

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday 13 May 2010

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Mineral Resources Development (Hon. P. Holloway)—

Operation of the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007—
Report, November 2009

By the Minister for State/Local Government Relations (Hon. G.E. Gago)—

The Commissioners of Charitable Funds—Report, 2008-09

QUESTION TIME

ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the City of Adelaide a question in relation to the Adelaide Oval redevelopment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: This morning on radio treasurer Foley made a number of extensive comments in relation to the redevelopment of Adelaide Oval and the wider precinct that the government is now talking about. At one point he said that we need to look at the whole area either side of the river as one precinct and ascertain how we can interface and maximise this opportunity for a great entertainment precinct for Adelaide. He went on later to say:

The point I'm making is that we've have maintained that \$450 million for the upgrade of Adelaide [Oval] but it is a larger precinct. You've got areas that are not impacting on the existing footprint of the Adelaide Oval.

My question is: will the minister define the boundaries of the Adelaide Oval precinct as proposed to be managed by the controlling authority?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:20): I thank the honourable member for his important question. This is a government of great vision for this state. We have a number of important plans for developments and redevelopments that will put Adelaide right up there on the map. The Adelaide Oval proposal is one of many proposals: the Riverside redevelopment precinct; Victoria Square, which we spoke about yesterday; and the Thebarton urban forest. As I said, we have many plans.

Those developments are still under consideration and are still being worked on; the details have not been completed. The minister responsible for negotiating and working through those details is the Deputy Premier, Kevin Foley—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Something like that, yes. Negotiations finish at about the end of July, so these matters are still being developed and are still under consideration, and they are matters the Deputy Premier and Treasurer is taking responsibility for.

ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): I have a supplementary question. Are you advising this council that, as Minister for the City of Adelaide, you have not been advised on the extent or size of the footprint of the precinct proposed for the Adelaide Oval redevelopment?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises,

Minister for the City of Adelaide (14:21): I have answered the question. I have said that these matters are still under consideration, they are still under development, and negotiations are still taking place. When the plans have been finalised, all will be revealed.

ADELAIDE OVAL

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): I have a further supplementary. Has the minister been advised of the size of the footprint of the precinct proposed for the Adelaide Oval redevelopment?

The PRESIDENT: The original question.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:21): For the third time—and I am happy to waste the time of this chamber if the honourable member keeps insisting on it—these matters are still under consideration, they are still being developed, and there are a number of discussions taking place with a number of different parties.

It would be most inappropriate for details to be released at this point, prior to the completion of this most important project. I can reassure South Australians that it will be something they can be proud of. It will really put South Australia on the map, and it will be something South Australians can be incredibly proud of. It will be quite visionary for this state and, as I said, it is just one of many development proposals underway to give this city a real facelift and something we can all be proud of.

RESPONSIBLE ALCOHOL SERVICE

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:22): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Consumer Affairs a question relating to the responsible service of alcohol.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: In October 2009, in consideration of the Liquor Licensing (Producers, Responsible Service and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2009, the Hon. Ann Bressington and members of the opposition raised concerns about the impact of the responsible service of alcohol regulation on people with disabilities. People with neurological conditions, brain injury, some people with an intellectual disability, and others, can be mistakenly perceived as being intoxicated. People with disability should not have their opportunities for social interaction curtailed by poorly implemented measures to address public intoxication. In response to the concerns raised the minister said:

These matters, we intend, will be dealt with in the development of the code of practice, and we hope that that will outline training requirements for industry staff, amongst other things. It is my intention that this training, as well as a new fact sheet, will be developed by the Office of Liquor and Gambling. That will further assist people to differentiate between someone who is intoxicated and someone who could be suffering from a disability.

The new regime the minister was referring to was implemented on 3 May 2010. My questions are:

1. Given the minister's commitments, why is the code of practice on the Office of Liquor and Gambling website still a 2006 edition and does not include a single reference to people with disability?
2. Why does the website not carry a fact sheet on discerning intoxication, as the minister promised?
3. Given the minister's commitments and her recognition of the need for staff training, why was the new regime launched on 3 May 2010 when the *Responsible Service of Alcohol Handbook* is not available on the website intended to support liquor industry workers to differentiate between intoxicated people and people with disability?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:25): As I have outlined in this chamber previously, the code of conduct is being reviewed. The former attorney-general and I announced a liquor licensing review last year, at which time we said that we would look at those elements of legislation and other practices to combat alcohol-fuelled crime. We announced at the time our desire to look at the powers of the police as well as the powers of the commissioner. We have started work on reviewing the code of conduct, and we have now placed the completion of that work within that

review process, because it would be quite silly to be conducting one review and completing our code of conduct separately, given that they would be assessing similar matters.

I announced at the time that we would be looking at things such as trading hours, the advertising of happy hours and the number of shots that could be bought in a single serve. We said that we would look at a whole range of initiatives, and put out for public consideration and discussion an extensive review of practices to address the problem of alcohol-fuelled crime, particularly as it pertains to our entertainment districts. We know that is an issue of concern. People say all the time that they are sick and tired of having their night out spoiled by people who have consumed too much alcohol and made a real nuisance of themselves, and, even worse than that, end up in fights and all sorts of things.

So, we have undertaken that review. The code of conduct, as I have said, is now part of that review process, and that will be completed and consulted on within that framework. Members would be aware that changes to liquor licensing legislation were passed fairly recently, and they were implemented at the beginning of this month. At that time, we released intoxication guidelines for licensees, bar staff and patrons, and we also produced an edition that was in plain English in order to make clear and simple the changes to be implemented. It looked at issues around the new description of intoxication, the responsibilities of bar staff and licensees, and the introduction of the new provision whereby a mate or a patron in licensed premises would be in breach if they attempted to buy alcohol for, or supply it to, an intoxicated friend on licensed premises. It pointed out that, under these new provisions, a licensee was able to remove both that patron and also the intoxicated person.

Within those guidelines we looked at the issue of intoxication, and we also made it very clear that, when a person is assessing intoxication, they must consider the circumstances of that person and consider other conditions that might mimic intoxication, and there are a list of matters for bar staff to consider. So, the guidelines draw to their attention that there are conditions that mimic intoxication. It also states that, when a bar staff member or a licensee or licence holder is making the assessment as to whether or not a person is intoxicated, they must consider these matters. In fact, when we developed these intoxication guidelines, we made sure that we consulted with Disability SA, and I think we also put it out to the Brain Injury Association for consideration. We also requested one other disability group to consider the guidelines. Generally, they supported the guidelines and thought that they covered the issue of those conditions that mimicked intoxication.

I would be most surprised if these intoxication guidelines are not on the website. However, I will double-check that and, if they are not on the website, I will make sure that they are available. I can say that these guidelines have been distributed extensively throughout the industry, so staff members are well aware of the new provisions and the considerations they are now required to make.

RESPONSIBLE ALCOHOL SERVICE

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:30): The minister refers to fact sheets. What about the responsible service of alcohol? When will that be posted, and when will the code of practice be posted?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:31): I am not too sure what the member is referring to in terms of the responsible service of alcohol. The intoxication guidelines go to the issue of responsible service of alcohol. It outlines what the requirements are of the licence holder, people selling and supplying liquor, patrons, etc. So those matters are addressed within the guidelines.

There is training and education around the responsible service of alcohol that we are also in discussion with the industry about. We are considering mandating the requirement for training for anyone involved in the supply or selling of liquor. That is still under discussion, but there is strong support. I have to say that the industry has been very responsible and very supportive of moving to a mandatory system, so that is well underway.

In terms of the code of conduct itself, as I have said, it has now been incorporated into the review process. A discussion paper is near completion, and that will be available to go out for broad public consultation very shortly.

VICTORIA SQUARE

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the City of Adelaide a question about Victoria Square.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: The Hon. Michelle Lensink asked the minister a question about the costing of Victoria Square yesterday, and the minister responded that the total cost is estimated at about \$100 million. This is obviously a significant and important project to Adelaide and for South Australia. In the past, the media have reported that the government has not been sensitive to all the stakeholders when it comes to consultation with the public about major projects.

When it comes to Victoria Square—which has been marked by the government as an exciting concept—if this project were to go ahead, it would no doubt change the landscape of Victoria Square forever. It would have a huge impact for all those who come to the city and it would also impact on hundreds of businesses within Adelaide, as well as all the traders and small businesses within the Central Market and the Chinatown precinct.

I am aware that many small business owners and traders are from a non-English speaking background and that they may not be aware of what has been proposed for Victoria Square. The development may significantly impact on their livelihood or business viability if they do not fully understand what has been proposed by the government. My questions are:

1. If the government is seriously seeking views and encouraging all South Australians to take part in the master plan consultation for Victoria Square, why is the closing date for consultations set for 7 June 2010?

2. Does the minister believe that the short time frame is sufficient for public consultation, given that this is considered a major project for the city?

3. Has the minister considered a different consultation format for small businesses and traders in the area to ensure that their views will be heard and that this group of stakeholders will not be disadvantaged?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:34): I thank the honourable member for her most important question and her interest in these important matters. Indeed, as I said previously, the developments that this government has in mind and is looking to support are many, and they are visionary for this state. Hopefully, these are developments that we can be very proud of.

We have seen attempts to revitalise Victoria Square over a number of decades but, unfortunately, those attempts have failed for a wide range of reasons. At present, the Adelaide City Council has put forward a master plan. The honourable member needs to understand that this is not a state government master plan; this is an Adelaide City Council master plan.

It is a project that is owned and managed by Adelaide City Council. It is not a state government project. It is a project where, obviously, the Adelaide City Council will be looking for support, and it will require support to be able to bring it to fruition. No doubt the state government will be requested to support it, as we have already, and we have indicated a \$2 million contribution to date, which I have already talked about in this place.

The consultation process is one that the Adelaide City Council has formulated and is conducting, it is the Adelaide City Council that will collate the responses, and it is the Adelaide City Council that will then use that information in the way it sees fit to modify or amend and feed into its master plan.

If any member in this place or the other place, or a member of the public, believes that the consultation period of, I think, a month is too short, then they should raise that directly with the Adelaide City Council. I understand that the Adelaide City Council has put in place an online process of information and consultation. I understand there is a model you can go into and move around to see the proposed changes. I understand there is also online provision for feedback.

If people require assistance they can go to the council and obtain maps and plans to look at and explanations, if required, and they can put forward submissions or comments in writing if they do not want to use online facilities. I believe that the council has gone to some lengths to

accommodate the different preferred styles people may have in submitting their views and obtaining information

As I said, this is a project that belongs to and is in the control of the Adelaide City Council, and the consultation is their process. If anyone believes that is inadequate, they should raise that with the Adelaide City Council, and I think that is a fair and reasonable thing to do.

BRICKWORKS MARKETS

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Urban Development and Planning. Will the minister advise the council of any progress on the proposal of the City of West Torrens to revitalise the historic Brickworks Markets?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (14:38): I thank the honourable member for his timely question. Established in 1983, the Brickworks Markets have developed into one of Adelaide's most popular weekend markets. Built around the historic and heritage listed Hallett brickworks and the Hoffman kiln, these markets weekly draw South Australians to its collection of stalls and specialty shops.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink interjecting:

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: Perhaps the honourable member can come out and say something about the heritage of people in the City of Adelaide. Why doesn't the honourable member come out and say something about what she thinks about those residents in the City of Adelaide who are going through their heritage plan at the moment? Do you support those who say their heritage places shouldn't be listed or not?

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: I am very pro heritage.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: I see, so you think they are wrong. You are telling them they are all wrong, are you? If the honourable member wants to talk about heritage, I am happy to do so. What this government stands for is a balanced approach to heritage. I could have sworn that the Leader of the Opposition in the other place during the election campaign was talking about getting a can-do government and talking up the prospects of development in the city. Then the deputy leader up here apparently is saying that everything should be on heritage lists. No wonder members opposite seem to have a lot of difficulty in working out what they stand for. Certainly the people of this state did. They are all over the place.

What we are talking about in this question, to get back to it, are the important, heritage listed Hallett brickworks and the Hoffman kiln, and, contrary to what might be suggested, I do believe that these are wonderful and appropriate examples of heritage within this state.

The markets weekly draw South Australians to their collection of stalls and specialty shops. However, the economic potential of this major landholding has been held back by the previous zoning, which limited its use as a weekend market. I am pleased to say that the future of the Brickworks Markets at Torrensville is now looking more secure. Following an exhaustive consultation process, I have today approved for gazettal a development plan amendment for the site at Torrensville. The rezoning of the historic Brickworks Markets, initiated by the City of West Torrens, aims to create a revitalised market precinct at the site.

Between 1910 and 1979 the site was used for brick making by J. Hallett & Sons. The key remnant of the site's former use—the kiln and chimney on site constructed in 1912—is one of only two Hoffman kilns remaining in South Australia. Listed as a state heritage place, these structures provide a landmark for this well-patronised market. As members would be aware, the Brickworks Markets are strategically located close to key transport routes, the Adelaide CBD, the Thebarton Biotech Precinct, existing industrial activities and the River Torrens Linear Park.

