and also congratulate the new members on the other side of the house who have been elected. I congratulate everyone for their maiden speeches. I think there have been some great words spoken already in this house and there will be many more to come.

I would also like to acknowledge the election of the Hon. Andrew McLachlan MLC on our side of the house and, obviously, the election of the Hon. Tung Ngo MLC on the Labor side. He certainly has an interesting story of how he came to Australia, and I wish him all the best in his future role in the parliament.

In addressing the content of the speech, very early in the speech, it talks about the Hon. Dale Baker's passing. Dale was one of those—I do not think he would mind me saying—irreverent characters of the parliament. I have mentioned in this house before that I actually shored a few sheep for Dale back in the eighties. I did a lot more time working for his brother Dean. He was quite a character. If you can ever have a little bit of humour at funerals, there was a little bit at Dale's send-off as we celebrated his life and some of the things that Dale had done. I thought some of the eulogies that were presented that day were some of the best I have ever heard and I salute his service to this state. It was a pleasure, in the time before I was elected, working with Dale Baker as a Liberal.

I would also like to acknowledge Mr Ivon Wardell who passed away in November last year. Ivon's first wife, Dorothy, taught me music many years ago, and I do not remember much of it but he was a great man. I had not contacted Ivon for decades and yet when I got elected he came on board and came to my Christmas functions and I really appreciated that. I was saddened to hear of his passing and I certainly made sure that I attended his farewell. I really appreciated his support in my career.

I will just address other parts of the Governor's speech. A couple of aims of the government are realising the benefits of the mining boom for all and premium food and wine from our clean environment. I think this will be a challenge for the government. Certainly, I have been involved in the select committee into farming practices in this state and I have had a couple of mines previously in my electorate—I still deal with them, even though with redistributions you lose or gain some land; in my case, I have lost some country—and it is difficult to get that interface to work. I am certainly of a mind that both industries need to operate. We do need to realise the mining potential but we cannot do it at the risk of our primary production either.

It is hard work but I think a lot of it can be done a lot better by early consultation by miners, by mining companies working with their exploration companies and, I guess, their subcontractors to a degree to make sure that access arrangements are worked out long prior to any problems emerging with property owners. Also, people need assurance that there will not be any harm done certainly in the longer term, and even in the short to mid term, for their properties. It is a difficult path to tread but I certainly think, for a state that has really succeeded with agriculture and mining over many years—over the life of the state, in fact—we need to get both industries to work, but it is challenging.

We also note from the speech that in August 2012, BHP Billiton announced that it would delay plans for its expansion of Olympic Dam. I can understand why BHP made that decision but it saddened me to think that the biggest uranium and copper project was going to be delayed. BHP were going to have to spend \$30 billion before they got a cent back and it was a huge operation. It would probably have involved taking off the overburden for about four years and creating essentially

a mound of overburden of over 6,000 hectares that would have to be scraped off before getting to the ore body. I know they are looking for other ways to mine it but one of the main reasons was just the sheer cost of getting to the ore body before realising benefits not only to the state but to shareholders. The ore body has not gone anywhere. It is still here and I wish BHP Billiton all the best in its endeavours in how it is going to mine that ore body.

I also want to glance over and have a look at the comments about Holden closing its Elizabeth plant in 2017. Yes, it will be a sad day, as we just heard from the member for Napier, if what Holden's have said they will do comes through. We have many Holden cars in my family. We have had an HQ V8 wagon, 308 automatic, and it must have been one of those cars built mid week because there is nothing wrong with that car, and it went fairly quickly if you needed it to. We have an HZ Statesman, which my brother has control of. He is going to rebuild it, he tells me, but it is parked in pieces in one of the sheds on my farm. I am sure it will get rebuilt one day. I am the proud owner of a 1989 model VG Holden ute that I need to spend a bit of money on to get it in better order.

They are great vehicles, and it will be sad for the whole community. With the right outlook, if Holden's do go through—and it sounds like they will, because the decision was finally made in Detroit, regardless of what government money from governments of either side was put up, that they will be leaving the state—I think there is great potential for other opportunities out in the north for industry and IT services.

I note that in the Governor's speech there is commentary about the \$3.4 billion of infrastructure projects. The problem for me is, as the speech says, this includes 19 privately funded projects in and around the city that are in the approval pipeline or in case management. I would like to see more of these projects benefiting the regions. We are told we are going to get that focus in the regions, and we will make sure that we put plenty of pressure in place from this side of the house and that we do get that focus to get that infrastructure, whether it is built infrastructure or road infrastructure, into the regions.

I also go to another part of the Governor's speech, where he mentioned that, 'Our economy depends heavily on our capacity to retain our brightest minds and attract talented professionals from interstate and overseas. But they need more than a great place to live—they need a great job.' They need, he stated, 'A strong growing economy as the foundation from which South Australians can build full rich lives and protect the things that we love most about our state.' I could not think of better words.

The issue we have is, apart from attracting talented professionals from interstate and overseas, we must find a way to retain our young professionals here. We have heard in the leader's contribution to the Address in Reply debate that over 30,000 young people recently have left this state because they do not have the opportunity. We need to retain people in this state as well as attract bright minds and individuals here to make this economy grow.

I note that the government is going through a process of developing the new Department of State Development and it will become the agency that is the principal driver of economic development in South Australia. From what the Governor's speech says, it will bring together a range of development activities, such as employment and training programs and industry and business development for both small and large businesses, as well as supporting the energy and resource sectors, science and innovation, and trade.

I tell you what, I wish this department all the best, because there is a lot of work to do. There is a lot of work to do in this state. There is so much opportunity that just has not been realised by this government of over 12 years. There is a huge opportunity in this state and we need to embrace those opportunities. The government needs to get on the ball and get those opportunities realised.

The speech mentions that the government will also give the Economic Development Board carriage of the Jobs Acceleration Fund. The Jobs Acceleration Fund has been created to hasten the availability of job and training opportunities to those with the highest need, in particular South Australians adversely affected by sectoral change or experiencing intergenerational unemployment. I applaud that; that has to happen.

I note the \$10 million that has been put forward for the Jobs Acceleration Fund for the member for Frome's (the Minister for Regional Development) agreement with the government. It could not happen sooner. We need that funding, especially in regional areas, where there are high

rates of unemployment. I note the unemployment levels in Murray Bridge of 10.3 per cent. I know they are not as bad as in some areas of the state, but it saddens me when I see that level of unemployment in the area that I love.

With regard to another part of the speech, the Governor reflected on the South Australian public sector and talked about its renewal and how it must demonstrate its commitment to bold innovative approaches and encourage other sectors to follow. What I would encourage people to do is have a look at what the new member for Bright's contribution was about the public sector in this place only yesterday. I think for a bloke who worked in the office of premier and cabinet he certainly had an inside view, so it is not someone outside making a comment about the public sector.

I have never worked for the public sector apart from, I guess, you could say in public life as a member of parliament, but this was a view from the inside about the disenchantment, the morale that has just dropped to zero, and the nepotism. I would commend people, certainly in the government, to read the member for Bright's contribution and seek change so that people will endeavour to work for our Public Service and not just work for the Public Service, but work for the people of South Australia and put the state first. That is what we need in all levels of employment, especially in relation to the Public Service when one in eight voters in this state are members of the Public Service.

I also want to reflect on parts of the speech about the South Australia-India Engagement Strategy and the South Australia-China Engagement Strategy and the talk about expanded exports. I think there are huge opportunities in both areas; billions of people who we can form trade with. I know Prime Minister Abbott is working towards a free trade agreement with China and I think it will bring great things to this state and this country if that can be developed. I note the free trade agreements that have been negotiated throughout Asia in the last couple of months by Prime Minister Abbott and his government and this can only bring more rewards to our producers in this state and our suppliers of goods to increase the wealth of this state, so I applaud those strategies. I just hope the government can make sure that we get the best results that we can. I also note in the speech the comments:

We also benefit from significant inbound investment in mining and resources sourced from China, as well as in local construction...

I acknowledge in relation to Murray Zircon up at Mindarie—I do not have any of that patch now in my electorate after the redistribution—the Chinese investment of \$40 million to get that mine back on its feet and fix the rehabilitation. I think there is room in this state for coinvestment. If we do not have that coinvestment then sometimes things do not happen, so I applaud that investment. I think people need to look outside the square more, to look at opportunities to make businesses and mining ventures grow in this state.

I now want to address the Premier's agreement with the member for Frome and this is commenting straight from the speech:

...to support stable and effective government includes an undertaking to develop charters for stronger regional policy and for small business. These charters outline a series of commitments and initiatives that will ensure that my government will be more responsive to the needs of South Australia's regional communities and business community.

Well, on this side we wait with baited breath. The regions have been neglected for the last 12 years and we want to see some action. We want to see some action in the regions. I know the government has set up its committee with the five ministers on it to look at the regions. We have set up an internal working committee, the Regional Affairs Committee, which I am chair of and it is working across the breadth of the Liberal Party.

All of our shadow ministers and all of our people over here are on board because we represent the regions from the far West Coast down to the lower South-East. I am so proud to say that we represent right down to the bottom of the lower South-East now with the member for Mount Gambier finally getting that seat of Mount Gambier into Liberal hands. So, we have that broad representation and we aim to probe the government to make sure that we do get those commitments for the regions.

I note the member for Frome's agreement to get \$39 million in the regions. That is commendable, but he could have probably asked for the close to \$120 million of commitments that

we put up and I think Premier Weatherill would have agreed to it. However, we will keep working on it. We have got many projects and issues that we can chase.

The government says it is committed to improving the operating environment for small business and reducing red tape. Well, I am not going to hold my breath. I hope it happens, but it needs to happen sooner rather than later. People are burdened by the cost of running businesses in this state, and I get tired of hearing about people who have had enough who decide they are going elsewhere to run their businesses.

The government says it will work with primary industries in the regions and take responsibility in food manufacturing. I hope they do put some more money into primary industry in the regions, because there has been close to \$100 million pulled out of the primary industry budget since this government was elected. There is a whole lot of money there that could be reinstated to primary industries to make our primary industries work a lot better.

They get taken too much for granted, especially our broadacre farmers and livestock producers. It is great to have the premium foods and wines, fantastic, but where our main income comes from—the land—it is from the bulk commodities, and that is a fact. It is bulk commodities, and they need to be recognised in the same way as some of the more high-priced items that we produce on our great land.

I note that the government has an aim to work closely with the Local Government Association, regional local government bodies and individual councils. Perhaps it will pick up our policy of \$50 million in funding to assist loans for infrastructure builds, which would put \$500 million of funding proposals into the regions.

I see the government talking about the Education Act, talking about the better needs of our children, and I will address that further later on in my speech. However, one thing I will talk about here, in the Governor's speech, is that the rate of suicide in South Australia is unacceptable, and in rural areas the rate is significantly worse than in metropolitan areas. This is an issue I spoke of only yesterday in this place, in a grievance. It is distressing, the contacts you have with people, especially the constituent I mentioned yesterday and the fact that, to keep her son alive, she had to have him detained under the Mental Health Act because he had threatened to kill himself three times. It is very, very distressing.

With regard to the election, I acknowledge the re-election of the member for Fisher, the Hon. Dr Bob Such. As the Governor did in his speech, and as many people in this house already have, I wish Dr Such all the best in his recovery. It was great to see him the other day. I hope that, for his sake, he makes his health the number one priority.

In my closing minutes I would like to comment on issues closer to home in the seat of Hammond. First, I would like to thank all the people of Hammond who voted for me in my re-election for my third term. I promise to continue working hard on building a positive future for Hammond. Hammond has had its troubles. We have had the drought that started back in 2006, and we have had massive redistributions. In my first redistribution I lost Strathalbyn and picked up Goolwa, and in this redistribution I went from 15,000-odd square kilometres to 6,000-odd square kilometres, because 9,000 square kilometres of farming country went up to the seat of Chaffey. I am not sure if the—

Ms Bedford: You could walk it now.

Mr PEDERICK: Nearly; ride a bike across it almost—but that will not happen either.

An honourable member: A suburban electorate.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes; I do not know if Tim needed the extra margin that that afforded him, the member for Chaffey.

Mr Whetstone: Gratefully accepted.

Mr PEDERICK: Gratefully accepted. I guess the thing that saddens me is that when you look at 9,000 square kilometres, out of that there were only about 2,200 voters, and that is a lot of country. You have electorates in Adelaide over which you can put a postage stamp and can walk one from one end to the other without hurting your hip.

Mr Pengilly: Hear, hear!

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, the member for Finnis—a fellow traveller in hip surgery. It makes you think. I want to repay the faith the voters of Hammond have put in me, and I promise to work diligently in everything they ask of me.

I raise a few issues relating to Murray Bridge, Tailm Bend and throughout the electorate—Langhorne Creek and Goolwa. I refer to the Murray Bridge Racing Club, the Gifford Hill redevelopment. A lot of people say to me, 'This is just a racing club proposal; why do you want to fund them?', because we put up a \$15 million proposal to match the \$5 million from the federal government. I said, 'Because it's not just about racing; it's about housing development, about unlocking land for a sports precinct, and also about the domino effect of getting a bulky goods precinct in Murray Bridge.'

Over decades—and it will be over decades—I believe it will unlock \$1 billion of investment, but the project has stalled. The racing club has invested \$13 million and, like everywhere, the money in regional South Australia is tight, very tight. I am hoping that ministers Bignell and Brock will look carefully at this and take this proposal through to Premier Weatherill, as I have done, to push for funding from the state government in its regional financing package so that we can realise the potential of that project.

I acknowledge the Tailm Bend Motorsport Park and the involvement of the Peregrine Group and the Shahin family here. I welcome the government's commitment of \$7.5 million, I will follow that closely to make sure that commitment happens, and I am sure it will—they have said it will—and who cannot believe a government?

The Hon. A. Piccolo: More sarcasm!

Mr PEDERICK: I said, 'Who cannot believe a government?' I think that this was the ideal choice for a motorsport park in South Australia. We also need to make sure the government is held to account on its commitment to regional South Australia and the importance of primary industries—areas like the fabulous Langhorne Creek wine region, where Lake Breeze and other wineries won so many more awards at the Langhorne Creek wine luncheon only last Friday.

I refer to the Coorong and Lower Lakes fishery, the Mallee grain producers and the livestock producers, the massive egg and poultry farms in our area, the Mypolonga horticulture and fruit growing areas further throughout the electorate. We must also make sure that local industries that are doing well in the area, that are underpinning the state's economy with hundreds of millions of dollars investment and are generating billions of dollars of income for this state.

To name just a few of the bigger ones from my area: Thomas Foods International; Australian Portable Camps; Swanport Harvest and Staycrisp Lettuce; Adelaide Mushrooms; Big River Pork; and, numerous chicken farms that I mentioned before. As we all know, there are always regional transport concerns. We always need better transport to our country towns, especially areas like Goolwa, Hindmarsh Island and Murray Bridge. I believe that over time we will get a public-funded metro ticket transport. I know it has to be funded publicly, but it will give so much more opportunity for people to still live in a regional area and be able to access the city in a cost-effective manner.

Health services are something about which I talked in the parliament as recently as yesterday. They all need attention, especially when you have areas like Goolwa and Murray Bridge that do not fall under the patient assistance transport scheme because they drop out of the 100-kilometre limit. We need to make sure that with a population growth and an ageing demographic that people can access their health services.

We have education issues, local schools, and job cuts at the local TAFE in Murray Bridge. We have the slow response time, and I know that the Lameroo school has gone out of my electorate, but four of its school buildings burnt down last October, and we are still no closer to knowing whether or not those buildings will be totally replaced.

I have already mentioned the unemployment rates in the area—and I am running out of time, which is a bit of a disaster! With regard to the River Murray, as I mentioned earlier, in the drought of 2006 we not only had the dryland drought, but we had the river and irrigation drought to the lifeblood of Hammond and there are so many industries and towns that rely on the health of the river. We have the Lower Murray flood plains that need work, and I want to acknowledge and make further comment later about Henry Jones and his sad passing—a true champion of the Murray—and if the Murray-Darling Basin Plan should be attributed to one man, it should be him.

In my closing remarks I would like to thank all my family, my supporters and my staff: to my wife Sally, my sons, Mack and Angus; to Greg O'Brien, his wife Teresa; to Karen Parker, Neville and Marie Mueller, Rob and Jan Smyth, Norm and Margaret Patterson, Neville and Judy Woolcock, Liam O'Neil; and the Hammond SEC executive and all of their families. I would like to acknowledge all the membership down at Goolwa—a great team who handed out how-to-vote cards on the day. All the volunteers—everyone who helped with the whole process. My staff members: Kim Duffield, Diane Bolton, Liam O'Neil, and all the trainees I have had over time, especially Emma Kluske, the most recent. I would also like to make special mention of Jan Henderson and her husband, Brian, from the Goolwa branch and I am looking forward to another term as the elected member for Hammond.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Ms Hildyard): The member for Florey.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:16): Thank you, Acting Speaker. I acknowledge this government meets on Kurna land and pay my respects to elders past, present and future. I am also mindful of the contribution all members who have gone before me and us have made in this place to this state and the honour it is to be elected to represent your local community in such a forum. In these early days of the 53rd Parliament of South Australia, I put on record my thanks to the electors of Florey for placing their trust in me yet again. I will always strive to be worthy of that trust and undertake to serve them to the best of my ability.

During the election campaign, undertakings were made in each electorate that became part of the policy taken to the people of this state. This policy platform is something this government will begin to implement and it has done from the very first day of sitting. I commend the Governor for his speech, and would also like to take this opportunity to thank Governor Scarce and Mrs Scarce for their dedication to their roles and their commitment to South Australia.

There is much to be done to deliver the vision taken to the election and I look forward to being part of the government delivering the policies that will contribute to the progress that will be made in this state. At a local level, education and health remain key services and I know the undertakings to improve courses at The Heights School have already seen discussions put in place. The challenge will be to deliver opportunities for students looking to improve their skills so they can make a successful transition to the workforce and to meaningful paid employment.

All teachers make a significant contribution to the state through their work in nurturing and developing the young people in their care and I thank them for their dedication to their vocation. For someone who has an entire family of teachers surrounding them—all my siblings and their partners are teachers—I know what goes into preparing the work that is taken to school campuses every day.

Florey is home to the Tea Tree Gully campus of TAFE and this continues to be a hub for local students, assisting them in reaching their study and employment goals. The emphasis on promoting South Australia as a destination for further education is another important aspect of this government's strategy to make this state the education state, and there is a great deal of work going on to keep South Australian universities among those most in demand, particularly for international students.

With regard to health, the Modbury Hospital remains a focus of local health service delivery, and I am very happy to report that I have heard such good remarks about the work being done in the accident and emergency area since it was upgraded. The staff has great morale and it is wonderful to see the hospital really humming and only mentioned in a good way, which is marvellous. We have good mental health services and a rehab service will soon be in place which will cater for the ageing population of our area. I include myself in that because, as the member for Hammond pointed out, trudging the footpaths in the local area can be very dangerous—a lot of footpath falls!

The Modbury Hospice has a reputation for delivering exceptional care, and our thanks go to those dedicated nurses and doctors who help people like us face such difficult circumstances. Something that happens so rarely for us confronts these workers on a daily basis, and their work and efforts are truly valued.

With winter coming, it is always a very busy time in emergency departments all over the state, and I thank all the medical personnel and the ambulance personnel for their diligence and the care they deliver every day. It is a good time to reflect and remind people of the importance of prevention strategies in health services and to ensure that they remain a focus of the health initiatives of this state. To that end, flu vaccinations are a very easy frontline initiative and are recommended

for those vulnerable to the ever-resilient flu strains that appear and are a scourge on us every season. If members have not already done so in their electorates, it is good to take the message about vaccinations against flu, particularly for older residents.

Again, locally, the work will continue on the public transport needs of our area, with the O-Bahn remaining a mainstay, a jewel in the crown of our public transport system and a continuing source of commuter confidence. The work of bus drivers is an essential service, and I thank them for their diligence. It's a very hard job that we tend to take for granted until they are not working, which is when we all realise how valuable their contribution is to our daily lives. The park-and-ride car park facility has proven to be hugely popular with weekday commuters and is now winning a great following for weekend activities like shopping, entertainment pursuits and the arts and, most particularly, sport, with football at the new Adelaide Oval, a venue that, as far as I know, has had almost complete universal approval.

Florey is an electorate with only a very small amount of light industry. It is maintained by a large retail sector and small businesses. Therefore, family businesses and small to medium enterprises provide the backbone of employment stimulus in our area. It is good to be able to say to those businesses that this is a government that holds them as a priority.

We also have a large number of retirement villages in Florey. It is a place where I know the recent review of the Retirement Villages Act was noted with great interest, and it was a topic of one of our most recent public forums which we hold in conjunction with the member for Newland. We have a very interesting agenda of forums coming up in the next few months, which I will tell him about shortly.

We have a great number of community groups and sporting clubs in Florey, and volunteers are involved in just about everything you can imagine. We are lucky to have every activity, every sort of outcome, sport and whatever you name in Modbury, with one of the largest centres in South Australia's suburban area. I think it is second only to Marion, which we can't have for very much longer: we will have to supersede that.

We have a great SES and CFS close by us, and an RSL which serves our defence personnel and their families. I might add, too, that they have great jazz on Sunday afternoons, so I highly recommend, if you are out our way, particularly in winter when it is very cold, that members come along and have a listen to some great jazz.

Statewide, and more broadly, maintaining the momentum of building a better and stronger South Australia remains as we face the future together. Even in a period when changes to employment will face many workers, we must instil in the community the necessity to embrace the changes and opportunities that are coming. That is easy to say, I know, but it is a time of change that can deliver something good to us. The undertaking to represent all South Australians is something the Weatherill government takes very seriously.