The Brickworks Markets development plan amendment was initiated by the City of West Torrens in 2006 due to concerns that the economic potential of this strategic landholding was being severely limited. I am advised that, at that time, a number of market stallholders reported difficult trading conditions and approached the council for revitalisation of the site to improve trading conditions.

The revitalisation of the Brickworks Markets required the rezoning of this precinct, which was predominantly a commercial recreation zone along with a narrow western allotment contained

within an industry zone. The provisions of the commercial recreation zone did not provide any real scope for diversification and alternate commercial development on the site.

On 16 December last year, the City of West Torrens lodged the Brickworks Markets Precinct Development Plan Amendment for approval in accordance with section 25(14) of the Development Act 1993. The City of West Torrens resubmitted this DPA on 14 January this year with minor amendments as requested by the Department of Planning and Local Government.

This rezoning and the potential redevelopment of the site will ensure that the iconic market remains economically viable. The area around the 6.5 hectare site has been rezoned to accommodate a discount department store, supermarket and specialty shops, offices, a health centre, educational and community facilities, and high density residential accommodation.

The amended development plan also ensures that the heritage listed chimney and kiln are retained as a focal point for the redevelopment around the site. As part of the future development, vehicle access to the site will be from an upgraded Ashwin Parade, which aims to limit the impact of increased traffic flows on South Road.

Initiation of this development plan amendment followed the removal of a community land classification carried out through a separate process undertaken by the then minister for State/Local Government Relations. This process ensured that a 60 metre corridor adjacent to the River Torrens was protected from the revocation of the community land classification.

I am pleased to advise members that the decision to amend the development plan initiated by the City of West Torrens is supported by traders at the Brickworks Markets and the local community. I am confident that the Brickworks Markets redevelopment will provide a catalyst to revitalise the site as a vibrant and exciting commercial precinct that underpins the continued success of market stallholders.

HEARING LOOPS

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:44): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for State/Local Government Relations, representing the Minister for Disability, a question regarding hearing loops in government buildings.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: Hearing loops are important devices which promote hearing assistance to people with hearing aids and, in turn, promote their social and intellectual inclusion and wellbeing. I note that a hearing loop has been installed recently in this place—and I congratulate the powers that be on this. I understand that government buildings support the use of hearing loops. My questions are:

1. How many state government buildings are currently equipped with hearing loops in South Australia?
2. How many of these hearing loops are currently functioning?
3. What routine maintenance, if any, is in place in state government buildings to ensure that hearing loops are maintained effectively?
4. If hearing loops within state government buildings are not functioning, when will these devices be fixed?
5. Does the state government have any plans to extend the provision of hearing loops in state government buildings? If so, which buildings are these?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her most important questions on hearing loops. I will pass those questions on to the Minister for Disability in another place and bring back a response.

WOMEN'S INFORMATION SERVICE

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO (14:46): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women a question about the Women's Information Service.

Leave granted.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: The Women's Information Service (WIS) is a free information referral and support service for the women of South Australia. Assistance is provided in person, over the telephone, through email and on the internet. The service also has an active volunteer program, including the Family Court Support Program. Will the minister provide the chamber with more information about the work volunteers do for the Women's Information Service?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:46): National Volunteer Week runs from 10 to 16 May. I understand that it is the largest celebration of volunteers and volunteerism in Australia and provides an opportunity to highlight the role of volunteers in our communities. It is there to say thank you to more than 15 million Australians who volunteer.

I am pleased to inform members that the Family Court Support Program run by the Women's Information Service recently celebrated its 200th case, commencing in 2006. The volunteer program supports women attending the Family Court and the Federal Magistrates Court. This is a really good example of what a fantastic job volunteers do in our community.

The dedicated court support team provides personal support for women at a time of tremendous difficulty. It can also be a very emotional time in their life. Volunteers in this program support women, providing them with confidential emotional support, as well as practical support by explaining court processes and asking questions of solicitors and court personnel. The volunteers can also help with accessing essential services for women, such as secure accommodation, interpreters and child care.

Women travel from all around South Australia to the Family Court in Adelaide. They are often in unfamiliar surroundings and lack the support of family and friends back home. These friendly, reliable volunteers assist women to have the strength and courage to go on.

The Women's Information Service offers assistance and advice on a range of health and wellbeing matters. More than 30 volunteers help around 20,000 women every year at the Women's Information Service in Grenfell Street. The service also provides a telephone link-up for women in regional areas who are able to call toll free and be connected to any Adelaide-based service relating to their health and wellbeing. I urge members to promote the Women's Information Service and encourage women to be volunteers.

BURNSIDE COUNCIL

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:49): My question is to the Minister for State/Local Government Relations concerning Mr Ken MacPherson's investigation into the Burnside council. Does the minister and/or her staff receive regular or irregular briefings with updates on the current status of the investigation, including costs? If so, how often do these briefings occur, who attends and when was the last one?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:50): In relation to briefings from the investigator, the investigator does not brief me on his investigation. He is at complete arm's length from the government. He is following the investigation as per the terms of reference handed to him and the contractual agreements that were entered into at the time in terms of his fee for service. I have already indicated that, in relation to those fees (which are already on public record), I will bring back those details and provide them to this place. In relation to the matters such as the extension to his contract, he raised the request for an extension with me in writing, outlining his reasons why, and I responded.

In relation to general matters such as how the investigation is progressing—and again, in the most general way, there is no detail or content in relation to the investigation itself—things such as the issue around entering the natural justice part of the process were passed on to me via the agency; that is, he had commenced preparations and was about to enter that phase. That is simply general information that the agency would pass on to me, but I have no direct briefings or conversations with Ken MacPherson about the inquiry whatsoever. He is completely independent to conduct it in the way he sees fit and, as I said, those matters are on the record already.

BURNSIDE COUNCIL

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:52): Mr President, I have a supplementary question. If the minister and her office do not receive briefings from investigator MacPherson, how was

The Advertiser able to report that her office advised them that the natural justice period has commenced?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:52): I would suggest that he ask *The Advertiser*. How on earth would I know? That is information gained from *The Advertiser*. Ask *The Advertiser*.

BUILDING INDEMNITY INSURANCE

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:53): I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Minister for Consumer Affairs a question on the subject of building indemnity insurance.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: In a media release on 25 July last year, the minister stated:

OCBA had received 87 complaints about home renovations so far this year, compared with 65 complaints received over the same period last year...there have been some complaints involving many thousands of dollars of work but no indemnity insurance for the consumer to claim against.

In April last year, in response to a question in this place, the minister stated that OCBA had been working on a discussion paper, including options to deal with issues surrounding indemnity insurance, but that 'the review has since been overtaken by the Council of Australian Governments' decision in July 2008 to pursue a national trade licensing system'.

Building indemnity insurance (known as home warranty insurance in other parts of Australia) has also been tagged as 'junk insurance' by the Australian Consumers Association, and concerns have been raised by industry groups like the Master Builders Association and the Builders Collective. It is a low risk product for insurers, being a last resort scheme for consumers, and has a rejection rate of some extraordinary 45 per cent of claims made—and that is Australia-wide. My questions are:

1. Will the minister provide an update on the national trade licensing system?
2. What decision has been agreed to in relation to building indemnity insurance by COAG or the relevant ministerial council?
3. What are OCBA's options for dealing with the rise in complaints against builders?
4. Does the minister consider this rise in complaints as an emerging trend and what does she intend doing to address it?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for her important questions. The national licensing scheme is being progressed under the COAG agenda to simplify licensing for selected occupations. Once a licence is issued, the licence holder will obviously then be able to use that licence to work anywhere in Australia without additional paperwork costs. COAG has agreed that a national licensing initiative be applied not only to building but also to electrical, plumbing, gasfitting, air conditioning, refrigeration and other occupations. Over the past two years the commonwealth, states and territories have worked collaboratively with industry and occupational regulators to improve that current system of mutual recognition of licences for a number of occupations.

However, under mutual recognition, licence holders in one state obviously still have to apply for licences in others. The benefits are obvious in moving to this new system. It will reduce the number of licence categories and make it simpler for those organisations to work across borders. A number of licensing reform principles have been put in place which will be really valuable. The establishment of an intergovernment agreement is progressing on that. The national licensing authority will commence its operation in 2011, and the national licensing system is due to commence on 1 July 2012 for a number of those industry groups. Obviously key stakeholders are playing a key role in the design of those developments. Those matters are still underway and are still being worked through and rolled out. There were a number of other questions, so I will seek to take on notice the other matters raised and bring back a response.

WEST TERRACE CEMETERY

The Hon. B.V. FINNIGAN (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Urban Development and Planning a question about West Terrace Cemetery.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.V. FINNIGAN: Recently, on ANZAC Day, we saw how important it is to Australians that the service of veterans be recognised, and that includes the maintenance of war graves. Members would be aware that a joint state and commonwealth government funded Glenelg to Adelaide Parklands pipeline project is a major initiative to re-use wastewater in our Parklands, sports fields and open spaces. Will the minister outline any moves by the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority to tap into this high quality resource to supply water to irrigate the West Terrace Cemetery, in particular the war graves section?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (14:59): I thank the honourable member for his important question. The Adelaide Cemeteries Authority administers four major cemeteries across Adelaide: the West Terrace Cemetery, the Cheltenham Cemetery, the Enfield Memorial Park, and the Smithfield Memorial Park. As part of these responsibilities, the authority administers some of South Australia's most significant historical cemeteries and gravestones. The West Terrace Cemetery, in particular, is one of our state's important sites of historical significance and, as such, is listed on the state heritage register.

The location of the West Terrace Cemetery, originally known as the Adelaide Public Cemetery, was fixed by Colonel Light in his 1837 survey of the city of Adelaide and is one of the last original capital city cemeteries still operating in Australia. The Australian Imperial Force (AIF) Cemetery was officially opened in February 1920, soon after peace was declared in the Great War. Dedicated for the burial of ex-service personnel, the AIF Cemetery was the first soldiers' burial ground in the commonwealth.

The four hectare AIF section located in the Light and Kendrew Oval areas of the West Terrace Cemetery contains the gravestones of 4,155 ex-service personnel, including four Victoria Cross recipients: Lieutenant Arthur Blackburn, Joergen Jensen, Private Reginald Inwood and Corporal Phillip Davey. The Cross of Sacrifice, a gift of the commonwealth government, was also the first of its kind in an Australian burial ground. On a personal note, my grandfather is one of those buried in that AIF section of the West Terrace Cemetery.

I was pleased to announce recently that the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority had signed a supply agreement with SA Water to receive high-quality recycled water through the Glenelg to Adelaide Parklands pipeline project. The West Terrace Cemetery will be supplied high-quality recycled water by accessing the 32 kilometre network of pipes that links the upgraded Glenelg Wastewater Treatment Plant to Adelaide's Parklands. I am particularly pleased that water from the Glenelg to Adelaide Parklands pipeline is now being used by the cemetery to integrate the AIF section.

Water restrictions, introduced in 2006 in response to the worst drought in Australia's recorded history, left the West Terrace Cemetery and surrounding Parklands parched. Understandably this brought some criticism from the RSL about the upkeep of the AIF section, temporarily resolved by the issuing of water permits to the cemetery. However, a more permanent solution was required, which is why I am pleased to inform members that this agreement to supply water will allow the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority to maintain the cemetery—in particular, the AIF section, which has a significant lawned area—to a high standard of presentation, even during Adelaide's hot and dry summers.

This arrangement will help to ensure that the AIF Cemetery is maintained as a green resting place fit for our heroes. I am sure that the families of the ex-service personnel who are buried at the cemetery will appreciate the improved grounds and amenity. It is only fitting that we preserve the final resting place of those South Australians who fought so bravely to defend our liberty.

ARKARoola WILDERNESS SANCTUARY

The Hon. M. PARNELL (15:02): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Mineral Resources Development a question about protection for the Arkaroola Wilderness Sanctuary.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M. PARNELL: This week, following Greens' pressure, public submissions into the future of the Arkaroola Wilderness Sanctuary in the Northern Flinders Ranges, in the document entitled Seeking a Balance, have finally been published online. Although not all the submissions are available (including the one from Marathon Resources, the company that was caught red-handed illegally dumping radioactive waste at Arkaroola), under freedom of information I have obtained a summary of the submissions prepared by the environment department.

The message could hardly be clearer. Of the 450 submissions, less than 1 per cent of the respondents are supportive of the government's suggested future for Arkaroola in Seeking a Balance, a whopping 82 per cent support further restrictions on mining with another 8 per cent marked as 'unclear', leaving a bare 10 per cent wanting more mining. However, it is not just the raw numbers; what also stands out is the quality of the submissions. These are not one page proformas; there are submissions with detailed arguments from academics, scientists, business operators, even mining companies, all saying that Arkaroola is too precious to mine.

Six PhD level scientists and two museum collection managers contributed to the submission from the South Australian Museum, which described parts of the government's document as being greatly flawed, and suggested that it should be rejected totally as it is likely to lead to species extinction. The World Conservation Union, the world's oldest and largest global environment network, a democratic membership union with more than 1,000 government and NGO member organisations, described the Arkaroola region as one of the great geological heritage sites of the world, and certainly one of its finest teaching sites for students of geology. The University of Melbourne submission highlights concerns that, in the currently unprotected areas of Arkaroola, there is an ancient reef which, it states, potentially contains the remains of the oldest animals on earth.

Finally, even mining companies have raised concerns. The exploration manager of Petrathern called for the protection from mining of the central zone of Arkaroola to be upgraded. He said:

The current zone 3 area between Arkaroola village and the Yudnamuntana Gorge are high visibility zones for the thousands of tourists who visit the area each year and who make the ridgetop tour. Any form of mining operation in these areas would have a significant negative impact on the appeal of this world-class geo-tourist region.

My questions are:

1. Considering that less than 1 per cent of the 450 respondents approved of the government's plan for the Northern Flinders Ranges Arkaroola region, does the minister accept that the government got it wrong in Seeking a Balance?
2. Will the minister now act on the advice of some of Australia's most eminent geologists and ecologists, including our own South Australian Museum, and rule out once and for all mining activity in the core of the Arkaroola Wilderness Sanctuary? If not, what more evidence does the minister need?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (15:05): As the honourable member said, those submissions, at least those where the submitter did not request that their submissions be kept confidential, have been placed on the web. The government has been going through those submissions, and I hope, in conjunction with the Minister for Environment and Heritage, to make a statement fairly soon as to the outcome of that.

The honourable member is quite correct. A number of those submissions were very detailed; they were not just one page submissions. I think they contained a lot of useful information, and that is why the government has been carefully going through them. I would hope that we will be in a position fairly soon to make a statement in relation to the next steps.

WORKCOVER CORPORATION

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:06): I seek leave to make an explanation before asking the Leader of the Government a question about WorkCover.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: In September last year, the Auditor-General wrote to WorkCover expressing concern about a range of issues, in particular, the validity of invoices from medical service providers. In that letter, the Auditor-General said:

When authorising payments, the case managers are expected to check the validity of medical procedures shown on invoices based on their knowledge of the worker's injuries. However, the case managers have no assurance that every procedure shown on the invoices were performed and whether the most appropriate gazette codes were selected by providers.

Further, the Auditor-General said:

The Corporation was unable to provide us with the number and value of services that were not validated to enable us to quantify the materiality of this control deficiency.

The Auditor-General noted that there was approximately \$114 million worth of invoices from medical service providers just in the financial 2008-09. The Auditor-General further noted that a limited survey had been conducted by the corporation but that the Auditor-General noted that, whilst these surveys identified no fraudulent billing, they did not provide a high level assurance as they did not cover all providers of medical services and covered only those workers who volunteered to participate in the surveys.

The Auditor-General went on to highlight the risks of this management practice of WorkCover, as follows:

Payments may be made for medical procedures that have not been performed. Gazette codes wrongly selected by medical service providers may remain undetected. This causes under or overpayments. Under or overpayment of medical service providers causes inaccurate medical expense and inaccurate actuarial estimates of the value of outstanding claims in internal and external financial reports.

The Auditor-General then went on to suggest a range of actions that the Auditor-General believed WorkCover should undertake.

I think it was two days later that Julia Davison, on behalf of WorkCover, wrote back to the Auditor-General and basically said that she and WorkCover proposed to take no action in relation to the Auditor's concerns on these issues. My questions are:

1. Given that this was raised now nine months ago and that he has been minister for a short period of time, does the minister support the actions of the WorkCover Board and its management in rejecting the concerns expressed by the Auditor-General on this important issue and resolving to take no action?
2. If the minister does not agree with the WorkCover position, what action does he propose to take in relation to taking up the Auditor-General's concerns?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (15:09): I know that the Hon. Mr Lucas was a member of the Statutory Authorities Review Committee (SARC) when that committee had the Chief Executive of WorkCover and the chair appeared before the committee as many as four or five times, so the honourable member has probably had more meetings with them over the years than I have. I know that the subject of WorkCover was before Statutory Authorities Review Committee for at least 12 months or so—

The Hon. Carmel Zollo: More than 12 months.

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY: More than 12 months. I thank the honourable member for that. So, the honourable member certainly had plenty of time to raise that matter. In relation to the Auditor-General's recommendations, my general view is that they deserve to be treated seriously by any organisation. However, I am not going to comment on matters that happened nine months ago without going back to check the record. I am sure that the Hon. Mr Lucas, through his committee, will have plenty of opportunity to raise questions if they go that far back. I will take the question on notice and see what information I can provide.

ASK JUST ONCE STRATEGY

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:10): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Government Enterprises a question about the Ask Just Once strategy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Under the Ask Just Once strategy, the state government is committed to providing a single source of information or a point of contact for citizens and business. The development of a common internet site for government provides for access to government services. Will the minister advise what information is currently available to members of the public through the government website?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for State/Local Government Relations, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Consumer Affairs, Minister for Government Enterprises, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (15:10): I was pleased when the single entry point online sa.gov.au was officially launched in November 2009, and I am sure that access to information on government services online has made it much easier for a lot of other people.

This website obviously benefits citizens, businesses and state government agencies by providing easily accessible information for customers online, with a much stronger customer service focus. It is great public value, as customers experience a reduction in time, effort and costs when transacting with government, reducing their frustration in getting around some of those sites. Another benefit is that there is a reduction in red tape by providing more streamlined and integrated information focusing on the service required by the customer rather than the government department.

Currently, there is a great deal of information on the website. For example, consumers can easily find out how to register their vehicle online; find train and tram timetables; find out how to request a birth or marriage certificate; find contact details for a range of government services such as health, housing and schools; and obtain a great deal of other information. I believe that the website is much more user friendly and offers commonly sought information. It means that members of the public do not have to navigate through a sometimes confusing range of departmental websites to get answers to commonly asked questions.

Further updates to the website will be made as government agencies begin to use the single website as a key way of providing information to the public, and I understand that the website will be fully implemented in the 2010-11 financial year. I look forward to providing the chamber with further updates as that service continues to develop.

CONTACT SPORTS

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE (15:13): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the leader of government business a question regarding sport.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHERE: Over the last year or so, there has been quite a lot of comment in the media, both electronic and print, regarding more aggressive attitudes in contact sports within the state, particularly football and rugby. I myself have witnessed what I see as a deterioration involving some serious physical confrontations in football in some of the country leagues, in particular, when I have been watching. In the Labor government's South Australian Labor platform 2009, Labor's commitment regarding recreation and sporting activities (378) states:

Given the legal and justice issues concerning some behaviour associated with organised sport, Labor will support legislative measures that ensure that violence on the sporting ground is treated with the seriousness it merits.

Does this mean that, if it is not on a football field, it would be treated as a serious assault, where people are straight out punching, etc.? Does it indicate that the government intends to bring in legislation to make that a possibility if it is serious enough? What is the intention regarding that particular part of the platform?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (15:14): I thank the honourable member for his question and I am pleased that he has diligently read the ALP platform. In view of the specifics of the question, I will refer it to my colleague in another place, as to exactly what he has in mind in relation to it. It is an important issue for all of us and, particularly as parents, we are concerned that the level of aggression in sport is contained to a suitable and appropriate level.

It is sometimes said that perhaps some sporting people nowadays are a little bit soft compared with the old days but, as the honourable member is highlighting, we need to make sure that aggression is contained within the rules of the sport and not outside them. It is an important question and I will refer it to my colleague in another place.

PRISONER REHABILITATION

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:15): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Leader of the Government, on behalf of the Minister for Correctional Services, a question about prisoner rehabilitation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: Since taking on the role of shadow minister for corrections I have been overwhelmed by the amount of feedback I have received about how this government needs to lift its game in regard to providing effective prisoner rehabilitation.

I say from the outset that I am a strong believer in being tough on crime and that convicted criminals must serve their time. Violent offenders and sex offenders, in particular, have no place in our society and deserve to face the full force of the law. However, we need to be mindful that the majority of prisoners will eventually be released back into society at some stage and that effectively rehabilitating these people within the confines of prison benefits us all.

What I have noticed in feedback from people in the know—people with an intimate knowledge of our prison system, as well as prisoners—is that the focus on rehabilitation is steadily decreasing. Recently, a female prisoner wrote to me to detail that, since 2001, she has seen the focus on rehabilitation decrease within the Adelaide Women's Prison. She detailed that recently prisoners were told that they would no longer have access to a psychologist except in crisis situations or unless the prisoner is mentally challenged. She also detailed concerns about the lack of programs and training offered within prison—concerns which are shared by many people I have spoken to since becoming shadow minister for corrections. My questions are:

1. Does the minister stand by his comments made on radio 891 on 7 April that prisoners can get psychological help when they need it and that prisoners will be offered the services they need, or will he admit that more resources are needed immediately?

2. Will he commit to ensuring that corrections staff and specialists such as prison psychologists are quarantined from impending Public Service cuts flagged by the Treasurer and his so-called razor gang?

The Hon. P. HOLLOWAY (Minister for Mineral Resources Development, Minister for Urban Development and Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister Assisting the Premier in Public Sector Management) (15:17): The honourable member asked me to refer to some comments made by my colleague the Minister for Correctional Services on 7 April. Clearly, I will have to refer those questions to him in order to get a specific reply.

Let me say generally that this government recognises the importance of rehabilitation programs within our correctional services. One of the easiest things in government is to find areas to spend money on. I am sure that anyone here could easily spend billions of dollars on very well worthwhile projects right across the whole field of government. However, government has to deal within the budget constraints that it is subject to and meet its requirements accordingly.

As I pointed out in question time yesterday, it is always easy for members to say, 'We want more money for this,' and 'We want more money for that.' However, the government has to weigh up all the priorities. There is enormous need right across government and we understand that, but there is also no great overwhelming willingness on behalf of voters that I have noticed to contribute extra taxation to pay for many of the things we want. Government has to determine those priorities accordingly.

As I said, while it is easy to ask for more dollars to be spent in particular areas, I notice that members opposite are never as forthcoming in suggesting how we might pay for the things they want us to do. I will refer the specifics of the questions to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

POLISH AIR TRAGEDY

The Hon. B.V. FINNIGAN (15:20): I move:

That this council—

1. expresses its sadness at the tragic air crash on 10 April 2010 that took the lives of 96 people, including the President of Poland, Lech Kaczyński; and
2. extends its deepest sympathies to the people of Poland, as well as to the Polish community and its supporters in South Australia.

It is important that we take this opportunity to express our condolences to those who have suffered due to the tragic crash of an aeroplane in Russia a month ago, to the families of the deceased, to the Polish people, and to the Polish community in our own state.

I associate myself with the comments made by members in another place who passed this motion yesterday, including the Premier, the Hon. Mike Rann, and the Leader of the Opposition, Mrs. Isobel Redmond. I place on record my own deep personal sympathies to the Polish people and those of Polish heritage for the loss of life resulting from the air crash at Katyn on 10 April this year. A number of Poland's political, social, business, military and religious leaders were killed in the crash.

It is a bitter irony that the purpose of the trip was to attend commemorations to mark one of the great atrocities committed in the Second World War: the massacre of Polish troops at Katyn in 1940. A number of the victims of the air disaster were relatives of the 20,000 Polish officers killed by Stalin's secret police in the Katyn massacre (who were flying to Russia to take part in remembrance ceremonies for the 70th anniversary of that heinous event).

The crash claimed the life of President Kaczyński, his wife Maria, the chief of Poland's National Security Office, the Governor of the National Bank of Poland, the Deputy Speaker of the lower house, a number of members of parliament and senators, the heads of Poland's military, foreign affairs department and other senior officers of the Public Service and armed forces, the nation's deputy foreign minister, senior members of the Polish clergy and Poland's last president in exile.

President Kaczyński will be remembered in particular for the instrumental role he played in post-communist Poland, for his staunch defence of Polish independence and its national interests, for his distaste for corruption, and for his support of the Jewish community in Poland and their tremendous suffering through out the 20th century. Kaczyński's politics reflected his understanding of the significance of Poland's recent history.

Poland's history in the 20th century was tumultuous, having been oppressed by both the Germans and the Russians in the First and Second World Wars. Poland has borne the brunt of modern European conflict as a result of its position between Eastern and Western Europe. Poland's journey to independence was long and difficult. I express my admiration for the strength and resilience of the Polish people today.

Like the massacre of Katyn, this tragic accident will be remembered with sadness for many years to come. Poland and Russia have been working towards better relations in recent years, and it is to be welcomed that leaders of both Russia and Poland were to attend the joint commemoration of the Katyn massacre; how unfortunate that they were instead attending state funerals.