The new Royal Adelaide Hospital is rising above the formwork and beginning to resemble the world-class medical facility that it will soon become. Likewise, the SAHMRI building has begun its important work and the employment transition from construction site to the medical centre of excellence it will be known as worldwide. There are already very new and exciting discoveries coming from scientists here in Adelaide and this trend will continue to grow over the ensuing years. I know that, with SAHMRI operating and as it begins to take up its full potential, we will see some amazing outcomes.

Sustainable energy and a thriving food and wine sector are emerging industries and, along with tourism and the arts, will keep South Australia among the world's best cities. Mining and manufacturing are in transition and the jobs that will be generated will come online as we urgently need them to help transition the workers from the car industry into other employment. Workplace safety and a strong WorkCover scheme must underpin all jobs in South Australia.

There can be no more important an area of concern than strengthening families and the protection of children, and it is no surprise that the child before eight is the adult we end up with. The ability to adapt and be resilient in many situations is the way to make sure the relationships of the future are strong and stable. Violence in all its forms is to be abhorred, particularly violence against children and women. Recent dreadful incidents show us that more needs to be done to name the behaviour that causes such devastation.

Seventy women have died this year at the hands of their partners, or former partners, and children have also met terrible ends. The real, insidious impacts manifest themselves in troubled individuals condemned to repeat this destructive behaviour, and so the problem goes on and on. Let's all redouble our efforts to find a way to make a difference, just as the workers in this sector endeavour to do each and every day. Our thanks to them seems little in the face of situations that confront these front-line workers in such a workplace.

Affordable living is another major influence on the government's deliberations. We know the value of a dollar; I certainly do at the end of a month, and I am sure that everybody else in here does as well. It is even more difficult for those relying on low fixed incomes permanently. Keeping concessions at a realistic level is a major consideration, along with the ways to maximise and keep the consumption of utilities such as power and water affordable.

The collaboration with the state and federal governments to deliver services and opportunity for all will be a priority. Our Premier is not afraid to take the case of this state up at the highest levels and with those who would make decisions that will have a negative impact. We call on all elected representatives to make their stand for this state and always put the welfare of our state's people first. Attacks on pensions, disability services and Medicare must be debated so everyone understands the issues and realises exactly what is at risk. I am sure that with wide debate in these areas everyone will work very hard to maintain what we have.

One of the things beholden on all of us here is the necessity to inspire the confidence of electors in the holders of public office. To this end, we must work to raise the level of trust electors have in us and our agendas. We must take the work of parliament to the people and offer every opportunity to provide information to the people we work for, the very people who want to believe in what we all stand for and that we will indeed deliver.

One particular undertaking pre-election was the commitment of the government to establish a gallery to complement the visits of school students and the public alike to Parliament House. It is hoped it will go some way to replace the old Constitutional Museum and tell the story of government and voting in this state, with a particular emphasis on the story of women's dual enfranchisement. South Australia was of course the first place in the world to extend dual enfranchisement—the right to vote and the right to stand for election—to women, and this new gallery will be another world first in that there is no other institution like it dedicated to this achievement in any other nation.

It will also tell the story of Australian women's participation in helping women in the United Kingdom to win the vote, particularly the role of Muriel Matters, the first woman to speak in the House of Commons. A section of the grille on display in centre hall, on loan with the kind assistance of the Palace of Westminster and our clerk, is a link to that protest and our heritage in the system of parliament which we embrace and in which we all participate.

The restoration of Old Parliament House is a wonderful project, soon to be unveiled for all to see. The building, which saw the beginning of representative democracy in this free colony, has been saved basically from falling apart. It has been money well invested in the history of our state. The old chamber has been brought back to life, and several beautiful meeting rooms have been created from cramped almost unusable space. Ours is a very compact parliamentary precinct, and this work will make for a much better environment for the staff supporting our work.

To close my Address in Reply remarks, I would like to thank the Premier for his leadership in the campaign and for visiting Florey on so many occasions. I know he will return as often as possible, because I will be issuing invitations, and it will be to keep him connected to the issues in our community. His efforts were supported by many fine and dedicated volunteers who believe in building a better South Australia, and they facilitated successful interactions that have led to good outcomes for our local area.

Thanks also to the Australian Labor Party office staff who assisted during the campaign. My gratitude also goes to my wonderful sub-branch members, especially those who attend meetings and who are involved in the campaigns. I would also like to thank team Florey, my campaign team and helpers, too many to name individually. Well, that is probably not true when you listen to some of the lists I have heard in the last couple of days. I will not be naming them all today, but they do know who they are and they know how grateful I am for everything they have done. Our shared achievement is remarkable more so because we do so much without any machine behind us and on a shoestring budget.

As the cost of campaigns rises, so too do the impediments for ordinary community members to run for public office. It is a very worrying trend, as parliament must be a place for all voices, and this will only continue to be possible if we contain expenditure on campaigns and make them information sharing periods and a contest of ideas rather than marketing exercises.

The days of unlimited spending should be brought to an end, and it may well be that the investigations and deliberations should be around capping campaign costs rather than attempting to construct a set of campaign fundraising rules. It is simply unsustainable to have unlimited campaign spending, and I look forward to participating in the debate around future measures.

I would also like to put on record my thanks to the Electoral Commission of South Australia, especially the Florey returning officer and his staff. The Electoral Commission faces challenges in making sure we get a timely result, hopefully on the night of the election. The trend for many people to take advantage of pre-poll voting is making this a very difficult task.

If it takes a village to raise a child, it takes many, many people to maintain and inspire an MP. I thank everyone who has lent a hand in making my participation at this high level possible. I thank the staff of the Florey electorate office, who worked tirelessly for the community and are dedicated to offering a level of service that we would all want for our families. I am sure that this is what we all hope our officers provide.

To my colleagues here in this place, I look forward to working with you over the next four years. This leads me to my family, who share my desire to have a happy place to call home in the best possible community. I look forward to continuing to serve my community.

'Community counts' has been my philosophy since first becoming elected or even since being involved with committees at the kindy and the schools my children attended, because we live in a community, not just an economy. It is a slogan that still holds true and resonates broadly because people want to be the centre of our deliberations when setting responsible budgetary goals.

We have seen the results of cuts and austerity in many other countries and know that the responsible course is to take people with us, leaving no-one behind. Every person is important and so is their contribution to this state. Shared prosperity is this government's aim. We will work hard to deliver and we will be judged by our results.

Someone famous—and I cannot remember who—once said, 'a seat in parliament is not a reward for past services; rather, it's an opportunity for further work.' I commend the government's agenda and look forward to working hard to achieve its vision.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (12:32): It is with great pleasure that I rise to congratulate the Governor on his wonderful address to the joint sitting. The Governor is doing an absolutely fantastic job representing this state. As one would expect from a senior Royal Australian Naval Officer, he is commanding the ship of Government House with sincerity and firmness. It is wonderful to see him at work.

I am not what one might call a Republican in the sense that I have never had trouble identifying myself as an Aussie, but I firmly support our constitutional arrangements, including our present arrangements in respect of governors-general and governors. I think it provides something above the gritty business of politics, which people can hold up and respect, something that is very important for charity work and for other purposes. We have seen that demonstrated this week through this address, and it is wonderful to be in a position to reply to it.

First of all, I will talk of my electorate of Waite, the suburbs from Netherby and Springfield right through to Mitcham and Kingswood, down through Lower Mitcham and into Colonel Light Gardens and Westbourne Park and, of course, into the new areas that have come into Waite, such as St Marys. I grew up in Panorama and went to Marion High School. I enjoyed walking each day through St Marys, and it was wonderful to be out there during the campaign doorknocking through the streets I knew so well and where most of my schoolmates had come from. In fact, I even happened to pass the Greens candidate's house as I was doorknocking in one street. I walked by the front and saw a Greens sign out the front and thought, 'I won't bother with that one; I'll just go to the next house.' The next thing I knew he sprang out of the front door and we had a little chat in the street.

I commend both the Greens and the Labor candidate; in fact, all the candidates in the Waite campaign. It was a very well-run campaign. Everyone acted with considerable respect and dignity, which was good to see. That was not the case in all electorates. That was a decent one, and I commend all the candidates for the effort they put in.

I also thank the many volunteers who helped with my campaign. I am supported by a wonderful group of members and volunteers in my local branch of the Liberal Party in Waite. They are terrific people. I want to particularly commend Milan Perisic, who must be the most accomplished director of corflutes in the country. If Milan puts a corflute up on a telegraph pole, it will take an earthquake and Cyclone Tracy to remove it. I intend to have him coaching all the young volunteers in the process at the next election, because he is getting on. I will not mention his age, but he may be sitting in a chair giving them directions. Let me assure any potential candidate in the seat of Waite that they will have trouble pulling down the Hamilton-Smith corflutes if Milan Perisic has had anything to do with it.

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I see volunteers springing up from around the chamber to get out their flamethrowers, but it was a wonderful group of volunteers stuffing envelopes, sending out printed material and getting on the phone. I particularly mention Jane Johnston at my office, who is one of the more senior PAs in the system, and the staff, Ben Page and Amy Guillian, who did a wonderful job supporting me as well. I thank my family—both my immediate family and extended family, but all who were involved in what was a pretty interesting and exciting campaign.

We picked up some new areas that were hostile territory, according to the polling. I am pleased to say that I had some good swings in those new booths to the Liberal Party and held comfortably to my margin, which was not the case in all Liberal-held seats. There were some interesting swings, but we held on pretty well in Waite. I thank the people of this wonderful district in which I was born, grew up, have owned businesses, where nearly all my family live and which has been my home for nearly all of my life for their support. It is an honour to be re-elected.

I congratulate the new members who have come into the house on all sides. I have listened to nearly all of the addresses in reply so far and I look forward to hearing the remainder. It is an honour to be elected. I see that we are refreshed and renewed on all sides with some very high-calibre people from both major parties. It is a credit to the community that they put such good people forward.

I recall my own first Address in Reply, my maiden speech, and the enthusiasm and optimism that comes with being a new member. I hope that the flame is burning just as brightly 10 or 20 years from now, but that is the challenge: to maintain one's enthusiasm, one's rage for justice, for progress or for whatever it is that members have staked their claim to in owning their seats. It is a great honour. It has been my observation that everybody in this place, I think, is here doing their very best and with the very best in mind and in heart for the people they represent. We have different views. Often those views bring us into conflict, but I think just about everybody—there are always some cruisers who are here for themselves in any enterprise, and that would include parliaments all around the world. However, I think the overwhelming majority of people are here doing their very best for whatever it is they believe in and for whatever it is that is their cause, and that is what gives life to this place.

I will go over the good, the bad and the ugly of the last four years and talk then about the future, because I think the government has done some good things, some bad things and at times has been a little ugly. Let me start with the good things because, to be fair, the government has, I think, kicked some goals. I will start with the Adelaide Oval. As the person who first put Adelaide Oval on the political agenda, I am glad that the government finally saw the light and agreed with the idea I was promoting.

I do remember that when I first got out there and said that football must come into the city, the Labor Party were running down rabbit burrows everywhere saying, 'No, no, no. It will never happen on our watch,' throwing money at West Lakes, going around and offering to give the SANFL whatever it took to get this off the political agenda, describing Hamilton-Smith's plan for football in the city, the re-enlivenment of City West, extending the Convention Centre and doing it all up alongside the riverbank—it was 'Marty World', it was Las Vegas on the Torrens. It was never going to happen under Mike Rann.

It was quite apparent that over there in the cabinet was the now Premier and a few others thinking, 'You know what, that agenda that Hamilton-Smith is talking about is not so bad, and maybe Rann and Foley need to get out of the way so that we can roll it out.' Well, lo and behold, Mr Rann and Mr Foley were gotten out of the way, and suddenly I am seeing 'Marty World' unfold along the Torrens. I am delighted that the government got with the agenda and realised that, having poo-pooed the idea of extending the Convention Centre and doing up the entire precinct and bringing football into the city finally got with the plan. I am very happy to see it happen.

I note with interest that those people from various quarters who were huffing and puffing about opposing Adelaide Oval were nowhere to be seen at the showdown I attended. They were nowhere to be seen—and they were from all sides of politics. As I predicted, it was a roaring success, and I commend the government for delivering it. Although they did need a little bit of prompting, a bit of help from me, they finally got there. It just goes to show you that from opposition you can get results.

I have some further ideas. I would like them to consider a six-star hotel down there. I would like them to go further with their plans for the city; I would like them to come up with something a little bit more exciting for the Parklands and various other things. I will keep getting out there with my ideas, and I hope that the government continues its practise of implementing them for me, which is a wonderful thing.

The government has done some good things. Of course, there are only a few good things the government has done. Sadly, the government has also made some terrible mistakes and some massive blunders.

There is just this one little problem the Labor government has, and I note that it is a problem that a lot of Labor governments have, and that is that they love to spend money, and they have wonderful ideas and plans about how to spend it. There is always a cause that needs attending to, there is always someone somewhere who needs to be flowered with the taxpayers' money. They just have one little problem: often, they cannot figure out how to pay for it. This is a problem.

My wife has this same issue, and I am sure that many people's spouses have this issue. They do love to spend but, sadly, we have to pay the bills at the end of the week. This is a fundamental thing that I think Labor MPs need to learn. It needs to be somehow included in the induction process when they come into this place. Perhaps the whip could run a small program in learning how to pay the bills for all Labor MPs when they come into the house so that they get it into their head that you just cannot go around spending, spending because sooner or later you have to pay.

If you do not live within your means, you have to do things such as run up the debt to something like \$14 billion; you have to do things such as run deficits of well over \$1 billion; you have to do things such as go to Canberra to beg for a bailout. Those things are quite embarrassing because, in effect, what you are doing then is mortgaging the children's future.

What I would like to see is a little more of what we have heard from this side: efficient government, a government that lives within its means, a government that realises that most of the jobs and enterprise out there will be created by small businesses in the private sector—letting them off the leash, instead of trying, in some sort of Stalinist five-year plan, to create a job program that involves massive infrastructure spending to get fuelled in order to soak up jobs because you have strangled to death the private sector. If we could have a little bit more of that. You have done a very good job building my stadium—

Members interjecting:

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: —you have done a very good job fixing up the City of Adelaide in accordance with my plans. Now if you could just listen to that little pearl of wisdom I have offered—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: —then maybe you could balance the budget by the end of—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I can't hear the member for Waite.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you for your protection, Deputy Speaker. They have been ferocious in their interjections, and I'm glad that you have saved me from their withering wit and rapier-like commentary. Of course, apart from the bad, there has also been some ugly. I want to get onto the issue of electoral reform and the way in which politics is done.

I have mentioned that the campaign in Waite was mutually respectful on all sides. I am sad to say that in some electorates that was not the case; both sides, I think, were guilty of playing dirty. I think one side excelled a little more than the other, and others have mentioned that; I will not go over it.

Individual candidates and members, when they are running their campaign, will often be asked to do things by their party structures or campaign committees that will test their moral fibre. We all have to make the decisions that we feel comfortable with as candidates, and I would just ask some candidates to consider that going forward.

Yes, you could argue that it is only about winning, but when you look at the level of public cynicism about politics, the major parties and the way they work in general, you do have to ask yourself whether it is about more than winning; it is about the honourable way that you fight the fight, and it is about how you win as much as winning. I think we all need to reflect on that on all sides. It is not something that is exclusively the province of any particular party, but I would like to see a cleaner election in 2018.

Times have changed—the gentle times of the 1940s and 1950s have changed, and I think the modern media have largely precipitated that: the electronic media, the diversity of media, all wanting the scoop, all wanting to report, all wanting to get the edge, all wanting to be the first one to knock a minister down or criticise MPs, all wanting to be the first ones to construct a broken promise or get some headline out there. Of course, we politicians often have not helped ourselves either by fuelling the media; you cannot blame them for doing their job when we feed them up so amply with behaviours and actions that disappoint. I think we all could do better.

I am sure when the Ancient Greeks sat around and talked about democracy—and it is interesting watching communities around the world who are fighting for their freedom right now have the same arguments—they would have tested themselves with many questions. Someone once said to me that democracy is really about deciding how the money will be raised and how the money will be spent. Even now, in the eve of a federal election, we are seeing that definition unfold, about redistributing the money from those who have it to those who do not.

The trouble is it captures entire arguments about the extent to which you strangle the golden goose. If you rake too much away from those who have worked hard to earn it they will find ways to ensure that wealth leaves the country. On the other hand, if you are too fulsome in your generosity to those who have not earned it for one reason or another, then you undermine the incentive to work. It seems to me that when redistributing wealth, we should focus on those who do not have the physical, mental or emotional strength to manage without that help, but when one extends that welfare to those who could work but are not working, we have a problem.

I actually think the Abbott government has been quite courageous in taking on some fundamental issues and questions at the moment publicly through the budget process that we will see unfold next week. If there is something that I would like to see from this government, it is a bit of courage in its first two or three budgets. I would really like to see this government balance the budget; they have said they would. It will involve some tough decisions: one of them will be that the government will have to stop spending—certainly, stop spending at the pace it has been spending. It will have to be smarter and wiser about how it spends, otherwise, as I said, we are doing nothing more than mortgaging the children's future.

That may involve embracing some new ideas. It may mean that the government needs to consider the sort of problems that other members have talked of in their addresses in reply with regard to the Public Service. We need an efficient, empowered Public Service, not necessarily a huge one. Would it not be better to have a leaner, better paid, better focused Public Service than a large, unwieldy one that is not delivering? You are going to need to find efficiencies within the machinery of government.

It is not just about job cuts; it is about the way the Public Service functions efficiently. Can I say, as a guide, one should not be doing as a government what the private sector can do better or

as well. You are going to need to sort it out because, if you do not sort out the machinery of government, the cost of government, you will not balance the budget and we will all lose. Similarly, the commonwealth government is calling on the states to consider rationalising assets so that asset values captured up and held up in government ownership can be redeployed to build new roads, new water infrastructure, to build the things we need—schools and hospitals.

The Labor Party may have to move away from some of its ideologically based principles and start to be a little more pragmatic about what it does on behalf of the people we represent. I have previously said to the house that I am still trying to work out why we borrowed money on behalf of the taxpayers to build, for example, a desalination plant that actually has a revenue stream from the sale of water but then used a complex, convoluted and expensive public-private model to build a hospital which has no revenue stream. I am still trying to work that out. Why it was not the other way around still confuses me, and I think it demonstrates some muddy thinking from the government, muddy thinking that could be corrected with courage and with conviction.

I would say at the start of this four-year term that the people of South Australia expect all of us to start putting them first, not our political parties. I think this is true of all political parties in the parliament. At times, we seem to our constituents to be driven more by winning or by political pointscoring or by advancing the interests of our political party than by advancing their interests. We seem to be too focused on our own pet philosophical or ideologically driven points of order than we are on delivering them value for their hard-earned taxes paid. We need to start putting the people of South Australia first, and I can tell you my first priority is the people of Mitcham and the people of South Australia, well before party and self. I think we need to start thinking that way. We give lip service to it, but I do not think we always deliver on it.

These are difficult times for parliaments and for politicians, I must say. I think there is a level of cynicism out there. We can dispel that by doing better. We will never dispel it all, but one of the great fears I have about democracy in this country is that, if we are not careful, eventually cynicism will create such an environment that good people will not want to step forward and do the job. I think that would be a terrible turning point if our democracy is to thrive and prosper. The public need to be tolerant and forgiving, politicians are not perfect, but we similarly need to lift our game.

On electoral reform, it needs to be addressed. I am not a person who wanders around after the grand final complaining about the rules. I congratulate the government for its victory—you have 24, we have 23, I can count. We can grizzle about the rules forever, but at the end of the day we just have to make sure that at the next grand final we play a harder game on all parts of the paddock. I would say that a large number of people in South Australia have been cheated of the outcome they sought. Many thousands more wanted to see a Liberal government, and it is not we who have been let down, it is they. There is something wrong with a system that does not deliver government to the party that has won a majority of the popular vote.

In saying that, I am not convinced that redistributing boundaries dramatically is going to guarantee that outcome. I have considerable fears for those who think that you can somehow have spoke wheels out of the middle of Adelaide going out to the country, that somehow you can manipulate the boundaries in a way that will guarantee that a majority of votes will deliver government.

I am not sure that that is the answer at all; I think there will need to be smarter answers. But I would just say to the major parties: be careful what you wish for, because as you solve one problem you often create another. Minor parties and Independents will have points of view, and you may finish up with a far bigger mess than you have solved if you do not get that process of reform right and fair and balanced. I think it needs to be approached with great caution but with great determination.

I want to talk briefly about some portfolio issues and give some further guidance to the government on the off-chance that, like Adelaide Oval, they will pick it up. One of the things I want to talk about is trade and investment. This is an area that urgently needs attention. I think that the government has under-invested in ensuring that as many companies as possible in South Australia can sell their goods overseas. We need to spend more in this area. We have a new minister. I commend the work of the former minister. He did his best with a limited budget. We now have a new minister. I would say to the government that more needs to be injected into this space. Yes, we have a strategy to trade with China and India but we have seven trading regions.

The overwhelming majority of investment into Australian FDI comes from the United States or North America and Europe yet we have no strategy for those two regions. We need a strategy for North Asia, and we need a strategy for South East Asia. I note that the government said that they will try and deliver one by the end of the year. It should not have taken that long. We need seven strategies at least for our seven regions. We need better representation in each of those regions whether it is through Austrade or independently, and we need to create some programs to help get companies overseas selling their products around the table with other companies who want to buy those products.

This is an area that the government has neglected wilfully over recent years and I am encouraged by the government's change of focus, though, in recent years towards science, innovation, moving up the value chain, all of the points and directions being alluded to by Göran Roos whom the government has wisely engaged to assist them. I think the government is doing a better job of putting the spotlight on these areas now than was the case in 2002 through to about 2010, but we need to do more. We need to now invest in this area and get better results. When you take commodities out of our trade figures and the fact that our farmers have had a good year, you nub down to what small to medium enterprises are selling overseas, and we are not doing well enough. I would encourage the Treasurer during budget bilaterals and during the budget process to look at spending more in this area.

Can I also say that I am encouraged in the Governor's Address in Reply to see that the government is now starting to identify that we need a much closer relationship between the university sector and the centres of excellence in South Australia and business. The reality is that the Roxby Downs expansion did not proceed. The reality is that it is no longer competitive to produce automotive vehicles in this country. We have had those debates, and we are losing those pillars of our economy.

This is a great state. This is a state that could become a shining star in this national economy but it needs fundamental structural change. Unless the government starts to invest in helping us to sell our products overseas more earnestly, unless the government starts to invest in science, innovation and entrepreneurship, venture capital, getting these things moving more effectively, unlocking the potential business opportunities from our three major universities, from DSTO from the CSIRO, from the various CRCs that exist already, through attracting new CRCs, new plant functional genomic centres, new centres that may generate business ideas for small and medium enterprises to seize upon and grow—the more that we can invest in that area, the more we will succeed.

Göran Roos is on the money. I find it difficult to identify anything Göran Roos is telling us that is off-direction. It is on-direction. What is missing is the investment from government to make it happen.

I would like to see far more in this space. I think we need structures to get this creative sector talking better to business. There have been attempts, but we have not gone far enough. We need better costing, we need better funding of innovation and commercialisation, better assistance—we need to nurture entities like Bio Innovation SA and others so that they can grow. We need to encourage start-ups. We certainly need to get our universities up the global and national rankings.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I could excuse myself, honourable member, you may wish to seek leave or wind up.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH: I will wind up, Madam Deputy Speaker, by simply saying that all the opportunities are before South Australia; we only need to seize them, and I would encourage the government to be more courageous in this next four years than it has been hitherto.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

[Sitting suspended from 13:01 to 14:00]

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Murray-Darling Basin Authority—Annual Report 2012-13

National Environment Protection Council—Annual Report 2012-13

South Australian-Victorian Border Groundwaters Agreement Review Committee—
Annual Report 2012-13
Water Industry Act 2012—Plumbing Standard—Technical Regulator

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Response by the Minister—15th Report—Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation—Briefing Report into South Australia's Ageing Workforce: Implications for Work Health and Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation

Question Time

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:01): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier enter into a deal with Adelaide Capital Partners for the development of 400 hectares of land at Gillman to create 6,000 jobs when the Renewal SA master plan for the site says that 6,000 jobs could be created by developing just 240 hectares of land at Gillman?

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) (14:02): I think some answers were given yesterday indicating the nature of the engagement between the proponents of this particular project and the government. As I think was made clear yesterday, the arrangements constitute—as I think we described it eventually yesterday—an opportunity for them to have an option, in effect, over the arrangements. I know of no particular proposition from Renewal SA to the effect of the formulation offered by the leader, but if he wishes to direct me to that, I will make due inquiry.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier met with Tony Nagy, the registered lobbyist for Adelaide Capital Partners, to discuss the Gillman deal, and if so, when?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:03): Well, if I have, I have no recollection of it. I don't think I know the gentleman, but I just have no recollection of meeting such a man.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): Supplementary: have minutes been kept of all meetings attended by the Premier concerning the Adelaide Capital Partners Gillman land deal?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You met with them; what did you say?

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:03): I think I have had very few meetings—I think one meeting—with Adelaide Capital Partners.

Mr Marshall: One meeting.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It was essentially—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is warned a first time.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: But I do know that they met with the Leader of the Opposition, and at no stage in that meeting did the Leader of the Opposition indicate anything other than—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —his complete support for the arrangement that they entered into with the government. It is of some surprise—

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is of some surprise to the proponents of this particular development that they now hear the Leader of the Opposition essentially trying to blacken their name in the public media by associating themselves with these criticisms.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order. It was a very clear question—not debating about what is expected—

The SPEAKER: So, the point of order is the Premier is not answering the substance of the question.

Ms CHAPMAN: Indeed.

The SPEAKER: Is that the point of order?

Ms CHAPMAN: The question was clearly to ask whether minutes were kept at this one or more meetings that he had.

The SPEAKER: Look, I think that's just an occasion for an impromptu speech by the deputy leader. I will listen closely to the Premier's answer, if there is any more.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I can explain my involvement in this. I think, the first occasion—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No, I think the first meeting—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The first occasion it was raised with me, I think, was by Raymond Spencer, the chair of the Economic Development Board, and then, I think, there was a meeting with proponents about this matter. I may have met them on more than one occasion, but I had no direct involvement in the negotiation of the matter. It was carried by a line minister.

The relevant minister at the time was the member for West Torrens, and he, together with his relationship with Renewal SA, had the carriage of the matters. From that point onwards, I simply was a very interested observer of matters and did request regular briefings on where this proposition was up to. It took, I think, in the order of six months or so for it to reach a position where it was brought to cabinet, where it was a cabinet decision which had the matter approved.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: So, I had no direct involvement in the day-to-day carriage of the matter.

The SPEAKER: And forced laughter will be treated in the same manner as sighing. Leader.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): Has the Premier or any cabinet minister been lobbied regarding land at Gillman by people who are not on the state government's lobbyist register?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:06): There were too many negatives in that question for me to answer safely, so I'll have to take that one on notice and look at it very carefully before I give an answer, but I have indicated the involvement I have had in relation to this matter—it's been rather limited.

Ms Redmond interjecting:

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

EMPLOYMENT

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house how the government has worked to support employment outcomes for South Australians?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:07): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the honourable member and congratulate her on her question, which goes to the heart of the key priority for this government during this term, which is jobs. The government continues to prioritise jobs for South Australians as the central part of its public policy agenda. The first thing that I said during the most recent election campaign was that this was an election campaign, above all else, about jobs.

While there is no doubt that, like the rest of Australia, we face some challenges, South Australia continues to perform better than the historical trend, even before the release of today's positive employment figures. We have prioritised improving skills of South Australians to ensure that we have a more productive workforce, and this has delivered results.

Indeed, when we came into office, less than half of all South Australians had a post-school qualification. Almost one in three students in our public schools weren't continuing to year 12. Now, more than 90 per cent of students are continuing on to year 12 and more than 61 per cent have a university or vocational qualification.

At the turn of the decade, under those opposite, the unemployment rate was over 8 per cent—a full two percentage points above the national average. When those opposite were last in power, thousands more young people didn't have a job when compared to now but, under this government, things have turned around.

We have diversified our economy. As outlined in the Deloitte's *Building the Lucky Country* report, four of five projected economic opportunities are emerging strengths in South Australia. Indeed, the fifth—the wealth creation industries—also hold prospects for South Australia.

The like-for-like costs of doing business in South Australia are among the lowest in the country. Indeed, Pitcher Partners examined small to medium business company tax rates around the country for businesses and found that costs in South Australia were either the lowest or second-lowest in the country, completely debunking the myth that's been perpetrated by those opposite.

This continues to be one of the great achievements of this government, and it's happened through the concerted effort of all South Australians. As we continue to work to help create jobs in South Australia, a key plank of this work will be the creation of the new agency—the new department for state development—which will be the government's front door to business. This agency will be given the important task of delivering our jobs plan—the only credible plan that has been put in the public sphere to grapple with this important question. Our jobs plan will accelerate the transition in the manufacturing sector and support those communities that are facing enormous uncertainty at the moment.

I acknowledge the fine Address in Reply that was made by the new member for Napier who I think articulated these challenges. He understands, just as all members do, how critical this issue is for our state and in particular those communities directly affected. The department will be given the role of case managing private sector major projects to ensure that they are given the best opportunity to succeed.

While I anticipate those opposite will feign indignation and find some statistic to talk down the economy and claim evidence of a jobs crisis, this government will get on with the business of working with the broader South Australian community, with our academic institutions, with our business community and ensuring that government takes a lead, doesn't step back and just hope that the market might resolve this, but takes a lead in stepping up and creating jobs for the future of our state.

EXPIATION NOTICES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:11): My question is to the Minister for Police. Does the minister stand by his comments made this morning on FIVEaa regarding police that 'there is no quota, no benchmark, no direction that they issue a number of expiation notices'? This morning when speaking to Leon Byner on FIVEaa, the Minister for Police repeatedly denied the existence of benchmarks for police in respect of traffic infringements, yet when Police Commissioner Burns

appeared before the Budget and Finance Committee in February 2013 he stated, 'There is no change in policy. We do have benchmarks.'

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:12): I thank the honourable member for his question. What I said this morning on radio—and the transcript will show—was that the use of the word 'benchmark' was used interchangeably and I made it very clear—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Interchangeably—it was used as a synonym, but it wasn't. They are quite two different things and I made it very clear if the word benchmark was being used in the context of some fixed figure or some quota and the Police Commissioner's office clearly advised me there are none. As I further explained, there is a whole range of activities which police officers undertake. One of those activities is that they need to make contact with the community to reinforce the road safety message, which I think is an important part of their role. I think keeping our roads safe and keeping people alive is an important thing, unlike the member for Stuart, who seems to believe that if you break the law in some areas it is quite okay.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That is the premise of—

The SPEAKER: Minister, would you be seated. The member for Unley's point of order is that the minister is imputing improper motives to the member for Stuart. We'll see if the minister does when he can complete the sentence.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The premise behind the questions and the comments made by the member for Stuart on the radio today was that essentially it is revenue raising and that we should allow some people to break the law in certain locations. It is quite inappropriate, because he said—

The SPEAKER: Minister, be seated.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: It is not for you to tell me to sit down.

Mr Marshall: The Speaker just told you to if you were paying attention.

The SPEAKER: No, the minister is right. It is not for the Leader of the Opposition to tell him to sit down.

Ms CHAPMAN: My point of order is that the premise of this is asserting a motive in relation to this question being presented, and at this point it is the responsibility of the minister to answer the question, not to reflect upon the basis upon which the question was asked.

The SPEAKER: I don't think the minister is imputing improper motives. I think the better point might be debating, but—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is called to order. I will see how the minister's answer develops to see if he either imputes improper motives—and the member for Stuart can be seated until I finish—or whether he is debating the topic. If the minister is trying to make the point that he thinks the member for Stuart is encouraging law-breaking, that would be another matter.

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, whichever way you go I support it.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I will make it very clear. The police commissioner's office has advised me that under no circumstances does the police commissioner's office require any police officer to issue a number of expiation notices, for the purposes of achieving road safety. They make it very clear that—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, the police commissioner's office made it very clear to me today—and they have reaffirmed it—that every police officer, at the point of interaction with the community, has a discretion to exercise. If they believe the person has, for example, done the wrong thing, they can still issue a warning or an expiation notice as they think appropriate in that circumstance.

The commissioner expects his officers to exercise judgement and also discretion. The suggestion that the commissioner has instructed his officers to achieve a certain level of revenue or expiation notices is totally incorrect. The worst part of this—

Ms Redmond interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The worst part of this sort of discussion is that it takes our eye off road safety. Members may laugh, but in the year 2000 there were 166 deaths on our roads; today there are under 100. The difference is that it was a Liberal government then and it is a Labor government today.

EXPIATION NOTICES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:17): A supplementary question. Given that in the minister's answer he said that road safety is improving, and given that in his answer he said that police will retain their independent discretion with regard to how they hand out expiation notices, why is the government budgeting for a 34 per cent increase in revenue from police-issued infringement notices, rising from \$64 million in 2012-13 to \$86 million this financial year?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:17): I thank the honourable member for his question. There are two things. First, what we do with that is extrapolate the budget figure—in other words, what has actually occurred in the past—and we extrapolate further on that. We will also have more people on the road, more people driving, and the likelihood—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Secondly, we will actually have more police than when the Liberals were in and they will therefore be more active. Thirdly, we are putting in more speed cameras—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: We have more speed cameras in place, and the reality is that unfortunately people continue to break the law and we will collect revenue. I would prefer that we collected no expiation notices on our roads because that would mean that people were not breaking the law. Our roads would be safer, and we would have fewer people in our hospitals recovering from accidents as well. Again, it is disappointing that the member for Stuart does not reinforce the road safety message, and distracts from the important message that we need to send out to the community about road safety by trying to score cheap political points.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order sir—

The SPEAKER: I think the minister has finished, and before we go to another supplementary, the member for Heysen is warned a first time; the leader is warned a first time; the Treasurer is warned a second time; the member for Newland is called to order; the deputy leader is warned a first time; and the member for Morialta is called to order. A supplementary: member for Stuart.

EXPIATION NOTICES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:19): A supplementary question: given the minister's answer and denials, my question to the police minister again is: why then did police officers and their family members call in to FIVEaa today to say that they do have benchmarks?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:20):

The police force is like any organisation, any workplace, and with over 4,000 sworn officers at last count—more than when the Liberals were in power—

The Hon. J.R. Rau: Many more.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: —many more—the reality is that like all workplaces, employees will misunderstand a direction—

Members interjecting:

An honourable member: So how many don't understand?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Well, either misunderstand a direction and when the message is conveyed from management down below, people can actually add their own bits to it. But I can assure—

Mr Gardner: Explain things to them through the commissioner.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, I reaffirm that the police commissioner, nor his senior management gives any direction to any of the officers to issue expiation notices for the purposes of revenue raising. This can be quite easily cleared up: if the member for Stuart has—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: —the hard evidence to prove what I am saying is incorrect—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Let me ask the question.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, what he has brought to us today is hearsay.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Hearsay, and—

The SPEAKER: Could the Minister for Police be seated just for a moment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: No, I haven't called the member for Stuart. The member for Kavel is called to order; the member for Hammond is warned a first time; the member for Unley is called to order; and for forced laughter, the member for Heysen is warned a first time; the members for Mount Gambier, Schubert and Hartley are called to order, and the Treasurer is on the brink. Minister for Police.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I have called the Minister for Police.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: If the member for Stuart can produce a document which actually indicates his position, I am happy to see it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The assertion by the member for Stuart is that the police commissioner has directed his officers—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: If it is quite clear that people are asserting on the radio things contrary to what the police commissioner has told me, they must have evidence to prove that—it is quite simple. So, I am happy for the member for Stuart to be briefed by the police commissioner on this matter, and I think we are arranging that at the moment and he is happy to do that. I have seen nothing before me to support what the member for Stuart said.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Supplementary question, sir?

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is seeking a third supplementary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Well, before he gets that, will he be seated while I mention that the member for Chaffey—that wasn't a sigh was it—

An honourable member: A sneeze!

The SPEAKER: —is called to order. The member for Heysen is warned for the second time and also the deputy leader is warned for the second time. Member for Stuart, supplementary.

EXPIATION NOTICES

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:24): A supplementary question, thank you very much sir. Given that in his last answer the minister said that there are significant misunderstandings within the police force—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: I didn't say that.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, he did.

Members interjecting:

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: He said that there are significant misunderstandings in the police force and I ask him what will he do to correct that issue with regard to communication within the police force. Will he suggest to the Commissioner of Police that he puts out a memo to all officers making it very clear and very plain that there are no quotas and no benchmarks?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:25): First, I assume the member is aware that, as police minister, I cannot direct the police commissioner on operational matters, and this is an operational matter. Of course, I have discussed this matter with the police commissioner—in fact, it was one of the first discussions I had with him—because I did indicate to him the general perception in the community about how we enforce the road rules, not helped by opportunistic people in the opposition who try to inflame misunderstanding for their political purposes.

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order, sir. The minister is imputing improper motives here, surely.

The SPEAKER: I will seek advice about that. Minister.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, I am happy to discuss this matter with the police commissioner so we can actually improve the message, but it would help the whole cause of road safety if the opposition did the same.

ROYAL VISIT

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:26): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier advise the house about the recent visit to Adelaide and, indeed, Elizabeth, by Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge?

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) (14:26): Can I thank the member for Little Para for this very important question. Can I point out to the house that the royal couple came all the way to Australia and then came all the way to Adelaide and then went specifically to the honourable member's electorate. What an honour it is that they selected his electorate, of all places.

Mrs Vlahos: And they flew into mine.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, the member for Taylor's electorate was where the plane landed. Can I also make the point, and honourable members may not be aware of this, that the several hours—three or more hours—spent predominantly in the member for Little Para's electorate is three-and-something more hours than they spent in the city of Melbourne. I think that shows a great deal of confidence in the northern suburbs of Adelaide. Anyway, it was a magnificent day.

On Wednesday 23 April, Adelaide (and, in particular, the honourable member's electorate) hosted Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge as part of their visit to Australia. It is estimated that some 20,000-odd people lined the streets for their visit to the northern suburbs of Adelaide, waving as they drove past—although His Excellency the Governor and I thought, for a moment, that it might have been for us. It wasn't.

I was pleased to meet them on their arrival at the Edinburgh RAAF base, along with His Excellency the Governor, Liz Scarce, Air Commodore Noel Derwort and his wife Pauline Koitka. A guard of honour saluted Their Royal Highnesses as the vehicles left the RAAF base, and they drove to their first stop at Northern Sound System and the Skate Park (which I know is an area with which the honourable member is most familiar).

Once there, six-year-old Lauren Stephenson presented Her Royal Highness with a posy and, equally importantly, they were met by my colleague the Minister for Health and the Minister for the Arts who, I am told, enjoyed a very lengthy conversation with the Duchess about young Prince George. *The Advertiser* reported that she was most taken with him, which is significant because I spent some time with her and apparently she wasn't taken with me at all.

Can I mention also that the Mayor of the City of Playford, Mr Docherty, looked resplendent in his mayoral finery, including a very large chain and gold medal of substantial proportion. I could not help thinking that he was quietly thanking the member for Newland for making it possible for him to be in attendance on that occasion. As some wit remarked, 'They did but see him passing by.'

In any event, at the Northern Sound System Their Highnesses were shown how to DJ, and they both stepped up behind the decks to give it a go. It was reported Her Royal Highness was a natural, where His Highness could perhaps improve with a little more practice. A number of groups then performed for Their Royal Highnesses, including the Remedy Break Dancers, Rainbow Vox Choral Group, ART Indigenous Group and N1 Electro Rapper. I am led to understand that the Minister for the Arts was also tempted but did not participate.

Their Royal Highnesses then had a private meeting with a group of disadvantaged young people, and they heard about their experiences. They were very impressed with the group and, indeed, they stayed much longer than was expected. Next was a function at the civic centre, where Their Royal Highnesses arrived to chants of, 'We want Kate'. There was much greeting of people. I am conscious of the time, and I do not want anyone to miss this, but if I can have an extension of time I will talk about the Leader of the Opposition's meeting with Her Royal Highness.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament students from the Mount Barker Waldorf School, who are guests of the member for Kavel. The deputy leader and member for Bragg.

Question Time

FAMILIES SA ADVERSE EVENTS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Thank you, Mr Speaker and member for Croydon. My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. When did the Families SA Adverse Events Review Committee into the death of Chloe Valentine commence?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:31): I have referred the Chloe Valentine matter to the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee, and I will be meeting in the next week with the chair of that committee to discuss the progress of that review. Obviously, the legal matters in the court have been completed. We are yet to hear whether the Coroner is undertaking a review, and that could potentially delay the commencement of the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee. I would expect as soon as all legal matters are finalised that review will commence.

FAMILIES SA ADVERSE EVENTS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Supplementary question: perhaps the minister did not hear what I said. I was referring not to the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee but to the Families SA Adverse Events Review Committee. When did their investigation commence?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:32): I will take that question on notice; I do not have that information.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned a first time. The deputy leader.

FAMILIES SA ADVERSE EVENTS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question again is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Has Families SA accepted or rejected any recommendations of the Adverse Events Review Committee in respect of any case as yet?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:32): I would imagine there have been many, many situations that that committee has looked at. It is about driving change within the department, so that is a very wide-ranging question. I will see whether I can get an answer for the member. I think that adverse events committee has been in place since way, way before I was Minister for Families and Communities, back in 2008, so it is a very difficult question to answer.

FAMILIES SA ADVERSE EVENTS REVIEW COMMITTEE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): Supplementary question. I thank the minister for indicating she will provide some information back to the house. If in fact there have been any recommendations from the committee to date, my question is: which of the committee's findings have translated into implementation to date? If there are any that you have implemented, we are seeking what they are. I am happy for you to take that on notice.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:34): Again, I will take that on notice. The questions the member is asking would require the department to go back many, many years. These are really very detailed questions that the member is asking. What I can do is come to the house with a very comprehensive outline of many reforms that have been undertaken since we came to government in 2002. Many of those, of course, were driven by the Layton report. What we know is that child protection was in absolute disarray prior to us coming into government. This government is the government that has shone a light on child protection. It is this government that has more than doubled—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I think the minister is now debating the question and introducing historical material.

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I am providing an answer. I am sorry, sir, but the member asked a question about reforms since we have been in government. We have reviewed the department through the Layton review. We had Justice Mullighan looking at child protection both for children in state care and for children on the APY lands. We established the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee. We established the guardian for children. We have more than doubled the number of child protection workers—

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Morialta.