Australia has enjoyed a strong migration from Poland to our nation, particularly in the wake of the Second World War. There continues to be a strong Polish community in South Australia, and a number of representatives were present in the gallery of the other place yesterday for the same motion. We extend our sympathies to the families of those who perished, all the people of Poland and the Polish community in our state for the sadness they must feel at this time in the light of a national tragedy.

I have always had a great personal admiration for Poland and its people. There is certainly no doubt that it is hard to think of another nation that so clearly bore the brunt of many of the tragedies and suffering of the 20th century—in the First World War and in the Second World War, in particular, when I think Poland had one of the highest casualty rates in terms of the number of people lost for its population.

In particular, the Polish people were always staunch in their opposition to the Nazis and, subsequently, to the Soviets. The remarkable courage of the people in the Warsaw Ghetto in World War II in rebelling against the Nazis is certainly testament to that. The Polish people also stood firm during the Cold War.

My first consciousness of major world events was in relation to the election of a Polish Pope and the events surrounding Solidarity in Poland, when the people once again showed great bravery and continued to do so in seeing the downfall of the Soviet empire.

As I remarked, we do have a very strong local Polish community. I was privileged to go to a lecture some years ago by Lech Walesa at the Adelaide Town Hall, and I could see how strong and vibrant the local community of Polish expatriates is. It was quite interesting because some of them

seemed to disagree with the translation that was coming through, so I had a number of people around me giving alternative translations as we went along, and that sometimes made it difficult to hear what he was saying.

I am sure that all members will join in supporting this motion that we remember those who died—may they rest in peace—and place on record our sadness at the events that occurred and our sympathies to the people of Poland, to those who suffer as a result and to the local Polish community. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (15:25): I rise on behalf of the opposition to support the motion moved by the Hon. Mr Finnigan. I quickly offer an apology if I mispronounce any of the Polish names that I will read out. The Polish president, Mr Lech Kaczyński, and his wife Maria died on Saturday 10 April 2010. With them, a number of serving members of Poland's political elite also perished when their plane crashed on approach to a Russian airport. At the time, Mr Kaczyński was only 60 years old. He, with his wife of 30 years, and the official party were travelling to commemorate the 70th anniversary of the Katyn massacre in which the Soviet secret police killed 15,000 Polish officers in one of the most notorious atrocities of the Second World War.

Family members of the Katyn victims were also on board the President's plane. Others were waiting at the airport. Other members of that delegation included the chief of Poland's armed forces, the head of its Navy, the central bank governor and opposition lawmakers. There is no doubt that each of these people left behind family and dear friends, along with an entire country in mourning. In fact, the incident prompted a period of national mourning in Poland, and a number of countries also declared periods of national mourning.

Lech Kaczyński and his identical twin brother Jaroslaw were born on 18 June 1949. Their childhood aspirations were quite divided from anything of a political nature. They were popular child actors, with a highlight of their short but successful career being roles in what was apparently a hit movie *The Two who Stole the Moon* in 1962. The boys were 13 at the time. Lech Kaczyński went on to study at the Faculty of Law and Administration at the University of Warsaw. In 1978 he married an economist, Maria Kaczyńska, and had one daughter Marta, who is now 30 with two children of her own.

In 1981 Mr Kaczyński was interned under martial law until October 1982 for his involvement in the Solidarity movement, the pro-democratic anti-communist movement in Poland, the Workers Defence Committee, as well as the independent trade union movement. The fall of communism led him and his brother to be powerbrokers in Polish politics.

He was instrumental in the election of president Lech Walesa in the country's first free presidential election in 1990. He was appointed head of Poland's national security office under his presidency. In 2001 he founded the conservative political party with his brother and assumed the presidency of the party. Simultaneously, he was the mayor of Warsaw and championed a fight against corruption—which, of course, is close to the heart of the state liberal opposition.

Mr Kaczyński spurred the development of a number of culturally and historically significant buildings throughout his time as mayor. A particular one to note is the Museum of Polish Jews in Warsaw. He was later to become first Polish head of state to visit a Polish synagogue throughout an official service.

He was elected president in 2005 and named his brother as prime minister in 2006. As an inspirational leader in Polish politics, Lech Kaczyński will be sorely missed. His role in post-communist Polish politics shaped the nation and, however controversial he was, a great deal of Polish society has felt a positive influence of Kaczyński on their lives and those of their children.

Lech Kaczyński's legacy, which is extremely significant and which was mentioned by Isobel Redmond in the House of Assembly, is his image as an honest and incorruptible politician. He was not afraid to take a stand on controversial issues. He and his brother Jaroslaw have dominated Polish politics for the last decade, espousing a national conservative and often anti-Russian ideology.

The opposition expresses its deepest regret at the death of the 96 people involved in the tragic crash and, in particular, the death of Lech Kaczyński and Maria Kaczyńska. We give our condolences to the family of each of these people, to Marta Kaczyńska and her two children, and to the entire Polish community.

Motion carried.

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 12 May 2010.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins): I call the Hon. Tammy Jennings, and I remind the council that it is the member's maiden speech and she should be heard in silence.

The Hon. T.A. JENNINGS (15:30): I, like the Hon. Ian Hunter, prefer to commence by recognising the traditional owners of the land on which this parliament was built, the Kurna people, and I acknowledge that we meet today here on Kurna land. I note also that this house represents the peoples of lands—by my count, over 30 Aboriginal nations. I pay my respect to the elders of these lands and to other Aboriginal elders, and people past and present, and note that we have some long way to go before we achieve a state of reconciliation or even conciliation in this society in which we live. One thing I would like to see as a good step forward for reconciliation—and I do welcome that the Rann government has recently dropped its appeal against the Trevorrow case—is a setting up of a compensation fund for the stolen generations, and I flag that I will be moving such a direction.

I congratulate the Governor on his speech outlining the Rann government's platform for the next four years, their third term, and a term which I know has been dubbed in the press and by the government as a term of social reform not unlike the Dunstan era. I am excited to hear this and I look forward to significant social reform in this state. I also acknowledge the work of a previous member, the Hon. David Winderlich, who also was a great advocate for social reform. I regret that we did not get to share this crossbench, and I note that he has gone on to brighter pastures within the social justice movement in South Australia.

I also note the passing of Dr Paul Collier, who was a fellow candidate of mine in this recent election. I shared many forums and platforms with Dr Collier, and I know that we will all miss the humour and tenacity that he had, and the Dignity for Disability Party, while ably led by Kelly Vincent, no doubt will continue to mourn, but I am sure she will do his memory proud.

I thank you, Mr President, in particular for your congenial welcome to this place. I not only appreciate your welcoming me as a newcomer but I also appreciate your being very accommodating in ensuring that, in this place, we will soon see baby change tables in disability toilets so that those who are needing to change young children will be able to do so whether they are parliamentarians, staff or visitors. It reminds me of the old adage that babies in this place probably need changing and probably for the same reasons that we do change our politicians.

Today I would like to highlight some aspects of the Governor's speech on which I would like to reflect further. The government first launched what we are all familiar with as the State Strategic Plan in March 2004. It set targets, as you know, which include growing prosperity, improving wellbeing, attaining sustainability, fostering creativity and innovation, building communities and expanding opportunities.

I note that, in this new term, we will soon be revisiting these targets, and I particularly look forward to better cross-referencing between targets; for example, having a look at the way that we are structuring our economy and making sure that it is indeed sustainable; having a look at better mental health targets; making sure that, if we are talking about expanding and growing our cities and urban development, that that is not contrary to our targets for environmental sustainability or, indeed, social justice; and having strong and healthy communities and, of course, better mental health. I look forward to working with the government in improving the targets.

I also flag that the Greens also have a plan and we work by consensus to achieve this plan. It is not just a state plan; it is not just a national plan: it is a global Greens charter. Mark and I, as the South Australian parliamentarians for the Greens, are bound by this charter, as are other parliamentarians around the world. It was developed and adopted in Canberra in 2001. I will not bore you with the long and lengthy details—rest assured that there are many—but it is basically this. We have four pillars or principles: the first is ecological wisdom or sustainable economy, the second is social justice, the third is grassroots or participatory democracy, and the fourth is peace and non-violence.

There is no hierarchy between these pillars—they are interconnected. You cannot, for example, have a sustainable economy without social justice, and you cannot have peace and non-violence without grassroots democracy. I point that out to the government as we look at renewing

the State Strategic Plan. We need to have an interconnectedness in all our policies and we need a broader approach.

The Greens, as members are aware, are a new party in this parliament and we are also a new party worldwide, but we are a growing one. We first started in both Tasmania and New Zealand in 1972. In 1973, we saw the election of our first councillor in New Zealand, and that was followed in Switzerland in 1979 by the election of a member to its national parliament. Since then we have been elected to thousands of seats across the globe at a local level, at a state level and at a national level. At the moment, we hold 285 international seats, and these are in the parliaments of Europe, Brazil, Mexico, Mongolia and, of course, New Zealand. At a national level we have five Green senators.

I am really pleased to say that no longer does South Australia have one sole member of the state parliament. I am happy that we have doubled our number, and I thank Mark for doing such an admirable job for the last four years. As you have all welcomed me to the parliament, almost without exception people have commented on how across the issues Mark is and what a great job he has done in the last four years. I hope I can at least equal that, although it is a high bar you have set, Mark. I would love to see his vision and mine taken on by this parliament and for us to look at our economy as a green economy and to see a green vision for our state. We hear it in the rhetoric now, so we will take heart that perhaps as you talk the talk you will start to walk the walk.

I would like to note—and we cannot let this pass—that the election that has just passed is a very big part of any healthy state, and there were some problems with the election. The fact that we have so many private members' bills and even a government bill on electoral reform can only be a good thing if we look at it with democracy at our heart and the good of all Australian people in our minds as we progress those bills. As a result of that election—and I am not being disparaging—I have a new job. I have been elected, and it is an eight year contract and the South Australian people are my boss, which is an incredible and honourable privilege, and I believe that is where the word 'honourable' sits well with me.

As a long-time worker in the South Australian community non-government sector, it is a massive pay rise and a most welcome change. I note that the sector I come from—the community non-government sector—is among the lowest paid in our state, and the Greens have long supported the Strong Community Healthy State Campaign, not only for increased wages but also for a more robust sector.

It is a very vital sector and, most importantly for this chamber and this parliament, having consistency of contracts, not contracts that only go for a year for such vital work as helping our most vulnerable, would be a great step forward and one that I would like to see in this great social reform third term of the Rann government. Because it is such a feminised industry, that is one of the reasons we see such low wages for that industry, and I look forward to the pay equity case that will be coming through and hopefully raising the pay levels for the sector in the next few months.

My most recent job in that sector was as policy officer for the Mental Health Coalition in South Australia. It is the peak body for the area, and many of you would be familiar with not just me but also Geoff Harris lobbying you. It was a job I held dear because I believe that the stigma and knowledge of mental illness is an area where we really need to make much more progress, and we have a long way to go, yet it is not uncommon. We all enjoy mental health, every single one of us, and some of us will suffer from mental illness—possibly one in five every year, with almost 40 per cent directly having some sort of mental illness in their lifetime. When you count the families, friends and work colleagues of those who will have mental illness you can see that this is not a sideline issue but one that really needs to be brought to the fore.

One of the issues with mental health, of course, is the stigma surrounding mental illness. The fact that people do not seek help early is a real travesty in our society, and economically it is not good; it would be much more cost-effective to have early intervention rather than let people suffer in silence. However, that was my old job; this is my new one.

It is not quite my first day but it is my first speech—my maiden speech, as some delicately put it. So, my fellow co-workers, it is time to introduce myself. Something that I never used to tell people is that I was born in Dubbo, New South Wales—not the best thing to have to go through school having to hide. I was raised in beachside Sydney, in a number of low-rent flats and Housing Commission estates, mainly by my mother, who was a single mother, along with my two younger brothers. Mum went on to work for AFL Queensland, so I have a passion for football and

appreciate Robert's words a moment ago about violence and football not necessarily needing to be interlinked. My mother has actually done a lot of work on eradicating violence from football, and I am very proud of her for that.

I am most proud of her, though, for her achievement in leaving a violent and abusive relationship, something that was not supported by other family members at the time. However, it was supported by her workplace—a progressive, wonderful workplace—as well as by a chance encounter with a supportive police officer at the time, who made himself available and who ensured that the restraining orders that had been awarded were not only respected but enforced.

My mother and I are also extremely proud of my adult children: my daughter Pippa, who was in the gallery for my swearing in and has a wisdom and insight beyond her years; and my son Geordie, who has a different sort of a wisdom, the sort that only a 21 year old footballer can have, but whom I respect for his dream to work towards potentially playing for the AFL one day and also for him getting stuck in and working at the moment in Berri and playing for the Berri Demons as a gun player. Millicent, my two year old daughter (you will note that there is a 19 years difference there), has yet to show us her full potential, but she is fearless and inquisitive, and that can only be a good thing for a girl. I am sure that whatever potential she has will be significant and that her father Andrew will help me guide her towards whatever she wants to achieve in life.