Mr GARDNER: The question was very specifically in relation to the Adverse Events Review Committee and, therefore, under 98, the minister is not responding to the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: No, I think the minister is now providing information rather than debating material about an ancient government. Is the minister finished?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Thank you, sir.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): My question again is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. What specific changes has Families SA made either at the time of death of Chloe Valentine or since which have addressed any systemic practices arising from that case?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:36): The death of that little girl was no doubt a real tragedy, and it really struck everybody, I think, in South Australia. Reasonable, responsible people were absolutely horrified by the death of that little girl. What I can say is that from the time that child was born there were intense supports put around that family. Justice Kelly in fact said in her sentencing remarks that the mother did have an

enormous amount of support both from family and from various government and non-government agencies.

What we know is that the last visit to that home showed that mother and child were doing well, as I understand it, and that the house—which is a good indicator—was in a good state of repair and cleanliness. She was clean. She was happy. Mum and the child interacted well. There were no reports from that time until the little girl's death as a result of falling from that motorcycle in the backyard. That is a real tragedy. Let's be really clear: the people who are responsible for the death of that child are now in gaol.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): How long before the death of this child did officers of your department visit for that interview and observation that you have just described as being obviously satisfactory from their observations at that time?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:38): I understand it was in August 2011 that Families SA conducted a home visit. As I said, the interactions between Chloe and her mother were observed to be good. The house was clean and in good condition. At the same time, Chloe was attending child care and continuing with respite that was being provided by a non-government organisation. So, no further notifications were received about Chloe prior to the motorbike incident in January 2012.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): A supplementary, if I may, sir. Now that the sad event has occurred, that the child has died, and some months have passed and you are now aware that there had been multiple notifications about this child generally, albeit before 11 November on the information you have been provided, are you saying that, therefore, you haven't requested any change of the management of these notifications in your department since that disclosure and, indeed, the death of a child?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:39): I am advised that all notifications were appropriately assessed and rated. This family had the support of the Safe Babies Program for some considerable time. Respite was being provided, and there was support being provided by a non-government organisation. I understand those involved with the family were reporting that the family was, in fact, doing well, and there was, at that point, no requirement that there be a statutory response to that family.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): Further supplementary: given that this child was able to access, apparently, the Safe Babies Program and have access to respite and independent agencies, are you satisfied, notwithstanding that multiple notifications had been made about this young girl prior to August 2011, that there was no need to make any changes to your department to deal with cases which clearly have identified that there was a problem? Given all those circumstances, is it your view that there is no need to make any changes to the way your department operates as a result of the disclosure of the death of this child?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:41): I will take advice from the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee, which is independent. It is made up of very eminent people who will interrogate this case very, very carefully. They will provide recommendations to me, as they do on a regular basis, as they review cases where children may be harmed through a variety of ways, including, for example, swimming pool deaths, which has been an area that they have made recommendations that we have acted upon, and road safety issues in relation to the way children are harnessed in cars. I am sure that this will have their very close attention, and they are the people that will give me the recommendations.

I am not a professional social worker; I do not have the qualifications to make clear assessments about social work processes, but we have an independent body that was not in place prior to 2002 that will do that. In the main, the recommendations of the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee have, as I understand it, been acted upon.

FRUIT FLY

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Can the minister inform the house about the response to recent fruit fly outbreaks?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:42): I thank the member for Taylor for not only her question but also the advocacy that she performs on behalf of the primary producers in her electorate. South Australia can be proud that we are the only state or territory on mainland Australia that remains fruit fly free, but this January we did have two outbreaks up in the Riverland, at Loxton and Pyap. They were the first outbreaks in the Riverland in 23 years and it meant that we had to pull out the emergency plan.

I was very pleased to join the member for Chaffey up there a couple of weeks ago, on the day before ANZAC Day, to host a celebration that the people on the frontline (that is, the SARDI biosecurity people, the local industry, the exporters and growers) had all come together to make sure that the enemy—the Queensland fruit fly—had actually been eradicated from the area. There was a lot of hard work that went into that, and a lot of anxiety as well for local people.

There was a local fruit fly community group set up, of which the member for Chaffey was a member, and it was great to sit around with that group and go through the things that went well—obviously it went well, because that was the day that the quarantine of the area was lifted—but also to work out what lessons can be learned from this outbreak which, as I said, was the first one in 23 years. I know another couple of sessions are scheduled in for later this month, and people up there will go through those things.

We have also had an outbreak of Mediterranean fruit fly down in the Sellicks Beach area. We are releasing around a million sterile male fruit flies a week down there to make sure that they can try and combat it, and—the member for Goyder is looking at me. Do you know how they tell that they are sterile ones? They have put pink dye in their eyes so that, under the microscope, they can check out that these are the sterile ones. So, a lot of work goes into it.

The government invests about \$5 million a year to make sure that we can maintain that fruit fly-free status that South Australia enjoys. To clean up the Riverland outbreak cost about \$1 million. We are spending about \$500,000 down at Sellicks. Obviously, prevention is better than cure, and we are trying to get the message out to all South Australians travelling into the Riverland or those travelling from interstate not to bring any fruit with them.

I was a bit disappointed at Easter time—they set up a mobile fruit fly station at Blanchetown and about 24 per cent of the people, who were mainly coming from Adelaide into that Riverland area, were caught with fruit in their possession. So, I think all South Australians need to get the message that the horticulture and citrus industries are worth so much to this economy that we can't afford to have fruit fly in our state. The message needs to get out there to everyone who is travelling not to take fruit with them; it is just far too dangerous.

I was at the ag ministers conference last week, chaired by Barnaby Joyce, and we went around the table and I was really pleased to hear that I think pretty much every ag minister listed biosecurity as the number one issue for their state. It is so important, whether it be fruit fly, phylloxera or the imported red fire ant that Queensland is grappling with—we sure don't want that in South Australia. They are doing some great work up there. We need to work with all the other states and territories.

I also had a meeting with Peter Walsh, the Victorian Minister for Agriculture, because they are our nearest neighbours; they are the ones who can have the biggest impact on us, so if we work together we can have a greater sense of security that fruit fly won't enter into South Australia. I want to congratulate the 40 employees who spent 14 weeks out there picking up fruit that had dropped to the ground and really helped us eradicate the fruit fly from the Riverland.

FRUIT FLY

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (14:46): Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, member for Finniss.

Mr PENGILLY: A PIRSA officer told me at Sellicks Beach that the fruit fly has been in that area for 20 years. Can the minister advise me if that is correct or would he like to take it on notice perhaps?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:47): I can talk in general terms from the briefings that I've had that, while we have not had an outbreak of fruit fly in the Riverland for 23 years, we do have regular outbreaks mainly around the metropolitan area. The briefing I have had is that they are mainly in the northern suburbs, and that may have something to do with the fruit markets being out there.

I can check out whether there have been others in Sellicks; I have been the local member down there—as you know, you have the western side of South Road and I have the eastern side. It is the first one that I can recollect in eight years, but I can chase that up for you. But I think the great thing is that these people from Biosecurity SA and PIRSA are working with local growers and the community to make sure that everyone is aware of it and that we will do everything we can to stamp it out.

FRUIT FLY

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:47): A further supplementary.

The SPEAKER: Further supplementary.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, are you aware of the announcement today of the \$80,000 contribution to the National Fruit Fly Strategy, and how far advanced is the sterile insect facility at Port Augusta?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:48): I again thank the member for Chaffey for those questions and for his great advocacy for his region and for the sector. It was announced yesterday by Plant Health Australia that there will be a national fruit fly advisory committee established. South Australia will be committing \$65,000 to that over two years, and there will be a whole lot of money coming in from other states and also from industry to make sure that we are all working together, because there is no point in South Australia trying to go it alone and fight this real threat to our state.

On the sterile insect technology, I can confirm that the government has put up \$3 million to build a facility at Port Augusta. We have gathered together industry players and researchers as well to come up with \$21 million of research money over five years once we get that sterile insect technology plant up and running at Port Augusta. Work on that is set to begin next year and, again, we want to work with the other states to make sure that they buy their sterile flies from us rather than getting them in from South Africa or some other place.

FOODLAND IGA

Mr GEE (Napier) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Small Business. Can the minister inform the house about international awards presented to South Australian Foodland IGA stores?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Small Business, who is on two warnings.

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) (14:49): Thank you, sir. I thank the honourable member for his question. Last Friday, I was privileged to be at the Munno Para shopping centre to congratulate the Chapley Group—a great South Australian family business—for winning awards for two of their South Australian supermarkets.

The Munno Para Foodland IGA was internationally recognised with a certificate of achievement for the store with the highest sales of all IGAs in the world. The Norwood Foodland IGA was internationally recognised with a certificate of achievement for the store with the highest sales per square metre of all IGA stores in the world. These are truly outstanding achievements from a great South Australian business.

Mr Marshall: I shop there every week.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Good; I'm glad. Every dollar you spend there is a dollar they can spend in a campaign. There are more than 5,000 IGA stores in over 30 countries, including the United States, Canada, South Africa and China. These two supermarkets have distinguished themselves from the pack and have highlighted how we do things better in South Australia.

From humble beginnings back in 1951, brothers John and Nick Chapley began their first independent grocery business. Today, the Chapley Group own and operate six Foodland supermarkets in South Australia. They are the Munno Para store, Norwood, Sefton Plaza, Frewville, Pasadena and, of course, Henley Square. They are proud to have three generations of the family working in their business. Their success has been driven by 63 years of retail experience, a passion for food, a hands-on approach and loyal staff. They actively support our community and have strong relationships supporting local suppliers.

John and Nick Chapley believe in treating their staff as part of their family. Their loyalty inspires this and it's evident in the longevity of their employees, many of whom have 10, 20 or 30 years of service. They are a great South Australian success story—one of the many success stories in this state, showing we have a bright and prosperous future. I congratulate the Chapley family and all their staff for winning these prestigious awards and wish them every success in the future.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

FOOTY EXPRESS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister inform the house about the use of Footy Express services for AFL matches played at the new Adelaide Oval, including those matches played by the mighty Adelaide Crows?

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned for the second time. The Minister for Transport.

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) (14:52): I am not sure I have an answer to the latter part of that question, but I do thank him for his interest in public transport, particularly for football games at Adelaide Oval. To coincide with the opening of the new Adelaide Oval to host AFL matches, the state government has introduced free train, tram and bus transport for ticketholders to AFL games. These are the Footy Express services which run in addition to regular scheduled services. The response from fans so far has been terrific. For the first game—a Showdown between Port Adelaide and the Adelaide Crows—more than 30,000 people took public transport.

An honourable member: Great result.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It was a great result. In the first six matches, more than 53 per cent of those attending football at Adelaide Oval have travelled on Footy Express services. This compares to just 20 per cent who used public transport to travel to AAMI Stadium last year. It is encouraging to see that so many football fans have taken advantage of public transport going to and from matches.

We are working hard to reach our target of 70 per cent of patrons travelling by public transport; however, as was outlined in our report on public transport strategies tabled in this place in October 2012, this was always going to be difficult to achieve in the first year. A lot of work has gone into ensuring we move people to and from Adelaide Oval as efficiently as possible.

The public transport plan for Adelaide Oval was released to the public on 28 February 2014. The development of this public transport plan involved detailed and ongoing discussion with representatives of the SANFL, the AFL, the SACA, the Adelaide City Council and the Stadium Management Authority.

Specific details regarding travel demand were gathered from previous experience with Footy Express services to AAMI Stadium, postcode information of existing members and season ticket

holders, as well as feedback from a targeted survey of football patrons at AAMI Stadium during the latter part of the 2013 season.

Since the first match at Adelaide Oval we have been monitoring and analysing patrons' travel patterns, attendance data, and service and staffing levels. We have made some modifications and improvements, including modifying bus services across the network to more accurately cater for patrons' travel patterns, installing additional direction signage at various key points to improve the flow of pedestrians as well as providing for clearer directions for patrons, and provided additional spaces for O-Bahn services at King William Road as these services are the highest patronised.

We will continue to monitor traffic management and implement any changes necessary to improve traffic flows both for bus services and for general traffic. As the season progresses we will also continue to monitor the flow of fans through the Adelaide Railway Station and where necessary we will continue to make improvements to ensure the efficient flow of patrons. With the new Riverbank bridge and its connections to the Adelaide Railway Station, the tramline and a range of bus routes, catching public transport to the footy has never been easier.

FOOTY EXPRESS

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): A supplementary question, if I may, to the Minister for Transport. Can the minister advise the house whether he has called for a report in respect of the patronage of the buses provided for the royal visit, given that only some 20,000 people attended for a published expected crowd of 50,000 and, if so, what did it say?

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) (14:56): I thank the Deputy Leader for her question. It is a good question. Members may recall that we provided some additional bus services, some express services, from Adelaide out to Elizabeth, also from Mawson Lakes and from Tea Tree Plaza out to Elizabeth to help people who were very keen to see the royal couple out at Elizabeth. Those services ran between 7am and 9am in the morning and there were return services between 1pm and 3pm.

My advice to date is that they were reasonably patronised; they certainly weren't overcrowded by and large. I don't have the exact figures with me, but I would be happy to provide them to the house. Providing these sorts of additional public transport services is important for these sorts of events. We work to do it where we can, but I will bring specific details back to the house in due course.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. I refer to the minister's previous answer that the Chloe Valentine case has already been referred to the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee. Given that this committee is yet to consider deaths that occurred years ago, how long will the family of Chloe Valentine have to wait to get an answer?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:57): Can I congratulate the member for Adelaide for being made parliamentary secretary for child protection. We were very pleased to be able to provide her with an hour-long briefing, I think, in relation to child protection a week or so ago. I do understand that no questions were raised at that time about the Chloe Valentine case so it is very nice—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: She can confirm that. No queries about the Chloe Valentine case.

Mr Gardner interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: I would be very keen to have the detail of the case she is referring to that has not been reviewed for years, so on that basis I would be happy to have that, but what needs to happen, and what perhaps the member for Adelaide doesn't understand (and we are happy to give her another briefing), is that when the death of a child is then the subject of a police investigation and court proceedings it is a requirement that the committee not undertake a

simultaneous investigation while those processes are underway, so they can only undertake their inquiry once those events are complete.

What we have in the Chloe Valentine case, of course, is that the court case is complete. What we will be waiting on is whether the Coroner undertakes an inquest into that death. If the Coroner doesn't, the inquiry can commence. If the Coroner does, it will wait until the Coroner has done his work.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:59): My question is again to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How much additional funding has been given to the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee since the budget, as suggested by the minister on 5 April?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Education and Child Development) (14:59): I have offered the committee whatever resources it needs to expedite its inquiry and, as I said, I will be meeting with the chair next week.

HARVEY, MARK CHRISTOPHER

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): My question is to the Attorney-General. Has the Attorney received advice that would indicate that Mark Christopher Harvey will lodge an appeal in respect of yesterday's proceedings?

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) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for her question. I have received no further information, to the present time, from the Director of Public Prosecutions about that particular matter. However, as the honourable member would appreciate, appeals being what they are, a would-be appellant has to realise that time is of the essence, and I would expect something to be happening sooner rather than later.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT AUSTRALIA

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. When will the minister confirm the details and conditions attached to the increase of \$1.6 million, as announced on 15 April, to now \$3 million in the 2014-15 financial year of core funding for the seven Regional Development Australia organisations?

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome—Minister for Regional Development, Minister for Local Government) (15:01): I thank the member for Goyder for that question. I have already put out a press release indicating the \$1.6 million, and the \$1.4 million since then, for the 2014-15 financial year. That will go for the next four years—\$1.4 million and \$1.6 million—and also, for the next four years, with the extra money we have achieved for the regional development fund, for the \$15 million there, leading up to and including the \$29 million (the \$15 million is included in the \$29 million), and the \$10 million accelerator fund for the first year.

I am looking forward to working with the member on the other side there, as well as all regional areas and RDAs, to get the best job opportunities with this money, as well as utilising state funding, federal funding and any local government and private funding to achieve what we need to in the regions to create jobs. The whole aim of what I have done is to get that money for you, everyone on this side here, and all the regions of South Australia.

Grievance Debate

MR MCKENZIE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): I rise today to speak on the passing of Anangu elder Mr McKenzie, who died on Wednesday evening in Alice Springs. In respect of Anangu culture, I will refer to him only by his last name.

Mr McKenzie was an Anangu elder who hailed from the remote APY lands' community of Pukatja, also referred to by some as Ernabella. Mr McKenzie was a former community minister in the Uniting Church, was ordained as a minister in the International Communion, and held certificates of theology from the Catholic Church, the Anglican Church and the Uniting Church.

As well as being a man of God, Mr McKenzie was a tireless advocate for the plight of people in the APY lands suffering from renal disease. It is with great sadness that I learnt yesterday that the very disease that he fought so hard against was also the disease that claimed him. He died in his Alice Springs boarding hostel, where he was living while he received treatment for this terrible disease. He was just 53 years of age.

Mr McKenzie and I met when he gave evidence to the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee in September last year. He had left the Queen Elizabeth Hospital, where he was receiving treatment, to address the committee, and spoke passionately and bravely about the complete lack of dialysis on the APY lands. He said he wanted to return to his home. He said too many people were returning home in a coffin.

Mr McKenzie was desperate to be as close to his lands and his people as possible. He was known to often leave Alice Springs or Adelaide suddenly, and against doctors orders, and travel back to his community to see his family. Unfortunately he could not survive without dialysis, which he had every three days, and he would fall gravely ill whenever he returned home. It was a cruel fate, and one that left him to die in Alice Springs, 450 kilometres away from his loved Pukatja community.

I am a firm believer in the need for a permanent renal dialysis unit on the APY lands. This is why I visited Alice Springs last year to meet with Western Desert Dialysis, which successfully manages six permanent dialysis units in remote Aboriginal communities in both Western Australia and the Northern Territory. This is why I committed to work with the federal government and Western Desert Dialysis to build a permanent dialysis unit on the APY lands in the lead up to the 2014 general election. I was disappointed to hear the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation confirm that the Labor government will not be adopting this policy as its own. I know this is hugely disappointing for the people on the APY lands and was personally devastating for Mr McKenzie.

I was disappointed to read in the *Hansard* of the other place in recent days that the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation described our Liberal Party policy as a sham. In particular, he said that the Liberal Party tried to perpetrate a sham on the South Australian community in relation to its policy. He did not tell the community that to fund this they would be cutting dialysis services in Port Augusta and in Adelaide; they would be cutting dialysis services to the mobile truck and saying, 'There is only one place where you will be able to get the services' even though they know full well that the Anangu community is incredibly mobile over different times of the year. Of course we understand this, and it is absolutely shameful that a minister of the Crown would make these statements in the other place.

There was no suggestion ever that the Liberal Party would be cutting the service in Port Augusta or in Adelaide or, in fact, the mobile truck service which I think to this point in time has never even operated. The simple fact of the matter is we were listening to the Anangu community—we were listening to the people suffering from this insidious disease—and putting permanent renal dialysis facilities onto the APY Lands is something which is long overdue for the people who live there.

The Central Australia Renal Study was conducted and reported on many years ago, and it has been very disappointing that this government has paid no attention to the recommendations in this report. I know this falls outside of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation's portfolio, but I impress upon the Minister for Health in this chamber to please consider permanent dialysis on the APY Lands. Mr McKenzie was a pillar of his community who spoke openly and honestly about the issues facing his people and he will certainly be very greatly missed.

SURFING RESERVE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:07): I rise to speak in relation to a proposed mid-coast regional surfing reserve along the beautiful South Australian coastline from Christies Beach to Moana which spans both the electorates of Reynell and Kaurna and which people may have seen reported in the media two or three days ago. Just prior to our recent election, the now member for Kaurna and I had the great pleasure of meeting with the surfing community in this area as they began to discuss their proposal. The community has now formed a mid-coast surfing reserve committee, and their discussions to secure surfing reserve status continues. The member for Kaurna and I have both indicated our willingness to support their work.

A surfing reserve is a dedicated area that is protected for use by the general public and surfing community and recognises sites of cultural, sporting and historic significance in Australian surf culture. Importantly, the recognition raises awareness about how crucial it is to protect our precious coastal environment. To date, 24 sites along Australia's 37,000 kilometre coastline have been identified for dedication by the National Surfing Reserves Organisation in partnership with Crown Lands.

Crown Lands has moved to legally reserve declared sites as Crown reserves for the public purpose of surfing recreation. This offers legal protection to a national surfing reserve and highlights the significance of the Crown estate in the surfing culture and Australian lifestyle. The National Surfing Reserves recognises these sites and ensures that they remain protected for generations to come. This model is a first in recognising the iconic status surfing has achieved throughout the world.

There are currently two other reserves in South Australia: one on the Eyre Peninsula and one on the Yorke Peninsula. If the Mid Coast committee is successful in its bid, it will be the first surfing reserve in metropolitan Adelaide. By having it so named, it will mean important avenues for protecting our coastline, signposting significant surfing breaks, providing safety information, marking historic surfing sites, attracting more tourists to the area, advising on surfing etiquette and improving facilities like pathways.

The Mid Coast was one of the places which made me fall in love with our ocean. It is a place I enjoyed as a child, and my family and I continue to enjoy it. The member for Kaurana and I are blessed to have it on our doorsteps, and what we may lack in surfing prowess could be made up for in a strong and shared desire to work with others to protect this coastline and its magnificent surfing breaks for generations to come.

In meeting the committee, we have had the privilege of hearing from some outstanding members of our southern community: long-term surfer and chairwoman, Sue Bennett, who has taught for decades at Wirreanda High School and successfully started their high school surfing program; life member of Christies Beach Surf Life Saving Club, life saver of more than 50 years and former president of Surf Life Saving South Australia, Bill Jamieson OAM; Dick Olenski, who has surfed the Mid Coast since the 1960s; Elaine Farmer OAM, the General Manager of Surf Life Saving South Australia; personnel from South Australia; numerous community members, young and old; and representatives from all of the surf lifesaving clubs in the area, all of whom share our love of the Mid Coast.

It is an extraordinary mix of people from across the southern community who are united in their desire to protect their environment, surfing culture and the fabric of the surfing community. The group is committed to working with all stakeholders in the area—local government, residents, anglers, state government, Surf Life Saving South Australia, Reefwatch and surfing groups, including those who come to surf the spectacular southern breaks from outside the area.

It is currently finalising its vision and goals and, to ensure it appropriately consults with and educates the community, it is shaping a proposal for initial funding to do this. It is a proposal the member for Kaurana and I will continue to support. Residents from electorates all over Adelaide flock to the beaches from Christies Beach to Moana for recreation, and it will be important for us to ensure those beaches are protected into the future. The Mid Coast Surfing Reserve is, indeed, a 'swell' idea, and I look forward to talking about it again in this house.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:12): I rise today to speak on the public transport apocalypse that has befallen the Bright electorate over the last couple of years. When *The Advertiser* published a profile of the Bright electorate in the lead-up to the 2014 election, journalist Daniel Wills described me as a 'public servant, Marion councillor, train user and Scottish migrant'. I was intrigued by the fact that a train commuter should pique the media's interest.

I have been a regular train user since my days of studying at Adelaide University and continued using the train during my five years working in the city. I would get on board, open my laptop or get out a good book and ease myself into the working day. In fact, on the days I had to drive into Adelaide for whatever reason, I arrived at work feeling far less zen than otherwise might have been the case.

In 2010, I welcomed the government's announcement that they planned to electrify the Noarlunga line and extend it to Seaford, a plan supported by the Liberal opposition. I believe that the great cities of the world are characterised by excellent public transport systems and, as a vocal proponent of public transport, I looked forward to new electric trains arriving, yet the project has been plagued by problems.

If there was a single issue that contributed to my election to this house, it was the public transport apocalypse which enveloped the southern suburbs as a consequence of the Seaford line upgrade. There are eight stations in Bright—at Hallett Cove Beach, Hallett Cove, Marino Rocks, Marino, Seacliff, Brighton and Hove—and the commuters have been through the wringer over the last two years.

There were two substantial closures—firstly, a part closure from Noarlunga to Oaklands for the bulk of 2011, followed by a closure for all but a few days of 2013. When the train was reinstated, its presence was sporadic and communication with the public was woeful. A closure over the Easter period this year was announced with only a few hours' notice. With the major 2013 closure came the wonderful world of substitute buses. What a joy they were.

Buses brought in to being long before I was born were wheeled out into the sunlight for the first time in years. All these poor old beasts wanted to do was to turn off their engines and be laid to rest in that great bus park in the sky; but, no, Deputy Speaker, they were brought back into service. They spluttered and choked their way to and from Adelaide. Some made it, some did not, and all the way commuters hung on for dear life. On the hot days we sweltered and on the wet days the rain poured in on top of us.

Today, even with the trains back running—sort of—there are plenty of problems. You only need to look at the Noarlunga line commuters' Facebook group, which has grown into a healthy online community, to read the trials and tribulations of commuters on that line. Packed trains, trains running late, trains not turning up, constantly changing timetables—it is little wonder that patronage has collapsed on the line.

The government's public transport passenger numbers, provided in the 2012-13 budget papers, show a dramatic drop in patronage from 65.9 million passenger boardings in 2010-11 to 62.9 million in 2012-13. I hope that some of those numbers have picked up, but I fear confidence in the system has been so damaged that it will take many years for everyone to return to the trains, as they take more reliable modes, including, unfortunately, further clogging of Adelaide's roads. I know personally that if I have to be somewhere in the evening, I have to drive down to Glenelg to take the tram, as I cannot rely on the train to get me home, and looking through the tram, I am not the only one. You see those familiar faces from the train taking refuge now on the trams.

The difficulties do not stop with just the Seaford line commuters. We have had problems with over the top tree felling, and we have had a pedestrian crossing close unexpectedly at Young Street at Seacliff, cutting a community in half and restricting access to the beach. When the train came back online, after months of service, their warning bells at level crossings were much louder than they used to be, and residents throughout the area have been bothered by the increased noise of the train horn.

Yesterday, I was heartened when the new Minister for Transport indicated his desire to be the sort of member who has a willingness to put aside politics and work to deliver outcomes for the benefit of this state. I hope that this bipartisan spirit will extend to ironing out the many teething problems when myself, the member for Bragg and the member for Mitchell meet with his department tomorrow.

Time expired.

TONSLEY PARK PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROJECT

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (15:17): I too am going to speak on transport in the electorate of Elder, but I am going to focus on it in a more positive nature. I think it is human nature that we can look at issues negatively instead of looking at them through the eyes of what we can achieve. The reopening of the Tonsley line on Monday (just past) was a very important event. The significance of its reopening cannot be underestimated for the people of the area. Along with many eager commuters, I boarded the train for one of the first early morning trips from Clovelly Park Station to

head towards the city. Clovelly Park Station, for those who are not sure where it is, is near the park-and-ride facility situated near the new Tonsley redevelopment.

Spirits were high, as locals spoke eagerly about the return of 'their train', as they so fondly called it. They had been patient, waiting for the return of this train to their track, and they were very understanding about what had been happening over the years. This is a critical element, this train, to the transport infrastructure that adds to the government's continued vision of the Tonsley redevelopment and renewal project. It is also a commitment that means better public transport, a quicker commute and fewer cars on local roads. It is what responsible governments do.

While the Tonsley line catchment area on the local demographic is Mitchell Park, Clovelly Park and Ascot Park, very quickly, I am sure, many surrounding suburbs will form an extended catchment area as both knowledge of the park-and-ride and the effortless service to and from the city becomes more widely known. With the once-in-a-generation revitalisation work on the line complete it is time to thank commuters for their patience during construction works and substitute services. The rebuild stands to change how people travel to and from the city. The revitalisation has seen investment in signalling, sleepers and electrification.

This line stands to transport hundreds of passengers as student numbers increase over time at the Tonsley TAFE and Flinders University campus. Flinders University campus will see its first students early next year. In addition to this, we will see over time the building of housing, as later this year we expect to see the master plan for over 1,000 homes.

These changes will offer commuters an improvement in the service available for people travelling into and from the city. Already, with the TAFE open and its first students well settled, I know that many of them have begun to use this service. Just the other morning I met a student who had travelled from Salisbury on our public transport network. He was pleased that now the last part of his journey to reach the TAFE that he studied at meant a very quick train commute from the city to the TAFE. In the near future we will expect to see more than 10,000 TAFE and Flinders University students move to this campus as the Tonsley Park redevelopment progresses. This new rail service will play a very significant role and is extremely important to this area.

The magnitude of this Tonsley line is clearly lost on those opposite, as we saw not one of them speak out in opposition when, unacceptably, their federal colleagues last year, prior to the federal election and in the stealth of the media blackout, ripped away millions of dollars from this project. This money was to complete the park-and-ride and upgrade the stations. If you were to go and have a look at these particular facilities you would see that they are in desperate need of upgrade.

Those opposite clearly have no vision for the area and the development of a ground-breaking site. This entire project—the Tonsley redevelopment, the transport infrastructure renewal—has captured the imagination and excitement of so many South Australians and is one that I continually hear support for. However, do we hear support from those opposite? They could get on board, but instead all we hear is negative rhetoric and the talking down of all the progress in our state. This train line is a key part of the public transport network and, most importantly, for our local community.

GLYNDE SUBSTATION

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:22): I rise today to speak about SA Power Networks' proposal to build an electricity substation on the corner of Barnes Road and Davis Road in Glynde, a suburb which lies in my electorate of Hartley. Unfortunately for the residents of Glynde, under the current proposal the site for this proposed substation is in the middle of residential Glynde, adjacent to the Aveo Retirement Village, which is home to dozens of elderly members of my electorate. These residents, as well as many others in Glynde, have raised significant objections to this proposal for many years and this controversial proposal was a central issue in the election that has just passed.

I acknowledge the hard work of people like Eunice Anderson who, as the president of the Glynde Aveo residents' committee, has worked tirelessly with her colleagues to fight for their views to be heard. I also acknowledge people like Mr Ian Rohde, who has vigorously argued against this substation being built in residential Glynde for many years. It is incumbent upon me as their local member to ensure that their views are heard and acted upon.

As the Liberal candidate for Hartley before and now as the member for Hartley, I will always fight to secure vital electricity supply to the people of Glynde and Hartley where I need to, and I

understand that a substation may need to be built in the general area to guarantee that supply. However, the SA Power Networks' proposal is completely unacceptable to the residents of Glynde and to me. I have always believed in seeking an alternative site for this proposed substation, preferably in an industrial area. I look forward to working with SA Power Networks and the government to find a site which provides the least disruption to the suburb and to the residents.

I note that a final decision with regard to this proposal is likely to be made and delivered in the middle of this year. It is worth noting that four days prior to the recent state election, which was held on 15 March, the Labor Party distributed a letter to the people of Glynde which included an explicit commitment from this government to making government land available to ensure that the proposed substation can be relocated at an alternative site. I will hold this government to account for the promises that they have made to the people of Glynde.

The house will record that one of my first acts as a member of parliament was to write to the Premier on 9 April seeking his support and recommitment to the residents of Glynde and the people of Hartley, and asking what actions this government intends to take when SA Power Networks submits its final proposal. As yet, I have not received a reply from the Premier. Anything other than a complete reiteration and endorsement of his previous views and comments will be viewed by the constituents of Hartley as a betrayal, and feed into the deficit of trust that the Premier and this government already has with some of my constituents. I hope that the next time I raise this matter in the house this controversial and potentially damaging issue will have been resolved for the betterment of the people of Glynde and Hartley.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Comrade Colton.

ELECTORAL REFORM

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:26): Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker, and may I congratulate you on your re-election and your ascent to such high office. Soon after the election, I had the privilege of addressing the Australian Society for the Study of Labour History, and what they wanted me to do there was talk about, or at least put forward my view, as to how it was that Labor was retained. I gave them my eight reasons as to why that occurred, but I also told them that what they could expect from the opposition, if I was to be correct, was a fair bit of whingeing, a fair bit of sulking, and of course the comment that 'we was robbed'.

To their credit, I have not seen whingeing, I have not seen you sulking, but certainly from yesterday's Address in Reply we can expect from here that the rhetoric is going to be 'We was robbed,' and I do want to—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: I do want to look at the member for Davenport's contribution, where he said the system's not working, the system's broke, and that democracy was not served and is not serving the voters. The member for Davenport referred to the fairness test, and referred to the select committee that was established in 1989. As I understand it, the opposition got everything they wanted and everything they asked for in the question that was put to the referendum. As I further understood it, they shied away from the more progressive or radical (depending on where you sit) proposals that were part of the recommendations.

The rules they asked for are the rules they got. As of yesterday, the opposition rhetoric was 'The rules don't work,' 'an affront to democracy', and 'this is not a Labor/Liberal thing.' To that particular matter, I say: poppycock. Have a look at where it was that the opposition picked up its votes—votes that, under the system—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: —skewed the two-party—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: You are setting a very bad example for the new fellows. If we have a look at where the opposition picked up its votes, they are votes which, under the system in my view do skew the two-party preferred vote. I will call it the 'rusted on belt of seats', Deputy Speaker: Flinders, 79.2 per cent two-party preferred; MacKillop, 76.7; Chaffey, 75.1; Mount Gambier, 71.4; and Stuart, 70.5. There are 10 seats in excess of or in the high 60 per cent two-party preferred, and a clutch of seats in the high 50s. I do not begrudge them these margins, but what it does is skew the two-party preferred vote. The member for Davenport—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: The member for Davenport also referred to the 2002 election, where the Liberals received 50.9 per cent of the two-party preferred but did not form government. But, you cannot look at 2002 without looking at the 1997 election and the period in between. Mount Gambier, for example—they picked the wrong candidate; Mr McEwen ran as an Independent, and he was caused to be an Independent—

Mr Whetstone: He was a traitor.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well then, does that make the member for MacKillop, who was a fiercely Independent member who has since come in out of the cold, a traitor as well?

Mr Whetstone: He saw the light.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Oh, he saw the light. Then there was the member for Fisher, who was certainly pushed, alienated and marginalised by the party that he was a member of; the member for Chaffey, who could have formed and been part of a coalition had the opposition worked a little bit harder at things; and then, of course, the member for Hammond, who was pushed out of the door by the party of which he was once a member. When you fold all these seats into the mix, they are in essence Liberal seats. So, the 2002 result was a result of the Liberals' own making. Our system is based on member electorates. I found the comments of the member for Davenport in one regard most interesting, where he said:

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.

Mr GARDNER: Deputy Speaker—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr GARDNER: Erskine May makes it clear that it is unparliamentary to read from *Hansard*.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Brains trust says no point of order. Continue.

The Hon. P. CAICA: And do it better next time, will you? It's alright, I won't finish today anyway, so I will have to resume my remarks—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta: order.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I think that the attitude of the member for Davenport with respect to that that he said in *Hansard* regarding the voters Fred and Mary and others is really selling short voters—selling short the voters of Ashford, of Newland, of Florey, of Colton and many other voters in many other electorates. I have not had one voter that has come up to me to say, 'I voted for you, but I wanted a change of government.' Government is ultimately formed, despite the best endeavours of the Electoral Commission to realign boundaries to meet the fairness test, which is not an exact science, by the party that wins the most seats. I look forward to resuming this contribution at the next grievance.

Time expired.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

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

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:33): I rise today to provide my contribution to the Address in Reply. I start by welcoming all new members. The people of our electorates have bestowed their trust in each of us, and we must all honour that faith diligently. I also take this opportunity to thank the people of Port Adelaide for returning me to this place and to thank all of those who worked so hard in the campaign. I would like to single out my parents, who have used their retirement extremely productively to help their daughter remain employed.

This government has been re-elected on a platform of building South Australia with policies that emphasise the importance of retaining and creating jobs. This is no easy task; our economy faces some enormous challenges. The continued strength of the Australian dollar has put intense pressure on our trade-exposed industries, and none more so than our manufacturing sector. Our exporters have also faced the challenge of a higher exchange rate and slower global growth in most of our major trading partners.

As a government, we could have stood back and let these external pressures rip through our economy. Instead, we chose to stand by our industries and the workers they employ to help them undertake the transformation required to adapt to this new and challenging economic environment.

Our task has been made more difficult, our goal to diversify industries made more urgent, by the decision by Holden, Ford and Toyota to stop manufacturing cars in Australia. While I welcome the challenges that being a minister in this government will bring and look forward to meeting them head on, I also remain committed to being a passionate advocate for the people of the Port Adelaide electorate.

The honour of representing the people of Port Adelaide has given me a particular insight into the concerns of South Australian families working in the manufacturing sector. Each day, they sit around the table with their families and look ahead to an uncertain future. Headlines about job losses and a troubled world economy feed into their natural anxieties. The media obsession with bad news also clouds the opportunities that do exist.

The truth in all of this is this: our economy is now more diversified and more resilient. We have sustained economic growth for more than a decade by embracing defence industries and expanding our mineral resources and energy sectors. We continue to create a vibrant city, and I look forward to that vibrancy spreading beyond the CBD to Port Adelaide, where this government has a strategy to revitalise the inner harbour and the heritage waterfront.

As Minister for Manufacturing, Innovation and Trade, I subscribe to the position that government must be an active participant in the shaping of our economy. Our role as a government is not simply to enjoy times of growth and prosperity and, in turn, expect businesses to work in solitude when times get tough. Experience shows that South Australia is a better place today because government has been prepared to work with business and the community to deliver results.

In South Australia, there is a positive future if we are willing to act together to achieve it. The challenge for this government is to work with business, our academic institutions, our skills sector and our community to embark on a rapid transition that ensures everyone can continue to enjoy and share the long-term prosperity of this state.

Fortunately, we have already embarked on a strategy to work with our employers, to assist our industries in this state to diversify and to move towards an economy that accentuates its strengths in advanced manufacturing and in innovation. Even before the car manufacturers announced their plans to exit Australia, this government had begun the task of preparing our manufacturing sector to transition to a business model that emphasises high value and lower volumes. This is only part of the challenges that lie ahead.

One of our central tasks as a government will be to respond to the void that will be created when the auto industry finally leaves our shores. Our actions must ensure that this seismic shift in our manufacturing sector does not lead to increased unemployment and slower economic activity. We can do this by supporting the many workers that will have to leave the automotive sector to use their high level of skills in other industries.

In that regard, South Australia is well placed with the defence industry and the mineral resources and energy sector that require a highly skilled, highly motivated workforce. Component suppliers will need to be encouraged to look to new markets and reduce their reliance on the

automotive sector, and we need to fill the gap in economic activity by accelerating infrastructure projects and expanding our ability to transform ideas that emerge from our research institutions and centres of excellence into commercial realities.

One of the areas of advanced technology I look forward to advancing in this area is the opportunities offered by fostering low-carbon manufacturing in this state. Governments, businesses and communities around the world accept the science of climate change and are taking action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Through the initiatives contained in the innovation pillar of this government's manufacturing work strategy, I will be seeking to assist local manufacturers to capture low-carbon opportunities. Through the future markets pillar, initiatives aim to combine industry innovation with future market opportunities to stimulate restructuring of industries in which South Australia has significant strengths.

As I have said before in this place, a manufacturing sector cannot be restored once it has gone. Our efforts must focus on retaining a manufacturing sector in this state but one that is more advanced, more nimble and leverages off our natural strengths in adopting innovation and in value adding.

This government has already begun the task of partnering innovators with entrepreneurs through the vision that is being transformed into reality at Tonsley Park. We are also creating a highly-skilled and trained workforce that will be ready to take on the jobs of the future, whether they are in advanced manufacturing, clean tech or mining services. We will continue to support manufacturers to identify markets both locally, through our industry participation program and the mining industry participation office, and internationally, through our China and India engagement strategies.

Our exports are currently at record levels. A bumper harvest and a greater contribution from increased volumes of mineral exports are helping to drive our nation-beating trade performance, but we need to do more to ensure that our small and medium enterprises maintain and expand their share of our exports.

In South Australia barley is already being used to make China's famous Tsingtao beer, our copper and iron ore helping to build its infrastructure, but we also need our SMEs to tap into the growing middle class appetite in Asia for premium and quality goods. Our wines and our foods need to make the most of the opening up of markets in Japan, South Korea and, of course, especially in China.

As pleasing as it is to have the value of exports break through the \$12 billion barrier, we need to continue to target new markets and diversify the products we export, rather than focus on bulk commodities, such as barley and iron ore. As a minister I am lucky to have inherited a portfolio where the foundations for this trade engagement strategy have already been laid by my predecessors, the member for West Torrens and the member for Newland.

We are well on our way toward deepening our relationships with China and India. As minister I will continue that work to support our businesses to find pathways to these promising markets. Our engagement with China and India goes beyond trade to include the opportunities for investment and cultural exchanges. We are well on our way to establishing South Australia as a brand that represents premium value, reliability of supply, and what is increasingly important for consumers in these emerging economies, a high standard of quality.

As a minister, I intend to work with businesses to increase the awareness of South Australian products in targeted markets and develop the capacity of our local businesses to engage with the specific challenges of operating in China and India.

South Australia has a long history of innovation. From the stump-jump plough in our early years of settlement to the technological advances being made in areas such as media devices, South Australians have been able to come up with ideas with a commercial application. We need to continue that innovation and link it to an entrepreneurial spirit that also exists in our many small and medium enterprises.

As I mentioned, Tonsley Park is a showcase for the government's approach to better integrating science and research with entrepreneurs to accelerate the ability to commercialise ideas. Having TAFE SA's Sustainable Industries Education Centre and Flinders University share the

precinct with companies such as Signostics, Siemens, Basetec, ZEN Energy and Tier 5, puts companies in touch with the innovators of the future.

Beyond Tonsley, our major universities are growing and internationalising our education and research sectors. By bringing international students here and developing cooperative relationships with overseas institutions, we are creating links that will eventually improve our capacity to target new markets.

These are exciting, challenging times. This government's intention is to engage those families in my electorate and elsewhere in this positive future, to ease their anxiety about their own job security and the future opportunities for their children here in this state. Our ability as a government to deliver this future is also predicated on having a public sector that has the capacity and the resources to implement our strategies.

It is with honour that I have accepted the Premier's invitation to take on ministerial responsibility for the South Australian Public Service. As a former public servant, I am proud of the quality of our Public Service in this state. We have some of the best regulators and policy developers in the world right here in Adelaide. More than 100,000 people work in Public Service jobs in this state educating our children, protecting our streets, fighting fires and providing a range of professional services.

In February this year the Premier released 'A Modern Public Service', a policy designed to do more to harness the expertise and professionalism of our public servants. Through adopting these reforms the government wants to provide greater opportunities for young people in disadvantaged areas to gain employment in the Public Service. We want to improve the community's interaction with its Public Service; whether it is ways to further reduce red tape or using technology to improve access to government services and information, there is much that we can do as a government to lift our game.

As Minister for the Public Sector I look forward to developing a charter of Public Service guarantee so that South Australians know exactly the standard of service and treatment they can expect when engaging with our many government agencies. No-one is perfect, but the charter will ensure that, when something goes wrong, the government will respond effectively to fix it.