I never wanted to be a politician when I was growing up but, according to family folklore, apparently I am distantly related (and please do not hold this against me) to Mark Latham. However, there are no other direct connections with politicians in my immediate family, so I have often attributed my politics, and my interest in politics, to the fact that I went to a progressive feminist public high school, Maroubra Junction Girls High. For those of you who do not come from New South Wales, I think it could be seen as equivalent to Gepps Cross Girls High.

My first election campaign actually occurred in a history class at Maroubra Junction. It was in the eighties, and I had been on peace marches and was quite opposed to the progression of the nuclear industry. Of course, Peter Garrett was a local hero; he was in the local band and was heading up the Nuclear Disarmament Party in the elections at that time. I was not old enough to vote, but in the mock elections at school I headed up the Nuclear Disarmament Party. As you probably know, the NDP did not do too well in that election; however, at my school it romped in!

I moved to Adelaide in the mid-1980s and into the northern suburbs, where I attended Parafield Gardens High School for the last year of my schooling. I then went on to the Salisbury campus of the University of South Australia. The Salisbury campus must have been a bit of a political breeding ground at the time, and I note that the member for Little Para, Lee Odenwalder, is also making his maiden speech today. Lee and I were close university friends, along with the man who is now the member for Wakefield, Nick Champion. Nick, Lee and I and some of our other Salisbury mates actually shared many beverages and endless games of Trivial Pursuit in the dimly lit Eureka Tavern as we worked our way through university some 20 years ago.

Of course, back then there was a Salisbury campus, and that was a great service for the students of the north and another thing that I think politicised me. It played a vital role in connecting people who had no connections with university. They were the first person in their family, who were working class or underclass, to go to university and to see that they could have an education that progressed beyond the basics.

It also supported mature age women, and a high number of mature age women went to that campus. It had a real diversity of courses, and it had a childcare centre. For me as a young mother, that was essential and it was the only reason I could go on to university. When that campus was closed, it spurred me into action. I think it is one of the main reasons I am heavily involved in politics now.

One of the things I decided to do as a result of my campus being closed was to organise a minibus to go to Canberra, because we thought we could talk to the people in the parliament there and get them to change their minds and put pressure on our campus administration. I note that Jackie Adams is in the gallery today. She shared that stinky little minibus across to Canberra with me, and she was there when I did my first question without notice. Of course, I did not get to ask it, but I did get to write it, and I do thank the late Democrats Senator Robert Bell for putting it for us that day.

I put those election and campaign skills to use. While the Salisbury campus closure was not able to be stopped, I went on to be very involved with student politics, and I also eventually went on to hold a position on the university council, and I was also state president of the National

Union of Students. It was in this role that early one morning in Glenelg in 1995, I was protesting an ALP plan to introduce a \$1,000 up-front tuition charge.

Along with about 20 other people, I was down at Glenelg with our placards. It was also the day that the prime minister at the time (Paul Keating) told me to go get a job. That night, I was on *Today Tonight* and there were questions in the parliament—so, possibly my second question. From then on, I understood much better how the media and the political cycle works. I had a job when Paul told me to get one; I was just giving him some advice on how to do his job better!

As the year drew to a close, I started to think about what I would do with my life beyond university and student politics. I got a phone call. On the other end of the line was a woman I had met through my campaign—Natasha Stott Despoja. She had recently been elected to the Senate, and she was offering me a job. Of course, I took it—after about a split-second thought. It was a great opportunity. The real attraction of that job was that it was with someone who embodied a new vision of what politics could be—someone who had eschewed the old parties. It was a great learning experience, and it was a great chance to break down stereotypes of politics and to break new ground.

I am thinking of tabling an e-petition, and I gather that we cannot do that yet. In the Senate, when I worked for Natasha, we got that changed. So, I am looking forward to working with you all here to bring us into the 21st century to enable us to table e-petitions sometime soon.

In the course of that job, I met Peter Garrett. He walked around the Senate one day and knocked on our door. I am sure I am the only person in the whole world who has said to him, 'Oh, Peter Garrett! You taught me about preferences!', because he, of course, was preferenced out by the old parties. Peter Garrett is now the local member in my childhood electorate of Kingsford Smith. So, he got there in the end, but he needed to join one of the old parties to do so.

I feel saddened by that. I wish he had held onto the vision of what the Greens leader in Tasmania, Nick McKim, calls the 'vision of the new believers'. I have long been a new believer; I just did not know that is what it was called. I am certainly inspired by others who are new believers—Mark, of course, and Christine Milne and Bob Brown, being ones you would know. Of course, the 49 other Greens candidates who stood with me in this election are all new believers.

I would also include in this group the majority of the people in this country who believe in things like same-sex marriage, voluntary euthanasia and an Australian republic. I am glad that in 1999 Natasha Stott Despoja encouraged me to be seconded to the Australian Republic Movement's 'Yes' campaign. I had a very interesting interview in a bar with Malcolm Turnbull and Neville Wran, and the next day I had the job of helping out with the campaign.

At the time, I was working with Cathy King from the Labor Party and Martin Cameron from the Liberal Party, and I learnt so much from those two people. While they were from old parties, they had a lot tricks to teach me, but they also had a lot of vision for how this country could be better as a republic. I think the referendum was both a highlight and the lowlight of my career, and I do hope that we can become a republic one day.

I went on to work for Amnesty International after this, again in the non-government civil society sector. While I had known Amnesty since I was a child as a great worldwide organisation of human rights, I expected to be working on human rights violations in other countries. In fact, Amnesty long held a WOOC (Work On Own Country) rule on other countries. But what I quickly learned as the state coordinator for both the NT and South Australia was that we had a lot of human rights violations taking place in our own backyard—in the backyards of Beverley.

In the last few days, the Hon. Mark Parnell has spoken about the young Aboriginal girl and the protesters who were capsicum sprayed and held and about the 11 year old girl who was capsicum sprayed on her own lands. As a worker for Amnesty, I saw the video of that at the time and I was horrified to think that that was my own country.

I was also horrified to see what was happening with human rights being violated in the backyards of South Australia—in both Woomera and Baxter immigration detention centres. That was a decade ago, and I found it a real eye-opener. I did what I could to raise awareness, particularly about the fact that children were being kept behind razor wire in this country.

I organised a toy collection to highlight awareness of the issue because many people did not actually believe at the time that children were being kept in detention centres because, as many people here would realise, there was a great deal of effort put into making sure that people were not able to be identified and into keeping it quite hidden from the Australian public.

I would not like to see us go back to the bad old days of only 10 years ago, when we had hunger strikers and people willing to starve to death rather than remain in those detention centres. We had people sewing their lips together, we had children who were witnessing suicides and we had children who were attempting suicide. I hope we do not go back there, and I am really scared to see what is happening at the moment, with the scare and fearmongering happening around asylum seekers who have every right to seek asylum in this country of ours.

From that job, I went on to work for the YWCA. The YWCA is the oldest and largest women's organisation in the world. It is also quite passionate about women's human rights. I have often been told by the stalwarts of the Y that, in fact, they are nice girls who help bad girls do great things, and Michelle Lensink, as a fellow member, can probably attest to that in the nicest possible way.

I think radical women doing wonderful things is a great description of the Y. They were at the forefront of gaining suffrage many decades ago. They were also countering racism, and they were also working for equal pay. Apparently, we have achieved that three times now, but I am still waiting to see it. They were also, of course, leading the vanguard to end sex discrimination—battles we think have been won but, apparently, it is not always so, and it is always one step forward, two steps back, as the minister would no doubt attest.

I pay tribute in particular to the executive director of that organisation, Pamela Lockyer-Scrutton, who was a mentor and an inspiration not only to the young women who came through the Y but also to me. During my time there, I was privileged to create an exhibition of shoes, and again Michelle Lensink played an integral role. I put together an exhibition of 77 pairs of shoes. That number 77 was significant because it actually highlighted, on average, how many domestic intimate partner homicides there are each year in Australia. I got shoes from people such as Missy Higgins, Andrew Denton, footballer Craig MacKay, Jason Gillespie, Germaine Greer, Cathy Freeman, Bert Newton and many more.

Each of these pairs of shoes was significant to that person and came with a quote attached. The exhibition actually travelled the country and lasted for almost two years, I believe. What I think the quotes showed was how we are all touched by domestic violence. We in this chamber probably all know somebody who has had some experience of domestic violence; it would be unusual in the Australian population not to know somebody.

My other work included issues around drink spiking (and I hope that drink spiking law reform is on the government's agenda in the future); sexual assault; safe relationships; and safer sex—issues that are very important to young women and to equality.

I was also privileged to be part of a process in putting together a women's human rights report card when over 100 women and girls from South Australia came to our consultations. We prepared a report on many areas of human rights and identified that we still have a long way to go in this state. As a result of that, I was selected to go to a world conference later on that year (the Beijing+10 conference of the United Nations) and I met some amazing women from around the world.

One particular woman from America had, 20 years earlier, taken up the case of lobbying the American government to sign onto the Convention for the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women. She had thought 20 years earlier, 'This is a no-brainer. Of course they are going to sign on for it.' As we all know, they still have not. I am proud to say that not only has the Australian government signed on, but it has also signed the optional protocol.

We also have some great women in leadership—another thing that I am very proud of. In this chamber we have the Hon. Gail Gago, the Hon. Kelly Vincent, the Hon. Ann Bressington, the Hon. Jing Lee, the Hon. Michelle Lensink and, of course, the Hon. Carmel Zollo. Including myself, we now have seven in a house of 22—almost a third—so we are halfway to being equal, I guess!

I am pleased to note that the Greens are now exactly equal: we are 50:50. That is a comparison which is borne out favourably by Greens representation in other state and territory parliaments. Federally, of course, we have a majority of women. We also see this pleasant occurrence reflected in WA, NSW and the ACT. I would particularly like to acknowledge that in South Australia we now have two female Greens MPs, with Sarah Hanson-Young elected to the Senate. With our lead candidate being a woman, very soon Mark could potentially be outnumbered in terms of the South Australian Greens' representation in our state and federal parliaments.

I would particularly like to acknowledge Sarah Hanson-Young, the South Australian Senator for the Greens. She came along to the swearing-in ceremony and I have had her great support over the last few months during the election campaign. In 2007, I was privileged to be the convenor of the election campaign committee which saw her elected and take a lead role. Sarah has been a trailblazer for young women. No doubt Kelly will follow in her footsteps, or whatever is done in a wheelchair to fulfil that analogy. Diversity can be a challenge and it is one that we should be embracing. I am grateful to see that this place is rising to the challenge or, in the case of Kelly, sitting to the challenge.

I am somewhat of a latecomer to the Greens Party, as you may have picked up by now. I joined when I was handing out for Mark in the 2006 election. I did not know him from a bar of soap, by the way, and it was not he who signed me up. I was volunteering at a meeting and I had been supporting the Greens and the new vision of the Greens for some time.

At the time, I had given up on politics. I was very distraught at what I saw were some really backward steps in this country. I considered myself a political refugee because I could not find a party that showed me human rights, social justice, dignity and grassroots democracy. However, I was pleasantly surprised to go along to a few Greens meetings and find that, in fact, those things still existed.

If I had lived in New South Wales or Tasmania perhaps I might have seen that vision earlier but I would point to the fact that in South Australia we are still quite the babies of the party. We have a long way to go but we are getting there pretty quickly. The Greens Party has welcomed me warmly, so much so that I have been state convenor twice—and I am not sure if that is for my sins or because they actually wanted me there! I would really like to thank the hundreds, if not thousands, of members and supporters who helped with polling day duties and on the campaign.

I pay particular tribute to Sandy Montgomery (who, I believe, is in the upstairs gallery). She is a person with a disability and she was No. 3 on our Greens ticket. Sandy is a stalwart Greens member and was fantastic in the office. Without her being around, I think we would not have done as well with our campaign.

I also pay tribute to Simon Jones, who was the No. 2 candidate. Our campaign team, on a very limited, meagre, shoestring budget, did marvellous things. I thank James Danenberg, Lia Svilans and Clementine Ford. The party stalwarts helped our Greens Party not only stay together as a party but also start to get people elected, and I pay tribute to the many hours and the enormous courage of Nikki Mortier (who is in the gallery today) and for the support of her partner, Rosalie Garland, in enabling Nikki to do that.

I also acknowledge Louise Rodbourn who, along with me, has held positions in the Greens; Joslyn van der Moolen; Palitja Moore, who is our office coordinator and one of our star candidates; and members of the election campaign committee, including Robert Simms, Kevin Phelan and Ros Gumbys.

Outside the party I also had many supports. I thank my former workplace for allowing me to have leave of absence and my family—my brothers, my sister-in-law, my ex's in-laws. I had a surprising amount of support from all sorts of people who I did not think would be so excited to see a Greens member get elected. I thank, in particular, my friends, some of whom are here today, including Kirsten, Peta-Anne, Huw and Danica. I thank them not only for their support, advice and expertise during the campaign but also for babysitting and baking me dinner every once in a while.