A modern open government that is valued by the community requires transparency, accountability and access. This government is working to improve access by allowing the community to make better use of the data held by the various agencies. We are making government more responsive to the community through our many 90-day projects.

Government is not the sole source of good ideas when it comes to how we deliver our services. That is why Our Citizens' Juries and the Better Together programs can play an important role not only in allowing our Public Service to hear different voices, but also in providing a mechanism to act on that advice.

South Australian businesses dealing with the government should also be assured that we are a model customer. Our government agencies receive more than \$2.5 million invoices a year, a majority of which are paid in a timely manner. This government acknowledges that there is still scope for improvement.

Last year the My Invoice website was launched to enable small business operators to track the progress of their invoices. By improving the flow of information to small business operators, My Invoice gives South Australian businesses greater confidence that their payments are moving promptly through the system and, in the event that invoices are paid outside the standard 30-day terms, they are now entitled to claim penalty interest. My Invoice is just one example of how government is able to use new technology to provide greater access and improved transparency.

I am grateful to the people of Port Adelaide for again returning me to this place. While I have taken on new roles and new responsibilities in this parliament, I will never lose sight of the fact that it is the people of Port Adelaide who have sent me to this place to represent them.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:45): I too rise to give my Address in Reply speech and congratulate His Excellency Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce, the Governor of South Australia, on opening the 53rd parliament. He has been a fine servant to South Australia over the seven years he has been in that position, and I have had the pleasure of meeting both him and his wife Liz on many occasions.

He is probably one of the most personable dignitaries I have had the pleasure of meeting and engaging in good conversation.

I am proud to be re-elected to this place for my second term for the seat of Chaffey. It is not only what was the then existing seat of Chaffey; the electoral boundaries were changed to incorporate another 9,000 square kilometres in the selection, so it now takes on all the council areas of the Southern Mallee, the Karoonda East Murray, and a little more of the Mid Murray council—and I notice that we have one of the councillors here in the chamber today keeping an eye on what I have to say. I am absolutely honoured to be re-endorsed by the constituents of Chaffey. They have put their faith in me to represent them in the parliament and also to give them a voice, which is very important in today's world.

I would like to congratulate all the new members in this place, on both sides. I think we have some good, young blood and I feel this place will be better for it. I would also like to congratulate the members who have been re-elected to this place, whom I have met over the last four years.

In reflecting on this reply speech today I went back over my maiden speech. I think it is held fond in everyone's memories; when they come to this place they gear up to put their beliefs, their platform, in stone on the *Hansard* so that they will be remembered in their time here. On reflection, I think the three main platforms I came into this place with, representing the people, were the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, the reopening of Lake Bonney at Barmera in the Riverland, and the ongoing pressure of biosecurity in the region. I guess it has been a long-held badge of honour that we were the only mainland state to be fruit fly free and, as a farmer and irrigator and grower, I experienced the advantage of having that, and the extra wealth it brought the region.

I can proudly say that over my first term I was part of the consultation process into that Murray-Darling Basin Plan, and I will touch on that a little bit later. Lake Bonney at Barmera has been reopened, it has been reconnected to the river, but I think many people today still reflect on the damage that was done by the disconnection of that lake. The social fabric, the belief that people had in the town was severely diminished. I think today we have seen the local government putting in money and the community re-engaging with that town and the lake. It really is a picture once again, and that is great to see.

The biosecurity issues are something that I will touch on, but as the minister stated today, after 23 years of having no fruit fly outbreaks, sadly we had two outbreaks in January of this year. Both outbreaks have been eradicated and the good work of biosecurity ensured that we now have that freedom status when we enter our markets and the added cost that it puts onto every box of fruit that leaves the property or leaves the packing shed is now underpinned by that freedom status.

I am proud to live and work in Chaffey and, as I said, Chaffey is now comprised of the Riverland and the Mallee. Once upon a time, Chaffey was half of the Riverland, and the population has exited through one region or another—I think the drought has played quite a significant part in this exodus over time. In saying that, the economic and social fabric is strongly associated with irrigated horticulture and dryland agriculture and they are probably two of my great farming passions—apart from fishing, of course!

The region is obviously recognised for its premium food and being a premier food bowl of South Australia. I noticed in the Governor's speech that he identified seven strategic priorities of which the government promised to focus its agenda and number one was an affordable place to live. Well, the government has certainly not lived up to that. Every day the cost of living continues to put pressure on every person, every business, every household and every electorate. Water prices have increased, electricity prices have increased, taxes have increased, and it has been a benchmark of the current government to let those costs spiral out of control—and they really have.

Why did water prices increase? It is a wealth tax—it is not about the cost of water; it is about what it costs for sewerage, supply, etc., and it is a cash cow. It is a wealth tax that creates a cash cow for the government. We talk about: why wouldn't we reduce those profits of SA Water to reduce the cost of living? As the government would say, 'Well, we will put taxes elsewhere.' I think that is atrocious. The desal plant obviously had a lot to do with it and I think they overstepped the mark. A 100 gigalitre desal plant was primarily because the government was a stormwater denier; it was a denier of diversification when it came to sources of water and South Australians are paying the price.

With regard to creating a vibrant city, yes, the government has put a lot of focus into the City of Adelaide and the Adelaide Oval, I think, is a benchmark of one of our great sporting grounds. We look at the transport upgrades that have been undertaken, with all good intentions, to bring us up to a world standard—poorly managed, I must say. The disruptions, the closures, the services that have been absolutely substandard have been a benchmark of this government. Sadly, living in the regions we do not have public transport; the regional centres, in most cases, do not have that luxury.

Concerning every chance for every child: as we see, regional South Australia is slowly diminishing, slowly retracting and the first people that we see leaving our regional centres are the young because they are not being given the opportunities. There are not the training opportunities. Businesses are finding it tough with the cost of living, the cost of doing business, and therefore they are not taking on apprentices, they are not taking on the trainees that we once used to have. Once upon a time, this state was a great state for apprentice opportunities, and trainee opportunities. Today, we still have those opportunities, but on a much smaller scale, and I think that will reflect as history continues.

Safe communities and healthy neighbourhoods. Yes, we are seeing the government putting out there that they are going to be tough on crime. They continue to put up new measures, new legislation and new bills on being tough, but I am not seeing the reduction in the crime. I am seeing more police and I am seeing these coward punches that are now being highlighted more and more. That has been around for some time but, sadly, safe communities are, I guess, a luxury of living in a regional centre because regional centres do have safe communities and healthy neighbourhoods.

Growing advanced manufacturing. I might reflect that I did not make a contribution in this place when we talked about the discovery that Holden's was going to close but I worked at Holden's, and proudly so. I was an apprentice at Holden's. I worked there for nearly seven years. I did an apprenticeship as a fitter and turner and went on to do toolmaking and pneumatics and hydraulics. I was a proud apprentice and a proud tradesman working at the tool room at GMH.

In 1982 the rot set in. There was a workforce of around 20,000 at Holden's—GMH, as it was called back then—and I was part of the 3,500 who were made redundant. But it was another opportunity. Everyone is dwelling on the closure of Holden's being the end of the world and we are all going to fall off the cliff and nothing will ever be the same again. Maybe it will not be the same again, but there is life after Holden's. People will look at new opportunities. People will look at a new experience and how they can potentially open a business of their own. They can chase a dream. They can go out and use the skills set that they already have, or they can go out and be retrained and be part of an existing workforce.

Sadly, Holden is an iconic brand here in this state that, after 2017, will no longer exist. I think that there is life after manufacturing as we know it and there is a life after Holden's. So, to all of those people who, sadly, will lose their jobs, there is an opportunity to look elsewhere. They will seek new opportunities and they will move on.

Realising the benefits of the mining boom for all. Sadly, Olympic Dam did not eventuate. There was a lot of bluster by the then minister, the Premier, that this was going to be the biggest thing since the Hills Hoist and sliced bread, and it did not happen. But, we do have a mining sector that is going along. If we look at why the mining sector is not as buoyant as it should be, it is the cost of doing business here in Australia—it is the cost, particularly here in South Australia—that is a detractor, and I think it has been made very clear that the mining boom is going to slowly ease its way in and slowly ease its way out over time.

I would like to make mention that in the new part of my electorate the Mindarie zircon mine has re-opened and is going along quite nicely with new practices and a much healthier style of extraction to get the zircon out of the ground. It is obviously moving large amounts of sand to then process it and extract the zircon which is exported to China and used to harden products. Essentially that is what the zircon is about.

That mine has never realised the jobs. It has never realised the potential flow-on effects to the region. We have a camp there now and people drive in and they drive out. They use food that is supplied from Adelaide. There is very little benefit to the local economy and very little benefit for local jobs because a majority of those jobs are imported from elsewhere.

Last, but not least, the premium food and wine from our clean environment. I will expand on that one because Chaffey is the premium food bowl and the most diverse food bowl in South Australia and, potentially, in the nation, and it is proud of what it has achieved over much time.

If we look at the wine industry, the Riverland is renowned for having the bulk wine tag, and we are slowly shaking that. We are slowly shaking that because we have introduced some of the alternative varieties, and we are refining our winemaking techniques. Our fortified wines and our brandies are world-class. I am proud to say that in the Riverland we produce more than 50 per cent of the vintage of South Australia. We produce a quarter of the nation's wine crush. I would like to add that Australia and New Zealand's winemaker of the year came from the Riverland—Eric Semmler—and I congratulate him. He was judged over five styles of wine, and he was given that prestigious award only recently. He is a very fine man and a very fine winemaker.

If we look around at the rest of the food bowl in Chaffey, it produces 95 per cent of South Australia's citrus (33 per cent of the national picture), 90 per cent of stone fruit is grown in the Riverland and 98 per cent of South Australia's almonds are grown in the Riverland. Eighty per cent of South Australia's potato and onions, washed produce, is grown in the electorate of Chaffey. Chaffey is the largest potato and onion growing electorate in the southern hemisphere. It is a highly diverse region. We have not touched on pistachios, avocados, or mangoes, or dates but we are trialling many new fruits that people will slowly see come on to their shelves, and very proudly so.

Underpinning all of that is water. It is water not only from the river, not only from the great River Murray, but it is also the underground water that is now part of Chaffey. The Mallee Wells is world renowned for its quality water, on its vast sandy paddocks, for growing the world's best washed potatoes. Through that, we are still looking at recovering from drought. The Murray-Darling plan is something that has been lingering for quite some time now. We have a date, and there has been much debate in this place about exactly how the Murray-Darling Basin Plan was going to be rolled out and when it was going to be rolled out, who would be affected, who it would impact upon, and exactly what it would mean to the driver, which is the economy here in South Australia.

With much debate on both sides of the house, the Murray-Darling Basin Plan is 2,750 gigalitres. Both sides debated for many, many hours what the number should be. The state Liberal Party supported 2,750 from day one. The Premier did not; he supported 4,000. All of a sudden, the basin plan has been signed off by all states and it is 2,750; but, where is that water going to come from? Of that number, South Australia's contribution is 183 gigalitres, and to date over 100 gigalitres has come from irrigators and their communities.

At the moment, we are looking at the 3IP program, which is a federal government initiative, to help growers readjust and diversify their businesses and help them put in better practice and more efficient systems to achieve 40 gigalitres. The federal government has tipped in \$265 million. That is something that could be ground-breaking for Chaffey, because Chaffey is not only a world leader in efficiency gains and monitoring, but it is also one of the great regions for showing the rest of the country just how efficiency gains can be made.

Looking at exactly how we are going to find the next 83 gigalitres is going to be the next challenge for South Australia. At the moment, of that \$265 million we are looking at getting 40 gigalitres. We need to achieve another 40 gigalitres of water. To put that into perspective, it is all the water, all the irrigation—if any of you have been to the Riverland—for Renmark and Berri, all put together; that is what we have yet to achieve, so we have a long way to go.

I will not dwell on the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, but what I do have to say to the current government here in South Australia is: 43 gigalitres is still to be achieved. How are we going to achieve it? We have had no commitment from the Premier. He claims to be the champion of the river. We need to see him put up. To date, he has turned the debate into a political circus. He claimed that he would achieve all the water without any coming from irrigators. As I have already said, we are looking at 183 gigalitres to come out of productive use here in South Australia.

The Mallee prescribed wells area in the Mallee has been an issue for quite some time. The prescription into that area is going to mean a reduction of between 30 and 50 per cent of production. That will mean a 30 to 50 per cent reduction in jobs, in production and in driving the economy. What it will mean is that people will have to adjust. I have called on both the minister and the Premier to look at putting a moratorium on the introduction of that prescription until there are adjustment mechanisms in place. We will wait and see.

We heard the minister speak about biosecurity today with the Queensland fruit fly outbreak in the Riverland. The two outbreaks at Loxton and Pyap have had a significant impact on the region, but the timing has been kind to us—not to some, but to most of us. Most of the seasonal produce has been harvested, but it has still impacted growers. We have to acknowledge that those growers had financial losses and severe market questioning, because when export markets hear of fruit fly it rings alarm bells and it puts their businesses at risk.

The Mediterranean fruit fly outbreaks in metropolitan Adelaide have been ongoing for many years. I was buoyed to hear the federal government put in an \$80,000 starting fund to look at a national fruit fly approach, and the South Australia is also putting in \$65,000. I think it is a great initiative to assist in keeping Chaffey fruit fly free. I would like to acknowledge the Liberals' election promise that we would encompass Mypolonga, which is part of Hammond, as part of that fruit fly free area. However, sadly, the current government and it is not acknowledging Mypolonga as being part of that freedom area.

Again, we look at cuts to research and development. One thing I have seen is that the federal government has come up with a finance package that is going to help the Loxton Research Centre. It is now going to be an international centre of excellence for water, but it is also going to be adopting cutting edge technology and using it in the local conditions. I know this is really almost a re-announcement, because it was world class 40 years ago and in the last 12 years it has been wound back to nothing. Through lobbying from industry and constituents in Chaffey, the federal government has decided, in its wisdom, working with PIRSA, to put some money back into that centre so that it can be reinvested into the realm where it once was.

I will touch on some of the issues around the region, starting with roads. Every regional member in this chamber—we all have concerns about the condition of our roads and the safety of our roads. Sadly, the two commercial rail lines that run from Pinnaroo down to Tailem Bend and from Loxton to Tailem Bend look as though they may close. That is going to put about another 6,250 truck movements on those deteriorated roads. I will be meeting with ministers, both state and federal, lobbying them to look at ways that we can upgrade those roads and keep them safe.

There are over 4,000 small businesses in Chaffey, and they all rely on water. That is why water security is so important. Regarding tourism, I congratulate Destination Riverland for its initiative. The state government almost fully defunded all tourism organisations, and Destination Riverland has done a magnificent job in giving life back into tourism, promoting the region and giving a stimulus to operators who have been and still are affected by the drought.

I would also like to acknowledge the Caudo family for their work around tourism and their initiative to bring True Grit to the region. As any regional member in this place would know, to draw 15,000 people into a region over two days and to have them spend and create a microeconomy is an outstanding achievement, so I pay homage to them. Also, Zac Caudo has been named Young South Australian of the Year, and he has done a remarkable job. Tourism is on the rise, and we have a lot of shining lights in the region, but most of it is centred around the river, so it is great to see.

When we look at health, we look at the Patient Assisted Transport Scheme. PATS has been one of those very topical issues over the past 12 months. It is great to see that we have had the review, but I am still waiting on the minister to come out and initiate the recommendations from the review. It has been a real concern that, with all the fuss and bluster around the PATS review, nothing has been implemented as yet. I was sad to see that \$500,000 in funding was taken away from the Closing the Gap program. Fortunately, private enterprise stepped in and is footing the bill for the Riverland Division of General Practice; I think that is a great initiative.

I have 64 schools in the electorate of Chaffey, ranging from preschools to primary, secondary and area schools. Sadly, over the last three years, we have had three schools close, but again, it is about keeping the viability of the regions there, and keeping the fabric alive so that we can actually keep those schools viable.

One of the main issues, particularly in marginal areas, is broadband and mobile phone coverage. Most people living in Adelaide would not have a clue about what it means to have nil phone reception, or not being able to access broadband. I have concerns that, in today's world, specifically in today's business world, farmers do their business in their tractors. They do not go home to an office; they are talking to their markets, they are talking to the silos, they are talking to their transport

guys, they are talking to their receival depots and they are talking to their pack houses, and that is why having internet services in those regional areas is so important.

Deputy Speaker, my time is all but up, but I have highlighted some of the issues that I have in Chaffey. Again, I thank the good people of the Riverland and the Mallee for putting their trust in me and giving me the opportunity to represent them for another term.

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

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (16:13): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I would like to start by thanking the Governor for his speech, and I would also like to acknowledge your election to the position of Deputy Speaker. I would also like to mention the member for Fisher; I have only been here for a few days and I do not know the member for Fisher, but like all of us, I have been following in the media his travails, and I wish the member for Fisher all the best and a speedy recovery. It is at times like this that we get a bit of perspective and reflect upon what are the important things in life, so I wish him well.

I would also like to mention the late Frank Blevins, a former member for the seat of Giles. His passing last year was a loss. Over the years, Frank made an enormous contribution to this state, to the seat of Giles and to the community of Whyalla—a real loss.

I would also like to acknowledge the sterling effort of the Premier, Jay Weatherill, in securing an amazing victory for the Labor Party. It is a great privilege to be elected to represent the vast electorate of Giles, the largest electorate in the state, an electorate the size of Germany in land mass. It is an honour to represent the people and the diverse communities that make up the seat, and I give a commitment to serve in the electorate to the best of my ability, and that means all of the electorate, from the smallest distant community to the bigger population centres of Roxby Downs, Whyalla and Coober Pedy.

To all those people who supported me during the campaign, to all my volunteers, to all those people who encouraged me over the years a heartfelt thank you, and a big thanks to the people who voted for me and voted for Labor. I particularly want to mention my family: my partner Kathryn for her unstinting support and thoughtful advice and for keeping me on the straight and narrow, not just during the election campaign but through a long life together. I am blessed to have such a loving and conscientious partner. My children, Sinead, Liam and Ciaran, for their down-to-earth good humour and their help. A big thanks to Tracy Robinson, Sherie Lamb, Linda Hall and Michelle Wilby for volunteering hours to assist during the campaign, and especially to Tracy, a real rock.

I also acknowledge Cheyne Rich for his calm, professional manner and invaluable input, and Dave Gray and David Di Troia. I would not be standing here today if it was not for the support offered by Dave Gray. A lot could be said about Dave—his poor table tennis skills, his inability to stay on a bike—but his great redeeming feature is that he was in the same class as me in that great Whyalla school, Eyre High. Your support, Dave, is deeply appreciated.

I wish the former member for Giles, Lyn Breuer, all the best in whatever she does next. Lyn diligently served the electorate of Giles for 17 years. Lyn made history as the first female Speaker of the House, an achievement that she is rightly proud of and something she probably did not imagine way back in 1991 when she was elected to the Whyalla city council as a single mum raising two children on her own—a real battler. Many thanks to Lyn for her support over the years. Lyn said she will put her feet up and watch daytime TV. I cannot see that happening for long; I am sure she will find a role where she can continue to advocate for regional South Australia. In the meantime, Lyn, get the fishing rod out, go catch some fish, and don't forget to drop some off at my place.

There is one other person I will mention. He shaped who I am and what I try to represent. My dad, Jim Hughes, is no longer with us, but he was a man with a deep sense of a fair go and an abiding belief that ordinary people working together can achieve extraordinary things. He was a Scotsman, a fitter and turner, an active trade unionist, a shop steward for many years, and for a time the secretary of the Australian Metal Workers Union in Whyalla. They were unpaid roles, something you did on top of your job.

He gave his time freely to his workmates, his union members, his church, soccer clubs and the community. He was a loving dad. He would always go into bat for the underdog. He died in 1998,

the year of the World Cup and the Peter Reith waterfront dispute. In that year, he gave part of his pension to support the wharfies and turned up at the picket, even though at the time he was very sick and in great pain. He lived out his beliefs to the end.

With my Irish mum, Masie, they raised three children: Kathy, Jim and I. As children, we spent the first years of our lives in the industrial north of England in a town called Rochdale, which is part of Greater Manchester. We had a simple rule in our household: you support Manchester United south of the border and Celtic north of the border. I have added Port Adelaide to the rule. Alas, one of my sons was corrupted at the age of six in Coober Pedy and became a Bombers supporter. I regret to inform the house that he is now 19 and he is still a Bombers supporter. Hopefully, as he matures, he will see the error of his ways.

When I was 10, we moved to Whyalla which, at the time, was a boomtown attracting people from around the world. My dad worked as a machinist for BHP and my mum worked as a cleaner in the coke ovens. My dad was an avid reader and I was lucky to grow up in a house well stocked with books.

I was fortunate that I absorbed the values that my dad lived in his day-to-day life. He expected that I would be the first child in our family to go to university, but I was a rebel and a ratbag at school and, as *The Advertiser* indicates, elsewhere, so that honour went to my young sister. My dad valued education and I met his expectation after a decade of labouring jobs.

It was people like my dad, across the generations and as part of the broad labour movement, who worked together to improve workplaces and the broader community. The Labor Party is at its best when it embodies that spirit of a fair go. We often take for granted what has been achieved over the years through individual effort and collective action, but those achievements can be wound back and there is now a full-scale frontal attack on the ethos of a fair go at a national level.

I want to acknowledge the people who voted for the opposition in Giles, especially in some of the communities beyond Whyalla. To those people and communities, I intend to be as strong an advocate for your interests as I will be for the interests of the community that I come from. Irrespective of which community we come from in Giles, we all have three things in common: we are all South Australians, we do not live in Adelaide and we want a fair go for regional South Australia.

A fair go is measured in tangibles. It means employment opportunities and access to decent education, health services and mental health services. It means the right environment for people and businesses that want to have a go. It means people with disabilities and their families get the support they deserve. It means early childhood services and services for the elderly. It means safe and attractive communities. It means looking out for future generations and respecting South Australia's magnificent natural environment. These are more or less the same things that people in the metropolitan area want.

When I referred to tangibles, I listed employment opportunities first. Unlike Tony Abbott, I do not accept that the loss of an industry and the resulting unemployment is a liberating experience. I come from a community that experienced huge job losses over a period of two decades. Few people thought that was a liberating experience. There is nothing liberating about intergenerational unemployment and, in the case of Whyalla, population loss.

I was there at the start of the job losses as a teenage grinder in the dying days of the Whyalla shipyard. Close to 2,000 jobs disappeared overnight. I was working as a steel deseamer in the steel industry, just before the commencement of the industry restructure which led to a wave of job losses over a 15-year period. Those changes to the steel industry were necessary; the alternative was no steel industry. The restructure was assisted by the Button Steel Plan, and it was notable at the time that, federally, the Liberal Party had no policy of assistance—not much changes.

Being part of a community where unemployment rates tracked consistently double the state average and reach close to 13 per cent and did so in the context of a population loss of just over 10,000 is definitely not liberating. Those experiences, that history, leaves its mark and it is why jobs, economic diversity and economic intensification are priorities. They are priorities that need to be addressed within a framework that treats seriously our obligations to future generations and the need to, in a thoughtful way, reconcile economic needs with environmental imperatives.

Whyalla turned the corner following the spin-out from BHP to OneSteel and for a period a few years ago during the term of the Labor government in this state we had an unemployment rate

that was below the national average. Our rate now tracks the state average. That represents a huge improvement but, once again, unemployment is edging up. But, there are opportunities; there are things that we can do to make a real difference.

One of those things is mining. Giles is made up of a number of communities that depend upon mining. Iron Knob is the birthplace of the Australian iron and steel industry, with its initial history of a century of iron ore production which has now been added to by a further anticipated quarter of a century of production. Iron Knob is responsible for the birth of the Hummock Hill settlement which officially became Whyalla 100 years ago.

Whyalla has the Middleback Ranges and Roxby Downs has Olympic Dam. The vast multi-mineral resource that is Olympic Dam will continue to be exploited over the coming century in one way or another. There was real disappointment in our region when the BHP Billiton board did not give the green light to the expansion and there is a lesson there about not counting your chickens before they hatch. We will see a reconfigured expansion at a different scale and with different timing and we can say with confidence that there will be a long-lived mine with all of the future opportunities that come with that activity.

Coming on the heels of the decision about the expansion, the Roxby Downs community experienced a difficult period as BHP Billiton moved to rein in costs to improve mine viability. An 800 job loss hit is hard to take and impacts in a serious way in a community the size of Roxby Downs. It hits the employees that have lost their jobs and their families. It hits businesses and especially small businesses in the community and it shakes confidence. The community will bounce back.

Within Giles we have seen the growth of mining over the last decade with a number of mines that have come online or are anticipated. AusMinerals continues to mine copper at Prominent Hill and the largest undeveloped copper resource in Australia at Carrapateena has also an additional gold resource, a copper and gold resource that was discovered through direct state government assistance in the form of the Eyre PACE program.

IMX continue to export their copper and rich magnetite from Cairn Hill and Arrium has expanded their Middleback Range resource, while developing the strangely named Southern Iron operation near Coober Pedy in the Far North of the state. We need to ensure that the Woomera Prohibited Area is effectively opened up to allow exploration and mining.

Any one of those established projects you could point to as a job generator in the seat of Giles and the broader region. To take one example: Arrium's mining expansion has seen mining related jobs go from approximately 250 jobs in 2002 to over 1,500 today. Some of that is fly in-fly out, but most is based in communities like Whyalla and elsewhere in the region. Arrium's mining operations continue in parallel with resource processing based manufacturing and the steelworks directly employs 1,230 people.

So when I referred to economic intensification earlier in this speech, it was a reference to further mining development while retaining and, against the current, expanding manufacturing. That current is strong with the continuing strength of the Australian dollar—even though it has come down—global competition, over-capacity in the steel sector and, a perennial one on the Australian scene, subscale production facilities. It means we have to be smarter and it means we have to innovate. If we give up on manufacturing as a nation we will eventually pay a very high price.

I want to highlight the importance of being willing to innovate, to look afresh at what we do. In that context, I acknowledge the passing, at far too young an age, of the former manager of Whyalla's OneSteel operations, Jim White. Jim was the driving force behind the transformative Project Magnet, which shifted the feedstock for the steel industry in Whyalla from haematite to magnetite and, in the process, enabled the export of haematite. It enhanced the life of the plant, reduced steel-making costs, and generated very significant environmental gains for the Whyalla community.

As part of that shift to haematite export, the harbour at Whyalla has been expanded to handle up to 13 million tonnes per year, and there is a lot of potential for further expansion if commercial drivers are in place. It is worth noting that OneSteel, or OneSteel Arrium, delivered the expansion on time, on budget, and without any controversy or community opposition.

There are a number of lessons, not just for Giles but for the state, in the way that Arrium has approached mine expansion and port development. It has followed a pattern of incremental growth

and consolidation, and has taken advantage of high iron ore prices. The two sites that have been used for additional shore-based shipping infrastructure have no inherent conflict over land use, and minimal environmental negatives.

During that period of high prices only one other company has delivered on iron ore exports in South Australia and that is IMX, with its copper-enriched magnetite, exporting out of Outer Harbor. There are extensive iron ore deposits in South Australia. I am told that there is potential for significant regional job growth and income generation.

With the exception of Arrium's operation, there is not much infrastructure in place to support additional iron ore export, and we are now entering a period of global oversupply of iron ore as major producers have added additional capacity. Demand from China is softening. As prices trend lower, companies that do not have financial closure and do not have infrastructure in place will find it increasingly difficult to get over the line. The temptation is to shelve planning for future development.

I think it is important that we take a long-term view, even a generational view, and be ready to catch the next wave when it comes. We do not want to repeat the multitude of poor proposals that have been one of the features of this round of high commodity, price-driven interests in mine development in South Australia. We cannot control commodity prices but we can control how we plan, as a state, to take advantage of our mineral resources.

Planning for the long term, a far more strategic and coordinated approach, and a willingness to engage communities early in decision-making processes as well as a willingness to consider options and alternatives in an open and transparent manner will ultimately lead to better results. Top-down decision-making often reflects a very narrow perspective and is often marked by a lack of openness and curiosity. It is usually a very expedient form of decision-making, and it is a form of decision-making that engenders cynicism.

The negatives are often amplified for regional communities due to the deeply entrenched 'metrocentric' culture that prevails in South Australia, and let us be honest, that culture has prevailed under Liberal and Labor governments. It need not be that way, and I am confident that it is an approach that will be abandoned in the interests of developing the whole of the state.

In the context of mining and associated infrastructure development, the last time there was an attempt to comprehensively involve regional communities—especially the communities around the Spencer Gulf and the various groups with an interest in the region—was nearly a quarter of a century ago when the former member for Giles, the late Frank Blevins, was the minister for mineral resources. The overall initiative was called the northern Spencer Gulf resource processing strategy.

The community engagement process was years ahead of its time and was well resourced. It was not fly-in, fly-out, tick-a-box consultation. It was carried out in parallel with the commencement of the aerial magnetic survey of the state—a great Labor initiative. The survey itself demonstrated an innovative approach to the use of technology and the openness with which the survey results were shared. Frank Blevins and the public servants providing the advice at the time deserve to be remembered for what was a very important policy initiative.

Subsequent governments continued support for mining exploration, but the engagement process was shelved when Labor lost office. If it had continued—if over time the initiative had been built on—we might well have been in the position to have had a far more coordinated, thought-through and timely approach to infrastructure provision and be in a position to take advantage of elevated commodity prices.

What the northern Spencer Gulf processing strategy represented was a clean-sheet approach to building decisions which involved communities and incorporated environmental, social, and economic aspects from the beginning. It had scientific input from the start, especially in relation to the marine environment. The aerial magnetic survey of the state was an important initiative allowing us for the first time to look extensively below the cover of sedimentary rock that hid potential mineral wealth in South Australia.

Below the ground we have mineral resources, but above the ground we have an energy source that dwarfs all other energy resources: the direct solar resource and indirect solar resource that is wind, can turn South Australia into a renewable energy power house and, in the process, give us a far greener mining industry while also greening all other sectors of our economy. Why not set a target to become the greenest mining province in the world, and why not marry our renewable energy

resource to our mineral wealth, or at least announce the engagement so that down the track they can tie the knot?

We have always been a solar state in a solar world, except that we just take it for granted and we do not give it much thought. We are entirely dependent on a biosphere that is driven by the sun. For thousands of years, Australia's Aboriginal people lived off the bounty provided by the sun. For generations, our farmers have harvested solar energy. What we are looking at now (and the process has started, but we have further to go) is developing and applying technology to capture the sun's energy. It is research and development; it is learning by doing; it is creating economies of scale; it is taking technology off the shelf that is being developed overseas; but it is also making our contribution with our know-how and adding our piece to the global sustainability jigsaw. We can do our bit and benefit as a result.

Nearly all of Giles is low rainfall but high solar resource. The seat of Stuart has a great solar resource and the seat of Flinders has a reasonable solar resource and a world-class wind resource. We should work together and as a state reject the tin foil hat rubbish that is coming out of Canberra when it comes to renewables and global warming.

The target to reach 33 per cent of the state's electricity from renewables by 2020 is likely to be met within a year. Most of that renewable energy to date has been from wind but solar will, over the coming years, start to make a greater contribution, largely as a result of the ongoing fall in the cost of photovoltaic technology.

Regional South Australia has benefited significantly from investment in renewables, with \$2 billion worth of investment out of a total investment of \$5 billion since 2003. The investment has created jobs for regional South Australia and provided rent for farmers and assistance for communities through the establishment of community funds. The penetration of wind and the displacement of fossil fuels has also led to a reduction in the wholesale cost of electricity in South Australia.

In my community of Whyalla, 120 jobs and 14 apprenticeships were created by fabricating the towers for stage two of the Snowtown wind farm, a process that was ably assisted by the state government with a \$2 million co-contribution to ENA. We should be building on those efforts but, instead, we see the Abbott government creating profound investor uncertainty.

The state Labor government initiated the preparation of a report on the wind potential on the Eyre Peninsula and the development of a green grid to harness that world-class resource and effectively link into the national grid. The report looked at harnessing an initial 2,000 megawatts on a staged basis, but the report indicated the potential resource was five times greater.

With sensible national policy, the resource could be developed and the grid upgrade would eventually benefit other potential industries on the Eyre Peninsula such as mining. It would represent a multimillion dollar input into the region and further displace fossil fuel generators. It would also help to provide a basis for higher end manufacturing, provided there was long-term investor certainty in the wind sector.

Manufacturing communities like Whyalla could increase tower production. Hubs, nacelles and blades are all imported. With investor certainty, local manufacturing facilities could be developed. If we captured the wind resource on the Eyre Peninsula and captured the manufacturing opportunities, it would be a big boost to employment. Rounding the numbers off, the stage development of 2,000 megawatts on the Eyre Peninsula would mean the fabrication of 800 towers, 800 hubs, 800 nacelles and 2,400 blades in addition to a wide range of job-generating ancillary services.

Companies in the past have expressed their willingness to invest in Australian manufacturing, but each time that desire has been undermined at a federal level, initially when the Howard government failed to increase the 2 per cent mandatory renewable energy target, and now with the Abbott government's review headed up by a man who rejects the science behind global warming. A review held just 18 months after the last review found that the mandatory renewable energy target was working to deliver cost-effective clean energy.

Over the coming years, we are going to see a fundamental change in the business model that underpins electricity generation, distribution and retail. The change has already started and we will move from the centralised hub and spoke model to a far more distributed system and a system

that will increasingly put power back in the hands of consumers. Members might not have seen comments recently made by Bob Stobbe, the CEO of SA Power Networks, where he said that all forms of centralised generation and transmission would inevitably become redundant.

That raises some really profound questions and I am sure it will lead to all sorts of debate. To date, the most visible part of that shift has been the massive increase in rooftop solar in our suburbs and regional centres. It is not the well-heeled that have been adopting solar; it is low to middle income earners that own their own houses, or at least are paying off mortgages. Thirty-two per cent of Australia's housing stock is in regional and rural areas, and those areas account for more than 40 per cent of solar installations.

In cities, it is the outer metropolitan mortgage belt that has seen the greatest penetration, and the suburb that leads the charge in South Australia is Salisbury. Contrary to the nonsense that is often pedalled about solar being a form of middle-class welfare, solar uptake declines as income levels increase. The affluent do not worry about high electricity prices. The less affluent do, and they look for ways to reduce their exposure to high prices. The levelised cost of energy from a run-of-the-mill PV system in Adelaide is approximately 13¢ a kilowatt hour compared to grid-delivered electricity at approximately 30¢ a kilowatt hour. It is a no-brainer.

The cost of photovoltaic panels has already come down a lot over the last five years, and it is anticipated that the levelised cost of PV-generated electricity over the next six years will drop to between 4¢ and 9¢ a kilowatt-hour. It is a game changer with incredibly significant implications for this state, for this country, and for other countries similar to ourselves with great solar resources. Those implications become even more interesting if the cost of small-scale energy storage for households and businesses replicates what has happened to solar PV.

We need to ensure that those people on low incomes in the public or private rental market do not miss out on the advantage that solar provides. I welcome the commitment to establishing a pilot program involving 300 households to trial the roll-out of solar, with a further 5,000 households to benefit if successful. In Whyalla alone there are 2,300 Housing SA properties, so I believe we need to look at a range of financial models that will be able to assist the roll-out of solar. Ultimately, those off-grid communities, such as Coober Pedy and Andamooka, will benefit from the technology cost reductions we are seeing and will reduce or eliminate their reliance on expensive diesel systems. I welcome the state government's commitment to reintroduce grid parity for South Australia's off-grid communities.

PV has of late received a lot of attention, but the solar technology that might be best suited to power on demand and best suited to a range of industrial applications that goes beyond straightforward electricity generation is concentrating solar thermal. Concentrating solar thermal is still expensive, but it is coming down in cost. Due to the high temperatures generated, a number of energy storage options are possible, and it addresses what is often seen as the weakness of renewables, intermittent supply.

Concentrating solar thermal complements wind energy, and peak energy production closely matches peak electricity demand. The high temperatures generated can also be used in a range of industrial processes. Copper miners in Chile are starting to use concentrated solar thermal. For a state like South Australia, the provision of early targeted support for concentrated solar thermal might generate significant long-term benefits. We need to build the industries of the future and the infrastructure to support the industries of tomorrow.

I have focused on the importance of mining and renewables and I have acknowledged the role of manufacturing, because in my region they are important, or potentially important, when it comes to significant job generation and also ensuring we take care of our future generations. There are other opportunities for my region and many opportunities for our state if we focus on research and development, innovation and collaboration. If as a state we are going to make the most of our opportunities, providing decent early childhood services and education for all our children is essential.

There is an attainment gap between educational outcomes in the metropolitan area and country South Australia. It partly reflects socioeconomic factors, factors which are also clearly at work within the metropolitan area. Australia lags behind a number of countries when it comes to ensuring that a person's postcode should not determine, to a significant degree, educational attainment. Needs-based funding is essential, but a comprehensive review of the specific factors influencing

educational outcomes in regional South Australia might assist in the development of policy and the allocation of resources to close the gap.

There is also a gap when it comes to health outcomes in both morbidity and mortality between the metropolitan area and regional South Australia. Once again, socioeconomic determinants play a role, as does access to timely diagnostic procedures and treatment. On that note, I welcome the commitment to overhaul the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme and the 30 per cent increase in budget allocation. Labor acted on the review of the scheme and will deliver. I acknowledge the role played by the Minister for Health and also the work done by the member for Frome and now Minister for Regional Development, Geoff Brock.

Once the changes to the scheme are bedded down, it would be advisable to undertake regular incremental adjustments to ensure the scheme reflects changing conditions, such as transport and accommodation costs, so that regional South Australians are not disadvantaged. Access to treatment in Adelaide is important for a whole range of procedures and it makes medical sense, but where possible we should deliver services closer to where people live. I welcome the work that is being done to deliver a greater range of medical services through our major regional hospitals.

The \$69 million upgrade of the Whyalla Hospital is a good example of Labor's commitment to improve health services in regional South Australia, which was carried out in partnership with the previous federal Labor government. I point out that the upgrade was opposed by the Liberal Party, at least in Canberra. The upgrade and enhanced services will benefit not just Whyalla but also the surrounding regions. Part of the upgrade includes the provision of accommodation for patients and families. Many of the people from my region suffering from cancer will now be able to access treatment at Whyalla through the new cancer centre.

Mental health services will be upgraded, with six dedicated beds, and negotiations to secure a residential psychiatrist look as though they will bear fruit. Residential psychiatrists in regional South Australia are as rare as hen's teeth. Like hen's teeth, I do not think there are any at the moment, despite the disproportionately higher rate of mental ill health in the country. Attracting specialists to actually live in the country is a difficult, challenging and complex problem. Regional South Australia's first MRI machine will be installed at the hospital in the near future, preventing many trips to Adelaide.

When talking about the gap in health and education, the most profound challenge we face as a state and a nation is addressing, in collaboration, the problems experienced by Australia's first people. There is much that can be celebrated. There are positives but, while the gap continues, it reflects badly on our state and our nation. However, that is nothing compared to the effect that it has on many lives.

In a previous occupation I spent many hours conducting interviews with Aboriginals who were either in gaol or awaiting sentencing. We all know that Aboriginals are over-represented in our gaol population. The interviews provided some insight into the circumstances, both near and long term, that led to appearing before courts.

Faced with similar circumstances, there but for the grace of God, nearly all of us would be in a similar position. The obligation to work together to address the causes of Aboriginal disadvantage is a deep one, and it is only working collaboratively with our First People that problems will be addressed.

There are many distinct communities in Giles and to talk about them all today would not give them the justice they deserve. The different communities have much in common, but they also have their own particular needs, opportunities and challenges. I know my own community of Whyalla well, but even there my knowledge is partial, and that is why I have always maintained that as an elected member, whether at a local or a state level, we need to involve people.

The knowledge, experience and passion in our communities and in our state will always outweigh that which is contained in the elected body. We always need to reach out and involve people.

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

Mr HUGHES: I look forward to working with the people and the communities of Giles to improve our lot and to help our state prosper. I also look forward to working with the elected members on both sides of the house in the interest of all South Australians. To my neighbouring electorates:

we have much in common, and I look forward to what I hope will be a constructive relationship with the member for Flinders and the member for Stuart. I especially look forward to working with the member for Frome (the Minister for Regional Development) so that we can advance the interests of regional South Australia and by so doing advance the interests of the whole of our state.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (16:58): I apologise to the member for Giles for not shaking his hand, but I had to stand ready to speak. Can I also tender the apology of many of the members of the opposition who would have been here for the remainder of your speech but had been called to the Upper House for a speech by the Hon. Andrew McLachlan. Many members were quite impressed by a lot of the words that you said.

Deputy Speaker, can I also pay my compliments to the Governor on the speech he gave on Tuesday, and indeed the way in which His Excellency and Mrs Scarce have performed a very challenging role for all South Australians over a seven-year period. I hope that in the last few months they have in the role that they continue to enjoy it and continue to enjoy the interaction that they have with so many communities in South Australia, and that good health and a wonderful time with their family follows them into retirement; they certainly deserve it.

Firstly, it is important that I express my great appreciation to the people of Goyder for allowing me to have the honour of representing them in parliament. A bit over eight years ago, when I first had the opportunity to stand in this place and to speak, I was very humbled by the confidence that our community showed in me. In the time since then, many experiences have happened to us, there is no doubt about that—some good, some bad, some challenging, and some absolutely wonderful—but it is still an absolute pleasure to have the opportunity to be a member of parliament. It is an honour that I never expected, but an honour that I will continue to respect enormously, and one which I will do my absolute best to undertake for as long as I have the confidence of the community and the people that put me here.

Deputy Speaker, can I congratulate you on your appointment, too. In the political world in which I lived prior to the election I was supporting the opposition candidate against you, Damian Wyld for Florey. I think the respect that he held for you in understanding what you had done since 1997 made him believe there was a great challenge to try and take Florey away from you. I do commend him on everything that he did. He worked very hard, had wonderful support from his wife and family, parents and grandparents, and some wonderfully dedicated supporters in the electorate, too, who put an enormous amount behind him and worked an amazing number of hours to make him—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes—to make him a worthwhile candidate against you, but there is no doubt the incumbency that you brought and the level of representation you have had in the community in 16 years held you in good stead, so well done on that. I also congratulate the member for Croydon on his continued appointment as Speaker of this house. I have enjoyed my discussions with the Speaker and respect the way in which he attempts to control this place from time to time and the need for it to actually be controlled, and I am sure he will do well.

Goyder actually had some interesting challenges. From a level of support point of view, my margin was reduced, and I readily understand that, from an (I thought) ridiculously high 17.7 per cent on the two-party preferred vote to now 12.5 per cent, for which I am still very grateful—

The Hon. S.W. Key interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: I don't think I'm that good. The member for Ashford says that she still wishes—what was that?

The Hon. S.W. Key: Seventeen would be lovely but 12 is good, too.