The Hon. Mark Parnell has been a great leader of the Greens in this place. I am very pleased to be joining him and lightening his load. I have enormous respect for the work he and his staff have done over the last four years. I pay tribute, in particular, to Cate Mussared and Craig Wilkins who have been great advocates for the Greens project, as they call it. I also pay tribute to Keiran Price, who is currently Mark's intern.

My sister-in-law Ya-Cheng is originally from Taiwan and, when she heard that I was elected to parliament, she was very proud and passed on her best wishes, but, given that she is from Taiwan, she got a little concerned for my safety. I assure Ya-Cheng and this parliament that I am pretty sure that I can handle this place. I do not see too many chairs—I would like to see more wheelchairs.

I do believe that in this place we can bring in the Greens' vision and, hopefully, change parliament for the better. I echo my colleague the Hon. Mark Parnell's words that the Greens are looking forward to working with all parties in this place and all Independents. I am looking forward

to being guided by the Greens pillars and our charter. I would like to note that we are only the party to have increased our vote in this state in every single election since 1997, so I am looking forward to being joined by more Greens some time in the near future. The Greens are pleased to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply.

The PRESIDENT: I call the Hon. Ms Vincent. I remind members that it is the honourable member's maiden speech and I ask them to show her the courtesy a first speech deserves.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (16:03): Thank you, sir. Given that I have such a small voice, your patience and silence would be much appreciated. I find I am simply not able to speak as loudly in my old age!

First, I acknowledge the Kurna people whose footprints meet our own every time they touch this land and within whose stories we weave our own. I also acknowledge and congratulate the newly elected members of parliament, in particular, the Hons Tammy Jennings and Jing Lee. I have already found their strength of mind and spirit, eloquence and kindness to be truly honourable. Congratulations.

Sitting in this chamber as the youngest female and the first person ever to be elected into the South Australian parliament who uses a wheelchair, is, as I am sure you can imagine, not an easy thing to describe. I would like to employ one of the basic rules I often used in what is now, I suppose, my other life as a writer.

I begin at the beginning. Until recently I would have said that the beginning of my disability advocacy journey occurred roughly 18 months ago—as I was struggling to get a new wheelchair for about that long. I was approved for the wheelchair in January 2008 but would not actually sit in it until October 2009. During this period I began speaking at disability-related conferences and forums about this experience and the effect it was having on my body, mind and life in general.

I would usually just get up onto the stage and adlib something, as I am of the view that the last thing that the sector needs is another PowerPoint presentation. Through these speeches I developed something of a small cult following, and, while I really enjoyed doing them and appreciated the increased support and awareness, it occurred to me that I still was not getting a new wheelchair.

So, late last year, I turned to my last refuge: Facebook—naturally. I began a group called 'Mission: Kelly's New Chair' on which I placed some of my story, as well as the contact details of the Hon. Jennifer Rankine, Minister for Disability. I began this group thinking that if just 10 or 15 of my friends joined and each of them sent a letter, then the group would have served its purpose. However, within a few weeks, the group had some 250 members, some in countries such as France, Mexico and America. Fortunately, I have some varying ability to converse in both French and Spanish and was soon dedicating as much time as possible to sending out trilingual updates. I believe that, although none of us ever said it out loud, we were all perfectly aware that we were in fact communicating in the universal languages of hope and goodwill. Soon the emails and phone calls were flowing thick and fast and, at times, I would simply sit in front of my computer and have a good chuckle about the fact that, at the age of 20, I was effectively leading a disability rights movement from my bedroom. Such is the power of youth.

Then one day, after I had been speaking at one of these forums, I switched on said computer to see that the group had gained a new member. His name was Dr Paul Henry Collier, and, though I did not know it at the time, the course of my life was changed forever. However, as I was saying, I no longer consider this to be the beginning of my journey. This is because, about a month or so out from the election, my fellow candidate turned staff member and, above all, beloved friend, Sam Paor, pointed to me and said three words that will stay with me always and forever: 'Advocate since birth.'

I did not realise before I heard Sam say these words just how true they were. I am not just an advocate when I present at forums or run a Facebook group, I am an advocate every time I point out to the owner of a restaurant that I cannot reach the soap dispenser in their accessible bathroom. I am an advocate every time I glare disapprovingly at the seemingly able-bodied lady who walks out of the accessible bathroom after I have been waiting to use it for half an hour. I was an advocate every time I came home from school in tears because some kid made fun of the way I walked, and, most of all, I am advocate every time I ask the following question: why is this allowed to happen to people with disabilities in South Australia?

Let me suggest a rather disturbing example of what I mean by this. Some people with a disability wait up to five years, perhaps more, for equipment such as a wheelchair. They may wait 15 years or more for supported accommodation, unless their primary carer in their current house dies or is forced to abandon them, unable or unwilling to care for them any longer. A 16 year old girl with burns to 70 per cent of her body may and does go without the wheelchair she requires to be mobile at school because the school lost that wheelchair a year ago and has not received a replacement. A deaf person may miss out on a large part of a presentation in a public place because the building's hearing loop has been out of order for some time—and the list goes on.

If we applied this concept to education, our children would have to wait somewhere between two and five years for equipment—schoolbooks and uniforms. Worse still, imagine having to tell your child that they could not go to school until another student died. This is, of course, unacceptable—indeed, outrageous. The ramifications of a child not having ready access to education, especially in their early years, are potentially greater than any of us in this chamber can imagine. They may become illiterate, have underdeveloped social skills and potentially be unable to contribute to society in the same way they would do so otherwise. If the disability funding model were applied to the education system, I have no doubt that there would be a public outcry, followed by a complete overhaul of the system, yet this happens in the disability sector every single day.

Perhaps what I have just said will give a little insight into why I am set back a little every time someone tries to suggest to me that Dignity for Disability is a single issue party. Disability knows no boundaries: it crosses transport, education, social inclusion, access and discrimination, just for a start. Anyone who needs proof of the wide reach of disability needs only look up at the galleries of this chamber and behold the special guests we have with us today. I sincerely thank them all for this: it is truly an honour to have you here. Disability affects people of all ages, race, gender, class and religion in different ways and this should be a source of celebration just as much as it is a difficulty. One of my favourite authors, Kahill Gibran, once wrote:

Last night I invented a new pleasure. And as I was giving it its first trial, an angel and a devil came rushing toward my house. They met at my door and fought with each other over this new pleasure, one crying, 'It is a sin!', the other, 'It is a virtue!'

If only disability could be a pleasure in this sense because, although Dignity for Disability is not a single issue party, I guess you could say that its mission statement is actually pretty simple: the idea that there is no such thing as one size fits all in regard to disability, that people with disabilities are individuals and, more than that, because of the struggles they have faced and the battles they have fought, taking the good and the bad, they have become some of the most strong, well educated and articulate individuals this state has to offer.

I am sometimes asked if the name of the party I represent, Dignity for Disability, implies that people with disabilities do not already have dignity. My response to this is simple: no. In my mind the word 'dignity' in the name of the party simply means that people with disabilities are dignified and intelligent human beings who are able to make a real and lasting contribution in society, and it is high time that the services and opportunities given to them reflected this.

I was recently asked whether comments about people with disabilities finally having a representative in parliament implied that we were somehow ungrateful for the contributions to the disability sector made by members of parliament who have already graced this chamber and this parliament for many years. I particularly acknowledge minister Jay Weatherill and the Hon. Mr Stephen Wade, and I acknowledge Senator Mitch Fifield and minister Bill Shorten in the federal parliament. These kinds of people, many of whom do not have any direct involvement in the disability sector by way of being a person with a disability or a carer, family member or friend to a person with a disability, work tirelessly and with ineffable passion and dedication on the basis that improving the lives of people with disabilities, their families and carers is fundamentally a social, economic and, above all, human rights issue. These people are what some in the disability sector refer to as allies. As we all know, the purpose of an ally is to work side by side with those they support, not to overtake or be put in place of them.

As I said in reply to the person asking this very valid question about allies, we at Dignity for Disability acknowledge and applaud the work of these allies and look forward to being given reasons to continue applauding them in the future. However, we believe that having allies in parliament is quite simply not the same thing as a person and a party that has lived and breathed pure physical and spiritual involvement in disability.

Think for just a moment of Indigenous Australians. I am not for one second suggesting that people with disabilities are comparable with Indigenous Australians in terms of the severity of the

hardships they have historically faced. However, if I may be so bold, I would like to suggest that these two groups are similar in that they are each their own culture, with their own rich histories, hardships, languages and joys that simply cannot be understood as clearly, wholly or naturally by outsiders.

Nevertheless, I will be the first to admit that I, and d4d as a party, do not have all the answers. I cannot do this on my own. So I would like to take this opportunity to give my heartfelt, spirit-deep thanks to just a few of the many people who have helped ensure that, while I am travelling this long, winding and difficult road, at least I will not be doing it with a flat tyre, so to speak—to the original members of the party: Sam Paior, Rick Neagle, Ronni Wood, Garry Connor and Michele Thredgold; to Fim Jucha, our volunteer coordinator during the election campaign; to David Holst of Disability Speaks, who joins us in the chamber today; to Natasha Stott Despoja and Kate Reynolds for their sage and—pardon the pun—democratic advice, both personal and political; to Ian Gilfillan, for much the same reason; to David Winderlich; to Chantel; to Natalie and Nick; to Lucy; to PJ Rose and Alirio Zavarce, who are largely responsible for my becoming an artist and embracing my disability as a part of that art; and to my mother, whose refusal to see her daughter effectively punished by society not only for being a sensitive soul but also for not being able to use scissors quite as well as the other children in her class, who may well have saved my life before I was even born.

Returning to the matter at hand, it is high time that these outsiders I have just spoken about came in, not only because we could use some more allies but because there are numerous factors—such as the rate at which our population is ageing—that means that the current 20 per cent of South Australians who have a disability, the 20 per cent who care for a person with a disability, and the 40 per cent of carers who, in fact, have a disability themselves, could at any second become 21 and 41 per cent. This number could include any one of the currently non-disabled people in this chamber.

As the tragic event of 9 March 2010 showed us, you just never know what is going to happen. The death of Dignity for Disability's late cofounder and president, Dr Paul Collier, was sudden and, in many respects, untimely. It goes without saying that it was a great shock to me and the party, and I once again offer my sincere condolences, support and love to Paul's mother, Wendy Collier, and his sister, Joanne Harvey. I would also like to thank them because, although I sadly did not know Paul quite long enough to figure out where all his charm, intelligence and warmth come from, I suspect it had something to do with his upbringing.

I recall a telephone conversation I had with a friend and fellow advocate a day or so after Paul had the brain haemorrhage that would ultimately claim his life. After taking 10 or so minutes to digest the news about Paul, my friend said that Paul was like an older version of us. I realise now how true and profound this simple statement was. In his 46 short years, Paul Collier did more than most can hope to do in 100 years.

He chose to attend Oxford not because it was going to be friendly to him and his wheelchair but because he saw it as the best place for him from an academic perspective. He was, of course, admitted and, during his time there as a student, he took steps to make the university accessible to everyone. Paul organised and ran public rallies and forums on disability issues. Towards the end of his life, Paul performed an action that at the time seemed small and, in some ways, still does seem small: he put my name down as the No. 2 candidate for the upper house in Dignity for Disability's 2010 election campaign.

I am still trying to figure out how big a place the idea of fate has in this chamber. However, I will say that the fact that the person who, for want of a less candle snuffing expression, would take Paul's place is 21 years of age, disabled and a woman seems a pretty big coincidence to me.

I had to laugh when I was recently talking to a friend of mine. He has been backpacking around Europe for about a year now, so is not quite au fait with Australian political happenings. He said to me as we spoke on Skype (our first conversation since he left the country), 'I was talking to mum the other day on the phone. She said to me, "One of your friends from high school has just been elected into parliament. You'll never guess who."' My friend exclaimed, without hesitation and without even the knowledge that this person had been elected on a disability platform, 'It's Kelly Vincent, isn't it? It's Kelly, isn't it?', to which his mother could only reply with a shocked nod of the head. So, perhaps there really is a plan for each and every one of us. I sincerely hope so.

There can be no denying that Dignity for Disability's recent election and Paul's death are intricately intertwined. However, like many people with disabilities, I am pretty good at working with

what I have. Yes, the circumstances under which my election came to pass are tragic, even macabre, and very difficult to deal with. But what option do I, and we as a party, have but to embrace this wonderful opportunity and privilege as best we can in order to achieve the best outcomes for people with disabilities and their networks in South Australia and to help Dr Paul Collier live on, because he should; we need him to.

Yes, I suppose I am the quintessential accidental politician, and I unashamedly admit that, on my bad days, I find myself questioning whether I am deserving of sitting at this previously non-existent custom-made bench, for which I thank you very kindly, which in itself is just a small symbol of just how big this is.