Mr GRIFFITHS: It is wonderful. It's very humbling, actually.

The Hon. S.W. Key: I got 1.9 per cent.

Mr GRIFFITHS: 1.9—the member for Ashford confirms that it is. In my case, actually, some boundary changes created some interesting challenges for me. Balaklava had been part of Goyder for some time, but transferred to the seat of Frome, so the Minister for Regional Development has

the great honour of representing that community. A lot of Liberal voters actually transferred with that boundary change, which I hoped would have created a different result in Frome, but Kendall Jackson was not quite as successful as I would have liked. But I commend her on what she did, too—a very committed person who, with a lot of family support, put an enormous amount into it. That is what politics about: it is about good people standing up. We have been lucky that in all political parties we have good people prepared to stand up.

So, in losing Balaklava and the sadness of not being part of that actual community all the time but still representing the area to its west, south and east—I am saddened by that, but I am excited by the opportunity that the transfer of Two Wells into Goyder from Taylor represents. I readily admit that I have to get to know that community and the key issues for them, and to have a sort of visual impression in my mind of what all the streets are like and the people so that when I meet them in the street I remember their names, and to try and do as much as I can for them. I have enjoyed my relationship with the member for Taylor. I know in speaking to the community that there was a level of respect for the member for Taylor and what she had done for Two Wells, and I hope that I can gain that same support from that community.

It is very humbling for any person who has the great opportunity to stand in this chamber that they do recognise that it is not just their own efforts that get them here. Normally, it is the support of a particular political party. For those who are Independents, it is still the support of a lot of people that makes it possible. I will put on the record my eternal appreciation for the Liberal members in Goyder who in their vast numbers, even though (as in many political parties) they are becoming a little bit older, accepted the challenge of assisting me in so many ways, not just in fundraising support but the physical and emotional support that comes with it, too, sometimes.

The confluents going up, but predominantly the amount of effort that went into working on polling day, is something that was very humbling to me. I think my head count was about 105 people who supported me, and for those I am very grateful. We had probably about 55 people in my home on election night with a great level of optimism, I must say, at the very start of it in the belief that some of the poll results in the days beforehand were going to show a result that was somewhat different to what the eventual situation was.

The mood swing did occur during the evening, there is no doubt. The uncertainty that was created with such a fine, delicate balance, and the position that it put the member for Fisher and the member for Frome into, caused one lady who was in my house to cry. She is a business operator—and I am grateful for her support, too—but she was quite tearful, not, I think, for my personal situation, but for what the impact would be on South Australia. She is not normally a politically biased person that much either, so it was interesting to see that.

In the days that followed, there were very mixed emotions for me. There was still a significant level of optimism that existed but also the recognition that, within 10 minutes seemingly, a decision could have been made that would have a result that I did not want to see occur.

On the Sunday, when the press conference was called and the member for Frome and the now, as we understand, the Premier jointly presented the fact that the member for Frome had chosen to support the Labor Party, I was actually driving to a community event at Dublin from my home, so I was about one hour and 10 minutes away. I got to Port Wakefield, and it was on the radio, and I just had to stop, turn around and go home because I needed a hug from someone who loved me.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: It wasn't going to be anyone in your car.

Mr GRIFFITHS: And I was by myself, member for Newland.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Phone a friend.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Well, I did do that. I did phone a friend, Deputy Speaker.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: I was on the Yorke Peninsula that weekend. I could have given you a hug.

Mr GRIFFITHS: You had better reason than I, member for Newland. My wife and I had been speaking while we were listening to the radio. She was watching it on television, and I just had to turn around. I just walked in the door and had to have a hug because what I had hoped to have been an opportunity to do for South Australians what I had been desperate to do for a long time was lost.

I recognise the member for Frome is in here, and I am respectful of the fact that he was put in an extremely difficult situation—I understand that—but I have to say that the events of that day had a profound impact upon me and made me, indeed, think about what the future is going to be for all of us.

For those on the right-hand side of your chair, Deputy Speaker, it was probably an unexpected result to some degree. I can understand the sense of jubilation that existed with them and the opportunity that it presented to them, but, wow, it shows that the competitive nature that exists in politics can bring out the best and the worst in people, just in the emotions they go through in what they want to do, the challenges presented to them and the capacity for them to achieve. So I, sadly, as it stands, have to be to your left side, Deputy Speaker, while I am in this chamber.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Left is good.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes. While it is a great honour to do what we do as an opposition member of parliament, it is still not a patch on the opportunity that presents itself if you sit on the other side. So, that is what I still believe in. It will be achieved one day. You have to be an optimist otherwise you would go out and do terrible things to yourself, I think.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Some people do.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Sadly, they do. Again, I just want to confirm the fact that I have been extremely grateful for a long time for the tremendous support from the Liberal members in the Goyder electorate.

I also recognise what has occurred to the member for Fisher and the emotion that existed on the opening day. Seeing him in a quite tearful situation, I think, when he first came into the chamber, and respecting the fact that he has been here since 1989 and has committed 25 years of his life to this place and the people of South Australia, and to know what he and his family are going through and the continuing challenges that presents, I commend him on the fact that he was here for that day, commend him for the strength of character that he shows and commend him on all that he has done when he has been in this parliament.

I think he is a bit of a doyen of a man who, in so many areas, has stood up for what he believes in, has consulted with his community and has tried to ensure that the outcomes are positive all the time. It is an example that all of us should observe and try to replicate.

I am pleased that the member for Frome, now as the minister for regional development and local government, has continuously put the fact that he will be there for the regions. It is interesting that the member for Giles in his speech also focused on the metrocentric attitude of, to quote him, both Liberal and Labor when it came to governance.

I think there is a great opportunity to respect the fact that 20 per cent of our population, but 50 per cent of our revenue opportunity for this state, comes from regional South Australia, and I hope in the shadow portfolio that I have with the two areas that the minister has that there is a great chance to work together for positive outcomes.

There is a bipartisan opportunity that presents itself in a rather unique place now where there is due consideration to be given to every issue. It puts the member for Frome in a very challenging role, it is fair to say, where you would focus on your portfolio areas, but now there will be a demand from people all around the state for you to have an involvement in everything, absolutely everything, far beyond and removed from your portfolio, that exists in a regional community, and they will want you to actually have an active involvement.

It will be a very delicate balancing of time and your capacity to actually understand all these issues and to have an impact upon the decisions that are made regarding them. I have known the member for some time. I believe him in my heart to be an honest man with integrity and I hope that the relationship that we have and that he has with all members of this place—all 68 other members of parliament—will be a positive one.

I am pleased indeed that the member for Frome, as part of the arrangement that he has with the Premier, has picked up on quite a few of the policies that we took very strongly to the last election too, with regional development funding and additional dollars for infrastructure and that he will continue to work on the \$10 million for the accelerator that he talks about and the \$39 million package in the first year. I am so pleased about that.

I must say that listening to the maiden speeches of new members has been very humbling also, because the level of capacity that exists within those people is outstanding, absolutely outstanding. They are all articulate and come from very diverse backgrounds; there is no doubt about that, but they have a capacity to craft their story. Now, I do not know if they have been working on their maiden speeches for months, but it appears that way. It is not just a rushed job for these people. They have actually thought very seriously about why they wanted to get here, what they intend to do while they are here, and the communities in which they have been given the honour to represent, so I commend all of them.

It is enlightening to sit here and, while you have a perspective on someone else who seeks the opportunity to be a member of parliament and you hear stories about them, it is not until you have the opportunity to sit down here and listen to the 25 to 44 minute speeches that are occurring that you do truly understand what makes up that person. I have learnt a lot and I am looking forward to hearing the other maiden speeches that are about to be presented too, because in some ways it has changed my thoughts on what sort of people they were.

I do respect that there is a particular bent in some of the statements that are made, but in the absolute majority of them there is a complete focus on what they want to do for their people, and that is why we should all be here, because parliament should attract the absolute best. I have had a frustration for a long time that, instead of the yelling and screaming that occurs, there should be the opportunity to debate stuff, and I hope that is the way that the Minister for Regional Development and I will do things.

Yes, there will be questions that are asked in parliament and yes, there will be a desire to try and get a question up that the minister does not actually have an answer for, but there is an opportunity to sit down rationally, talk about things, and come up with a solution and that is what all of us should try to do. So, future generations who have got the opportunity to be in this place, please focus on that. I want to commend the member for Dunstan on his performance as Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Gardner: Hear, hear!

Mr GRIFFITHS: It might have only had a relatively small level of support there, because most of my colleagues are listening to a member in another house give a maiden speech.

Mr Picton: I supported the mention of the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Well done! If I may use his name, Steven Marshall I think was outstanding in his first term, being elected in 2010. I spoke at a fundraising event in early 2010 when he was seeking to get the resources he needed to be elected for the first time, and I said with all sincerity that I was glad that I came in early, but he has just leapfrogged over everybody because of the work commitment that he has, the capacity that he has, the networking that he does, and his ability to understand an issue really quickly and to just articulate it so well.

Political times represent great challenges, no doubt, but I commend the member for Dunstan on everything that he did. No person is perfect, but God I am glad it was him and not me anyway, I have got to say that. He will be an excellent leader, and has proven that—

Mr Gardner: And an excellent premier.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Indeed, and I believe he will be a premier one day. There is no doubt about it. He has the persona not of a man who was born to it, but of one who has worked for it. I truly believe that. Through what he has done in his private life, with his family situation, and in his professional life he has developed the skillset that I believe will put South Australia in a great place.

There is no doubt that economic challenges for South Australia are rather high. Indeed, a lot of the policy work that the Liberal Party announced prior to the 2014 election was focused on cost of living pressures, and that has to be what we have to try to address. I am sure that the community contacts all members in this place on a very regular basis expressing concern about their capacity to pay the next bill. It is not being able to give them an answer for that, even though you can provide them with the history of it and the reasons for it in some cases, and be sympathetic towards them. They walk out of your office or finish the telephone conversation with you and you know that they still have to go through the same dilemma of where they will get the cash from to pay the bill.

That is what we have to try to govern for, what we have to try to fix. We have to try to ensure that we have a vibrant economy that provides the capacity for well-paid work and a level of servicing that allows our families to live comfortably. They will still work hard, absolutely, but work hard with a reward opportunity for the effort they put in. I think that will be a driver of policy work for a long time. Yes, there are great ideas out there and you can spend an enormous amount of money, but you have to pay for it, and paying for it comes out of the pockets of the 1.6 million people who live in South Australia. That will be the challenge for us, not just over the next three years and 10 months but in the long term for South Australians.

I listened quite intently to the member for Bright's maiden speech yesterday. I thought he did a great job, and I was particularly interested in his comments about the Public Service. I know it is 100,000 people or thereabouts in number, and that represents about one in every eight people who work in South Australia. They work for us, for all South Australians. There are great people, there is absolutely no doubt about that, but when the member focused on words about some low levels of morale, concerns about political interference, and that they need greater leadership in there, it really brought it home to me. That is someone who has worked at the coalface up until election day, basically.

I think there is an important message that can be delivered from the member for Bright's contribution on that aspect, and it is one that I hope all sides of parliament listen to. I have long held the belief that the Public Service has to be there with a positive attitude; it has to work out how it can say yes instead of saying no, and it has to challenge itself. That is at all levels, including local government that I used to work in and that I now have portfolio responsibility for from a shadow perspective.

From a Public Service point of view, there are great demands upon them, absolutely, and I understand that. There is a very high level of community expectation, and I do not retract from that either, because people deserve the best, but it has to be positiveness that comes from it. I look forward to what the member for Port Adelaide, who has portfolio responsibility for Public Service areas, will be able to do. It will be a challenge for her, but good luck with that.

I want to sincerely thank my staff who work for me in the Goyder electoral office. None of us in this place can do what we would like to do unless we have people who work extremely hard behind us. In my case I am blessed with the fact that they are loyal to me. I hope I am friends with all of them, and I respect them as individuals, and what they do collectively as individuals, enormously. I hope to have their support for a long time, and I am sure that will be the case. I would like to put on the record my sincere thanks for what they have done for me in the last eight years. Of the variety of people who have worked for me, some have gone on to other opportunities, but those who are with me now and those who will be with me in the future, thank you very much.

I listened intently to the member for Davenport and his comments about electoral reform. I know that the member for Colton had some concerns about that. It puts a very interesting perspective on it. When I was elected to this place I shook my head in frustration at the fact that I had joined a political party and become a member of parliament for the Liberal party when it had only won three elections out of the last 12, I think. The situation has not improved since, sadly.

The member for Davenport, by virtue of his experience and, indeed, the research he has done in this area, presents, I think, a very valid argument that needs to be listened to. I listened to part of it on radio this morning and have read some of the papers that he has produced on it. It is worthy of consideration because I truly believe that it reflects the questions that are posed to us about the seemingly inconsistent level of total support that exists versus the eventual result. I understand the numbers and I understand it is dependent upon who wins the majority of the 47 seats—I completely appreciate that. But I have tried to rationalise the member for Davenport's argument down to the fact that it is based upon the level of support that exists from all South Australians. So, it will be an interesting debate that occurs in future years about that and to see what occurs.

I want to sincerely thank my family. I mentioned at the very start that eight days after the election I needed to go home and get a hug from Donna because I was desperate to be with someone I loved—but they have always been there for me. Indeed, a lot of sacrifices have been made too. Anybody who is in here appreciates the fact that you are often separated from your family at times that you do not want to be, but to have this opportunity is a sacrifice that has to be made. I am blessed, indeed, that in April of this year, Donna and I celebrated 26 years of wedded bliss (I hope)—

much better than last year when I could not be with her because parliament was sitting. So, being a regional member creates that problem.

The Hon. P. Caica: We would have given you a pair, Steven!

Mr GRIFFITHS: The member for Colton mentions he would have given me a pair. We made an agreement—

Mr Gardner: Through me!

Mr GRIFFITHS: Through the member for Morialta, of course! But it is the level of support that I am grateful for, predominantly from my wife, my son and my daughter, but also the extended family support me and to them I say a sincere 'thank you'.

I will shamelessly advertise the fact that there is a great day of pride for my family next year when my son, Tyler, will marry his wonderful fiancée, Katie. They have been together for nine years and 10½ months. They will be married on their 10th anniversary of starting to go out. Tyler was 15 and Katie was 17 when the romance started, but gee they are good people. We all want to be proud of our kids, but I am so proud of both my son and daughter and indeed the partners that they have in life. I know they have made great choices and I know their lives together will be wonderful and I hope that I live long enough to actually see the fulfilment of that and have the opportunity to hold grandchildren—that's for sure.

I want to pay respect to the candidates who stood against me in Goyder too, particularly Elyse Ramsay. I think we have worked out that Elyse is a third cousin to my wife and is from a farming family in Warooka where my wife's family is from too. So, there was a bit of shock-horror amongst us that a very nice young girl was running for the Labor Party. I have never actually met Elyse, though I have met her dad, but can I say that I was so pleased that on election night, when the result was known locally, Elyse rang me. In 2006 and 2010 that level of contact did not occur.

I think Elyse is a great kid and I do not mean that disrespectfully—she is younger, but I wish her well in the future and I sincerely did appreciate the telephone call from her. I also recognise that Goyder had five or six candidates—one of the highest numbers in the state. We had a National Party candidate and an Independent, and it is interesting that the Independent—

Mr Gardner: All vanquished.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, all vanquished! The Independent who, it is fair to say, campaigned at a very low level and was not of a major political party, did not put up corflutes, did not have anyone handing out how-to-vote cards on the Saturday, yet got 5.1 per cent of the vote. He is 64 and I do not think he intends to run again (which makes me glad, I must admit) but it shows that for all political parties there is an increasing number of people who actually want something different.

So, either we have to demonstrate something different, if we represent one of the major parties, or we run the risk of somebody coming up through the middle all the time. For me it was a bit of an eye opener of what could potentially occur in the future. It shows, as with the member of Frome when he stood as an Independent with a public profile—particularly with a public profile and a level of very strong support from the largest communities in the Frome electorate—that anything can happen.

For all those candidates in the Goyder electorate, I commend them on the fact that they were prepared to be involved in democracy. As much as I get frustrated by the results of democracy, sometimes, I have to rationalise my sanity against the fact that the people get it right. Without that, I think I would turn my toes up. Well done to all of them, and I hope that Elyse has a great future, too.

Goyder is a wonderful part of South Australia, and I have lived there for 40 of my 52 years. It is part of my DNA and it is where I hope to live out my last days. It is where my home will always be and it is where I intend to spend the majority of my time holidaying, too, because I just love being there. Goyder has some particular challenges occurring at the moment. The member for Giles referred to alternative energy systems. A 197-turbine wind farm was approved three days before the writs were issued and over the last 18 months it is fair to say that has created enormous divisions within sections of the community.

It saddens me immensely that, particularly in the Curramulka area—a small town with a great past and, I hope, a very strong future—it has created tensions within lifelong friendships that I do not think will ever be repaired. There are those who are for it and, in some cases, hosting turbines, and those who are against it, and there will never be any movement in the position they hold. So we wait with bated breath about what will occur as a result of that approval. I hope, for the long-term future of the community, that there is a return to the connection that they have felt forever with people.

Mining, which the member for Giles also referred to, is very strongly at the forefront in Goyder at the moment. Just south-west of Ardrossan is the Rex Minerals proposal. If approval is granted and it is developed to what is envisaged, it will cover 3,000 hectares in the mine site and the overburden pits that will be established. That is 3,000 hectares in what is one of the best agricultural areas in the state and, certainly, in Australia, and that has caused a lot of concern for not only people who live close but also those who holiday close or have holiday homes and the people concerned about the impact it will have on those around it.

It has been a very delicate, not balancing act but, time of trying to demonstrate that there are two sides. There is a development opportunity that provides 600 mining jobs in the long-term and there is a concern for the operations of those who live and work close by to it. A decision does need to be made. I do believe that Rex Minerals has been quite a responsible corporate citizen when it came to community engagement.

A consultation group has existed for some time and, indeed, the consultation group has been quite independent when forming its positions. It has not been biased around what Rex Minerals the company has said: it has been biased around what the community has been asking it to say and what the evidence has proven. It will be a challenging time and a decision will probably be made in the next two or three weeks or month, and it will be interesting to see how it goes.

Deputy Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity and wish all of us here the best of times until March of 2018. I know the relationship will be challenging sometimes. There will be good times and bad times, there will be emotional times and exciting times. No doubt, the debate across the chamber will be spirited. I hope it is in the best of ways, though, where the focus is on what the people of South Australia truly need. Long live the rights of South Australians and long may they be preserved in this place and be the focus of every good thing that occurs here and the future of this great state.

Time expired.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

Adjournment Debate

PARLIAMENTARY BEHAVIOUR

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:30): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. If I failed to do so before, then I am very pleased to congratulate you on your meteoric rise to the position of honour and distinction which you now hold. It is in this vein that I wish to comment a little bit upon the way in which we conduct ourselves in this parliament and will continue to do so in the months and years ahead under your stewardship and particularly that of the Speaker, who I also recognise, the member for Croydon, who continues in that role.

I think that members of the public come to expect a certain poor level of behaviour by members of parliament and what some call the political class. I think that there are endeavours in this chamber—and I recognise that certainly some moves by the government have led to this. There is certainly a will, I know, from the Leader of the Opposition and members of our team to contribute, and I think that there is certainly a level of engagement that the Speaker has entered into that is going to hopefully give rise to a better than might be seen by many in the public level of conduct in this place.

When the Premier came to the position that he now holds, he promised that a level of civil discourse would be offered to the people of South Australia. He identified that the way in which we conduct ourselves should reflect the aspirations of the people of South Australia. Treating each other civilly is a part of that. Can I identify that ministers, when they go into members' electorates (I know some ministers do this and sometimes some ministers do this in certain electorates) should in fact identify that they are coming so that the local member can be involved. I think that is what local communities would ideally want to see.

I think that in this chamber the way we conduct ourselves is important too. There will certainly be opportunities for robust debate, and these things take their turn, as may be appropriate. When ministers make a political point they naturally expect that there will be a level of frustration or disquiet from the opposition. When ministers refuse to answer a question, that naturally takes its course, too. When a minister is giving, as the Premier described a couple of years ago, a serious response to a serious question I think that this chamber has by and large listened to ministers who offer to do that.

So, I say to the ministers in this place that they have the opportunity to fulfil the words that the Premier brought to us when he was elected to that position by the Labor caucus. It is up to you how you do it, but if you conduct yourselves in this hung parliament, this minority government, as serious ministers who are going to act in the best interests of South Australians, and not take political cheap shots when there is absolutely no call to do so, and work with local members in their communities, then having provided that respect you will be given such respect. However, when ministers conduct themselves appallingly, as sometimes happens, then the opposition will call them to account, and I do not think that should be unexpected.

This week has been an interesting week. I think for the most part it has been impressive to hear the new members speak. I hope that we will set a standard that they will contribute to. I think that by and large especially the new members on the Liberal side have conducted themselves very well and will make a terrific contribution. But I do just put on the record that the opportunity exists for the ministers to conduct themselves well, to conduct themselves better than in the last parliament.

When I was elected four years ago it was quite clear that there was an us and them mentality that could never be breached by the leadership as it was then. For the people in the top three seats, as they were, their first instinct was always to attack anybody who put their head up to talk, to ask a question, to raise an issue, to offer robust debate. The plan was clearly to whack it down whenever that was put forward. I think there has been a level of improvement since that time, and I think there is some way to go. Time will tell how that plays out.

At 17:35 the house adjourned until Tuesday 20 May 2014 at 14:00.