I did not earn Paul's votes in the election. I cannot earn a place on this earth in lieu of Paul Collier. But I can earn the respect of both our constituents and my colleagues. I can earn your trust, and I am sure, more often than not, I will earn your criticism. But I am ready and willing to earn all of these things until such time as people with disabilities, their families and allies do not have to fight for and ultimately earn something that is seemingly a birthright to all others: dignity through choice.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (16:25): I rise today to state my position on the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I would like to commence in the customary way by thanking the Governor for his service to South Australia and for his eloquent speech. I wish to congratulate the three new members of this place, who have now all made their maiden speeches. I was particularly impressed with aspects of each of those speeches. My heartfelt congratulations to the Hon. Kelly Vincent, the Hon. Tammy Jennings and the Hon. Jing Lee.

I also take the opportunity if I may, Mr President, to congratulate you on your reappointment as the fearless leader of our council. I look forward to your continuing impartial judgments in the ensuing four years.

I will begin by noting some aspects of the government's agenda with which I personally and, indeed, our party concur; that is, where we have a joint opinion and see things eye to eye. I would like to warmly welcome the government's commitment to introduce legislation to restrict the types of offences that qualify for wholly suspended criminal sentences in South Australia. There are way too many of these currently. Indeed, the imposition of suspended sentences is in fact, in my view, simply almost out of control.

It has been said on many occasions that South Australian courts impose wholly suspended sentences more than do any other courts in any state of Australia. Indeed, I believe the rate of suspensions in this state has reached the point of being intolerable when compared with the various other suspension rates around the country. In New South Wales, for example, of some 205 major drug cases sentenced in 2008, there were 138 actual imprisonments and 45 suspended sentences, or an actual imprisonment rate of some 63 per cent, according to the New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research. In Victoria, of the 196 higher court drug cases in 2006-07, there were 136 imprisonments, or an actual imprisonment rate of 69 per cent, according to the Victorian Sentencing Advisory Council.

In South Australia, there was a comparable number of convictions. There were 217 found guilty for major indictable drug offences in the year 2006—the latest data we had, unfortunately—and only 50 of these led to actual imprisonments. There were 142 suspended sentences given, which I think is inexplicable. This means that the actual imprisonment rate was only 23 per cent, according to the South Australian Office of Crime Statistics and Research. So, we have 23 per cent actual imprisonment in South Australia, 69 per cent in Victoria and 63 per cent in New South Wales for almost identical crimes.

Why should there be such a remarkable difference? That is no criticism of the government, by the way. I think it is a criticism of our courts system that so many sentences end up being suspended. Indeed, as I have said, Family First warmly welcomes the government's initiative to address that matter. I acknowledge that the various states categorise offences and that the types of offence are dealt with by the higher courts differently. That does make comparisons difficult but, nonetheless, the fundamentals of my statements apply.

The government has also promised to introduce legislation to allow prosecutors to introduce evidence of prior attendance in court by defendants. Some members would be aware that I introduced a bill on behalf of Family First in the last session on that exact issue. The reason I

did this, as you will probably recall, Mr President, relates back to a meeting I had with the family of Shirree Turner, a wonderful young woman from all accounts, who was tragically murdered in 1993.

In short, tragically, Shirree Turner was stabbed to death at an Oaklands Park reserve in 1993. A man by the name of Frank Mercuri was charged with the offence. Mercuri was serving a prison sentence in Victoria at the time for the stabbing and attempted rape of another woman in very similar circumstances to Shirree's murder. Under current South Australian evidence laws, this fact and the fact that he had been convicted on 48 prior occasions for other offences involving violent crimes with similar facts could not be used in his murder trial.

Surprise, surprise! As a consequence he was acquitted of Shirree Turner's murder by a jury in 1998. After being acquitted, tragically he went on to kill yet another woman, Rosemary Deagan, before committing suicide himself. These were two deaths that could have been prevented under a more sensible criminal evidence regime. It was a tremendously sad and frustrating case.

I was, indeed, very pleased to hear the announcement just before the election that the government would introduce legislation to amend our evidence laws so that this sort of event could not happen again. At the very least, two lives would have been saved—two lives without even having to think about it for any time at all and, I am sure, many more.

I can assure members that the Turner family, who I spoke to personally about this matter, was also very happy to hear of the proposed changes to the law when I informed them of it. It was certainly something they have campaigned on for a long time. It goes without saying that, when the legislation appears in this chamber, assuming it is along the lines of what I have just mentioned and subject to detail, it will enjoy Family First support.

One issue that was not raised in the Governor's speech was R18+ video games. I take this opportunity to pay tribute to our former attorney-general, who I believe was dealt with somewhat unfairly on occasions for taking a very strong stance on this issue. The former attorney-general championed the fight against our kids getting access to undesirable and violent video games across the nation, and a generation of children will benefit as a result. I particularly put on record Family First's policy that these video games should continue to be kept out of the reach of children, and I call upon the new Attorney-General to continue that fight.

Indeed, a landmark meta analysis study published in the March 2010 issue of the *Psychological Bulletin*, which analysed 130 research reports relating to more than 130,000 participants worldwide, concluded that the exposure to violent video games makes more aggressive, less caring children regardless of their age, sex or culture. These are quite compelling statistics. The report author, Craig Anderson, notes:

Exposure to violent video games increases the likelihood of aggressive behaviour in both short-term and long-term contexts. Such exposure also increases aggressive thinking and aggressive effect and decreases pro-social behaviour.

Family First believes that it is important to continue the fight in this area and will support the new Attorney-General should he continue to object to changing the current classification regime, and we certainly hope he does.

For the benefit of members who are new to this place, Family First is a party that believes that any government must be limited so that the rights and entrepreneurial spirit of individuals are not limited unnecessarily. Our focus in the current term in this chamber will be as it was in the last—holding the government, policy and bureaucracy to account in four specific areas.

First, we believe that taxes in South Australia are too high; we believe that there is too much red tape in this state; we believe that there is too much waste in this state; and we also believe that crucial social services require an immediate overhaul. To be fair, those four topics are not exclusive to South Australia, but it is the jurisdiction in which we operate and, hence, our focus.

On the first issue, numerous independent studies and economic papers name South Australia as having the highest business tax rates in the country. Our high tax rates are turning away business and investment in this great state. It has been said that business goes where it is made welcome and stays where it gets looked after.

Any state government plays a vital role in creating the right environment to attract and retain capital investment. Creating the right environment does not mean offering inducements. Inducements may attract capital, but they do not necessarily retain it. Further, they offend existing

state-based businesses by transferring wealth from locals who pay their taxes to newly introduced businesses.

Thomas Playford's grand strategy was cheap land, lower housing costs and lower input costs to build the state. This was his 'competitive federalism', as he called it. It should never be about states trying to out buy each other using taxpayers' money to attract companies to set up in their state. However, in Family First's opinion, it should be about making our state more attractive than the others.

When Queensland abolished death duties, some time ago now, all the other states quickly followed. South Australia should be setting the trend by having the lowest stamp duty and land tax rates in the country—something we still do not compare favourably on, it must be said, even after the changes announced by the government recently. It is a step in the right direction, clearly, but there is much more to be done in that area.

Something that many people do not know—as a matter of fact, it is only recent knowledge to me—is that 25 years ago South Australia was home to 21 of Australia's top 100 companies. Their head offices were actually based here in the state. Now, in the year 2010, of the top 100 companies in the country just two are based in South Australia: Argo and Santos. Of those two, as members would be aware, Santos is here because an act of this parliament prevents its being swallowed up and relocated. It is not that we necessarily oppose that but that is the fact of the matter.

Why was it that so much investment came to South Australia in the first place not that long ago? I personally place the credit in the hands of the various leaders we have had in this state, and it certainly must be said that premier Tom Playford played a crucial role in the beginning of that entrepreneurial spirit, back some time ago now.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: He gave them taxpayers' money to come here, that's why.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Well, okay. This was a premier who charged little to no business tax, had the Housing Trust build workers' homes near factories—of course, Elizabeth was built largely for the GM Holden workers—and ensured cheap electricity, land and water to business. Red tape was slashed. South Australia was unquestionably the simplest and cheapest place in Australia to set up shop.

Business in South Australia boomed as a result and we enjoyed ensuing booms over the next few decades. Mining, steel and shipbuilding industries appeared in Whyalla, Port Pirie and Port Augusta, and suburbs to the north and south of the city bristled with new industry.

When premier Playford left office in 1965, South Australia's population and economy had actually doubled. Personal wealth of South Australians was second only to Victoria, and 29 per cent of all British immigrants were choosing to come to South Australia. He is quoted as once saying:

South Australia has continued to make outstanding progress and we may justly claim to be the most progressive and prosperous state in the commonwealth. There have been no serious industrial disputes and prices have remained stable. Our industrial expansion has been relatively greater than in other states and public utilities—both power and water—have been more effectively planned. Unemployment in South Australia is the lowest in the commonwealth and we have more money per head of population in savings banks than any other state. We are building houses at a rate substantially above the Australian average. My government will continue its vigorous policies to develop the state and make it better place to live in.

Those are words which we would long to be able to say today, but unfortunately we cannot.

South Australia indeed is only one of two states, as I understand it—Tasmania being the other—that receives more from the commonwealth in tax disbursements that it actually generates. That is not something to boast about. Something like 70 per cent of South Australia's annual state budget now comes from the federal government.

South Australia has been slowly losing its competitive edge for the past 25 years. We used to offer a higher standard of living and quality of life together with a lower cost of living in exchange for slightly lower wages than New South Wales, for example. That can no longer be said to be true. In fact, almost 200,000 South Australians now live in poverty, according to some definitions, despite the state's economic growth. Just over a decade ago, about seven in 100 people lived below the poverty line, but the figures for 2005-06 show it is more like 12 in 100.

To be fair, South Australia will never be able to wholly compete with the Eastern States in many ways and in real terms. The truth is we cannot match the port facilities, financial institutions' might, the manufacturing base, or even just the simple population scale of the eastern seaboard.

If we are to overcome these natural disadvantages, we need flexibility in other areas: lower taxes, less red tape and less waste. What we have now, in fact, are the highest business tax rates in the country and too many barriers to development. For one, we are simply not releasing enough land in the state to allow builders to build and families to own their own home at a reasonable price. As I say, some of these points are not exclusive to South Australia but they are very important to South Australians nonetheless.

Recent ABS data shows that the state's population is steadily increasing, in itself an achievement. It noted an increase of some 18,500 (or 1.2 per cent) last year, raising the state's population to 1.612 million people. However, approvals for new residential dwellings actually fell in the same period by 10.2 per cent to some 12,000 in the 12 months to 30 June; that is, our population growth—low though it is compared with other states—is outpacing our building of new dwellings.

How can this be so? I have spoken to many builders, and they tell me that they want to build. I have spoken to many families, and they tell me that they want to buy a house. The main problem is that not enough land is being released. Builders are resorting to selling smaller blocks in order to keep up with demand, and we are left with the smallest lot sizes in the country. We simply need to release more land.

Of course, there are other issues—and I will not go into detail here—including restrictive planning regulations in councils that simply make it too hard on occasions. Credit where credit is due: the government introduced some very welcome improvements to planning legislation in the last couple of years in this place which Family First wholeheartedly supported, but I see that very much as a first step. Much more needs to be done and the simplest thing we can do is to release more land. It will keep prices stable and people will be able to afford to buy a house and certainly keep the economy thriving.

What is now the Land Management Corporation was first formed in 1972, and was originally called the South Australian land commission. Its primary aim, according to the Land Commission Act 1973, was 'the provision of land to those members of the community who do not have large financial resources'. The land commission act further made it clear that the commission 'shall not conduct its business with a view to making a profit'.

In 1981 those motives were deleted from the legislation—something I certainly would have voted against if I had been here—as the land management commission was reconstituted with a new directive to be more focused on profit than supplying needed land to South Australian families. The northern suburbs, targeted for future housing in the recently released 30-year plan for metropolitan Adelaide—again, something which Family First has supported—are a prime opportunity for immediate land release for housing affordability reasons.

I also mention that our conversations with builders indicate that several companies are unhappy with the way in which the Construction and Industry Training Fund (CITF) operates. They would like the option of directly investing in apprentices and the option of alternative training plans. The hiring of apprentices is becoming cost prohibitive on building sites, and the way in which the scheme has been set up does not help this problem. Resolving this issue would be of great benefit to South Australians wanting a home of their own, not to mention the added benefit of having an increased number of tradesmen available when people need them.

I also take this opportunity to mention another focus of Family First. I was privileged to stand with the Hons Robert Brokenshire, John Darley and Ann Bressington on the steps of Parliament House today for a media conference regarding this issue. It is a request that we have made jointly that high impact social services must be quarantined from the razor gang's cuts of \$750 million, promised prior to the state election and expected to be outlined in the state budget later this year in September. Obviously, the government needs to make extensive cuts to the budget. We do not oppose that at all; in fact, we endorse that. There is plenty of fat that can be cut from the budget.

The Hon. A. Bressington interjecting:

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Exactly. We would like the money to be retained and used for essential services, particularly for those most disadvantaged (as we outlined on the steps today).

There is no reason why we cannot reduce executive, administrative and non-core services and resources—and cut from those areas—while still ensuring that essential services, particularly for those most in need, are maintained. We have jointly called for essential areas of social services to be raised to a minimum benchmark of the national average expenditure in their respective disciplines. This would increase spending on disability services, public housing and other social services which in this state are, indeed, well behind national funding levels.

It is true to say, with record tax revenue in recent years, nevertheless South Australia has still failed to address the backlog of funding to the most vulnerable in our state, to some extent. Those people should not be subjected to further cuts from this budget razor gang (as it is called). It is time for genuine social inclusion for those who need it most. Disability waiting lists in South Australia have grown to over 3,000, with 2,000 people with a disability now waiting for service provisions and around 1,000 people waiting for equipment.

On the issue of Families SA, child protection notifications in this state have increased by 6,000 in the past four years to 23,000 last year. Now around one in five children born in 1991 is the subject of a notification. This vast increase in notifications is putting immense strain on the system, but funding is not increasing at the same pace as notifications. These are difficult issues for government. Family First is not ignorant of that fact; we acknowledge that. We are not saying that this is easy: we are saying that it is very important.

Family First, of course, is interested in the more intangible matters affecting our society such as defending traditional values; promoting the value of human life; supporting marriages and family; preventing reckless drug behaviour; pursuing justice for the poor and marginalised; supporting choice in education; supporting victims and preventing crime; curbing South Australia's addiction to gambling revenue; looking after our environment and future; and ensuring high quality health care for the city and also the country.

I believe that independent schools should be free to teach a curriculum that aligns with their faith. Actions taken by the independent schools registration board to stop faith-based schools teaching according to their ethos will be opposed by Family First. Family First is also intent on doing what we can to improve, at times, the atrocious levels of support for our constituents with disabilities in this state. Again we acknowledge these matters are not easy, but they are incredibly important.

A recent poll has seen some 89 per cent of people in agreement with 'nothing is more important than family'. Another survey noted that 77 per cent of Australians believe that any government's prime objective should be to achieve the greatest happiness of people, not necessarily the greatest wealth of people. As I have said in the past, strong families make life worth living for most people, and the primary goal and objectives of Family First in the coming session, as with all sessions, is to support legislation that we see as supporting these values and fighting legislation that is potentially harmful.

One concerning statistic which I feel is worth mentioning is that, in the 1950s, statistically people felt emotionally close to seven family and friends. Now the average is down to four people to whom we feel emotionally close, on average. It is a problem and I think it is important to keep some of the focus on those intangible issues facing South Australia. We are becoming increasingly isolated. Again this is not exclusive to South Australia but an important issue for us to grapple with.

In 2006, we had some 51,375 divorces in Australia, of which just under 4,000 were in South Australia. Each divorce represents a broken family, and many divorces result in loss and hurting children. Our marriage rate in Australia has only once ever been lower than it currently is today and that was in the midst of World War I when some 416,000 Australian men in their prime left our shores for battle. What more can we do to strengthen marriage, with both single mums and the perhaps forgotten single dads in this state being left behind, in many cases?

These intangible issues, which are sometimes unquantifiable from an economic stand point, end up costing and hurting our state in dollar terms. One in four homes in South Australia is now occupied by one person. Of course, this has a direct effect on the price of housing for people as demand increases, because more and more people are either living alone or in smaller numbers. Four out of five divorced South Australian mothers are dependent on welfare completely some five to eight years after their separation.

Family break-up rather than unemployment is now the main reason for the rise in poverty levels in Australia. Children without fathers, on average, have lower test scores in their schools and turn to crime more consistently, according to recent data. There are some figures which show that

63 per cent of youth suicides are from fatherless homes; 75 per cent of adolescent patients in substance abuse centres come from fatherless homes; 90 per cent of homelessness and runaway children are from fatherless homes; 71 per cent of high school dropouts come from fatherless homes; and 85 per cent of youth in prison had no father at home at all during their childhood.

Family First will continue to highlight these issues and keep our focus on the family in all our parliamentary deliberations so that these issues can be dealt with. Family First will also move to ensure that misleading how-to-vote cards are not used again in upcoming elections, as they were recently—and I note the Attorney-General has indicated legislation to that effect. We are concerned about the damage done to democracy by people when they see these sorts of things take place and, indeed, even the lowering of the esteem in which members of parliament are held as a result of these activities.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: What about Family First handing out how-to-vote cards in red T-shirts in Kaurua?

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Let me explain what happened there. I was about to sit down, but I need to take that point.

The PRESIDENT: The interjection is out of order.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: It is.

The PRESIDENT: The honourable member really should not respond.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: You are right, Mr President, so I will not. However, I will give a quick outline of what happened there in the situation of Family First handing out how-to-vote cards. Our colours are red, blue and white, Mr President, as you would be well aware. Some of our members chose to wear red T-shirts with our own slogan on them, that is, 'Some Things are Worth Fighting For,' which appeared on all our election material and which has always been our slogan—a registered slogan, in fact. How one deems that as somehow being deceptive I think is just incredible. I hasten to add that the how-to-vote cards we handed out were precisely those registered with the Electoral Commission and the only ones handed out by Family First.

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

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Indeed. That said, I have hit the high points for what will be our focus for the next four years. We certainly support the motion and look forward to the time ahead.

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO (16:51): I rise to congratulate and thank the Governor, His Excellency Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce, on his address on the re-election of the Rann government for a third four-year term. I take the opportunity to acknowledge the many good works of our Governor and Mrs Liz Scarce. They are a tremendous partnership of two very committed and caring people who lend their support to so many deserving causes and who represent this state and its interests with enormous distinction.

Along with other members, I add my congratulations to the three new members of this chamber: the Hons Ms Jing Lee, Ms Tammy Jennings and Ms Kelly Vincent. I congratulate them on their first speeches. I know that all three will bring both their personal attributes and talents, as well as the philosophies of their parties, to our debates. As I did not get the opportunity to place on record my condolences to the family and friends of the late Dr Paul Collier last week, I do so now. He was a determined and spirited man, having met him on a couple of occasions, and I know that the Hon. Ms Vincent will do his memory proud.

I commiserate with former members who lost their seats at the last election—hardworking representatives all—and I imagine it is very tough because the circumstances that surround electors decisions are immediate. I also congratulate not just those in this chamber but those in the other place on their election. I make particular mention of the three new members of the Labor Party in the other place: the members for Taylor, Mitchell and Little Para. All three—Mrs Leesa Vlahos, Mr Alan Sibbons and Mr Lee Odenwalder—are passionate about politics, and I know they will serve their electorates with commitment and integrity.

I make mention of several areas of special interest to me, as well as the commitment of this government in ensuring the best possible outcome for our constituencies. At no other time in the recent history of white settlement with our now population has this state been so challenged to ensure there is sufficient potable water, as well as sufficient water for agribusinesses and other industries. As to be expected, the prolonged drought has placed our resources and communities

under stress. This government has responded with strategies at every level to ensure our water supply, as well as demonstrating leadership at the national level.

The first water from the desalinisation plant will come online at the end of this year so as to reduce our dependency on the River Murray. As members would be aware, it will supply 100 gigalitres a year, which is half our critical human needs. It will be an important safeguard for South Australians. It is to be expected that we will see a Murray-Darling Basin Authority plan by midyear to address water access by all states.

The authority's latest water resource assessment shows that there will be improved water availability in the River Murray catchment, as well as the first instalment of 257 billion litres from South Australia's minimum 500 billion litre share of the Queensland floodwaters. As well, we have been able to raise River Murray irrigator allocations to their highest level in four years. As we know, they have been four very bad years, and the storage volume in the River Murray remains low. Nonetheless, it is pleasing that some good opening rains in the season, as well as some summer storm activity, have seen our reservoirs at an at least decent capacity.

This government's initiatives range from big picture ones, such as the desalination plant, to the announced \$200 rebate on rainwater tanks for backyard garden watering. Whether it is the initiatives just mentioned or the water-saving restrictions, it is about asking all of us to use water wisely and conserve our precious resource. Water remains one of the most important issues facing our state, and the Water for Good initiative is a blueprint for ensuring our state's ongoing water supply. Even with some improved conditions, we all appreciate that our farmers are waiting for some better rain right now as they make decisions about whether to plant or whether to wait it out a bit longer. Water will always remain one of the most important issues for our state.

At no other time in the history of our state have we seen so much commitment to infrastructure spend, including the upgrading of our public hospitals, the building of a new Royal Adelaide Hospital, the redevelopment of the Convention Centre, and massive rail and road upgrades and construction, to name just some of the things that will benefit all of us. In relation to the Northern Expressway, the Port Wakefield road improvements are part of a nearly \$1.5 billion joint state and federal investment to build a better north-south corridor in Adelaide. The minister in the other place, just prior to Easter, opened several lanes, or half of the bridge, which no doubt assisted with the busy traffic at that time of the year.

The minister also recently announced South Australia's biggest rail revitalisation project, the electrification of the Gawler line, with major trackwork on the line between Adelaide and Mawson Lakes to commence early next month. This multibillion dollar upgrade of the public transport system includes the electrification of the Noarlunga, Gawler, and Outer Harbor lines, as well as new station infrastructure upgrades, new electric trains, and a modern ticketing system. This amount of funding at the federal and state level means that South Australians will benefit from an unprecedented decade-long investment in our state's public transport system.

The securing of defence projects is another area about which I am certain we are all pleased. As His Excellency mentioned in his speech, South Australia is now the nation's premier defence hub, with a state Minister for Defence Industries now appointed. This strong commitment to infrastructure has no doubt assisted in the very good news on the jobs front. At no other time in our history has the unemployment rate been so low. Statistics released in early April saw South Australia's seventh consecutive monthly rise in total employment in the state, and the number of new jobs created since the Rann government came to office in 2002 now stands at 112,700.

The recent agreement with the federal government to see better health outcomes for our state is also something that makes just plain sense. Understandably, the health portfolio is one with a never-ending demand for funding, with costs continuing to rise. The fact that this is recognised at the federal level is important, and the fact that we have a federal government that is prepared to assist and take leadership is truly commendable.

The government has announced that disability, mental health, and emergency care are priorities for this government. As a former minister for mental health, I particularly welcomed the announcement last month that works on the new \$130 million Glenside Hospital will be completed and ready to use by the middle of 2012—again, part of this government's strong infrastructure spend.

The Rann Labor government showed real leadership in its negotiations to secure the historic agreement to reform Australia's health system, and it would be nonsensical for anyone to suggest otherwise. The agreement with the federal government will mean more than \$1.35 billion

extra for health services in South Australia over the next 10 years, commencing from July this year. South Australia now funds more than 60 per cent of our hospital system. Under the new system, that percentage will be reversed, with the federal government funding just over 60 per cent.

The Premier rightly pointed out that the agreement will secure the long-term sustainability of our health and hospital system, which delivers what we all want to see, and that is high quality medical care. The federal budget made even further commitment to the health sector, with South Australia to receive an extra \$306 million over the next four years.

Since I have been in parliament, one of the areas in which I have had the opportunity to take a strong interest is our food and wine industries, and at different times I have joined committees and councils in those areas. Our agri-food sector is impacted by both climatic and economic fortunes. They do not just serve our basic needs, but they are often also about passion and belief in a product of excellence that satisfies the consumer's palate and senses. This drive to deliver product with a difference and a sense of place sees South Australia well placed in the export area, as well as providing excellent fresh food and wine for all of us.

The Hon. J.M. Gazzola: Hear, hear!

The Hon. CARMEL ZOLLO: The Hon. John Gazzola says, 'Hear, hear!' I am pleased that we have agreement. Food/wine tourism is a combination that sees South Australia as a must destination for those who are passionate about a lifestyle holiday. Governments of both persuasions have been working with the industry sector for many years, and towards the end of last year we all welcomed new food and wine strategies.

In the 2008-09 year, the value of our state's gross food revenue reached a record of \$12.4 billion, and a record 146,000 people were employed in food-related industries. Of course, it goes without saying that the South Australian wine industry is a significant contributor to the state's economy, employing around 10,000 people, and it is our second biggest export earner.

As released during the election campaign, the government aims to create an extra 15,000 new jobs in our food and wine industries in the next five years by helping to boost exports. The then minister (Hon. Mr Caica) announced an investment of \$1 million per year in a new export program to drive growth in South Australia's food and wine industries.

This government has demonstrated its commitment at all levels in its provision of services in our education and health institutions, infrastructure spend and many other initiatives and, of course, in its law and order agenda to see a safer and secure society. I again congratulate the Premier in the other place on his historic third term win, and I thank His Excellency the Governor for outlining the government's platform for the coming four years.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

At 17:04 the council adjourned until Tuesday 25 May 2010 at 14:15.