

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Thursday, 26 February 2015**

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

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

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

Education Adelaide Charter, dated 2014-15
TAFE SA Ministerial Charter

By the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Adelaide Oval Licence Area Sub-Licence Agreement between the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and Adelaide Oval SMA Limited,
dated 8 December 2014

Adelaide Oval Licence Area Sub-Licence Agreement between the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and South Australian Cricket Association,
dated 8 December 2014

Adelaide Oval Licence Area Sub-Licence Agreement between the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and South Australian National Football League Inc., dated 8 December 2014

*Question Time***BODY IMAGE CAMPAIGN**

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for the Status of Women a question regarding the South Australian Body Image Campaign.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Last year the minister announced the launch of the South Australian Body Image Campaign, and I quote from what she said in October 2014:

Self-confidence and body image are among the most sensitive issues for young women... This body image campaign is designed to empower young South Australian girls and remind them that character, skills and personality attributes are far more important than [their] weight and shape. We want a generation of young girls to look beyond stereotypes and find confidence within themselves, and then to share this self-assurance with their friends and peers.

There have been several reports that women as young as 16 years old are availing themselves of cosmetic surgery and, certainly, that there has been a boom in the age bracket of 16 to 25 years. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is the use of cosmetic surgery one of the areas in which the campaign will send certain messages?
2. Is the minister aware of these alarming statistics in terms of her portfolio concerning the status of women?
3. Why has the government chosen to allocate \$15,000 to this campaign when today they have announced they are running a campaign of \$1.1 million to campaign against the federal government?
4. Does this indicate a level of priority where the government thinks the campaign against its federal counterpart is more important than the image of young women?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:21): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. Indeed, I did see those statistics come out that indicated that there has been an increase in younger people—teenagers—using cosmetic surgery, and I have to say that that is incredibly alarming.

I think this goes to that issue of body image and self-confidence helping particularly young girls from a very early age understand that it is not about external beauty, that beauty is within and that the sense of character and health and wellbeing and those sorts of attributes are far more important about one's person. That is one of the reasons that we launched the self-esteem campaign. It is targeting very young girls, as I have already outlined.

I do not think I need to outline the project again in this place. I have spoken about it in detail before, but that is why it is so important that we are able to capture young girls at a very early age to reinforce messages about not being overly preoccupied with their exterior in terms of what is classified as being beautiful, what is classified as being attractive and what is classified as being even female, which is often determined largely by men, actually, and often reinforced through media. That campaign seeks to work on those sorts of notions and, obviously, the more well-developed their sense of personal identity is from an early age, the less likelihood there is that as a teenager they will then be resorting to cosmetic surgery.

This government has committed large amounts of money. Our Watch is only one small aspect of our campaign, but we have committed a large amount of resourcing, as I said, to a wide range of projects to assist women and particularly women's safety. Some of these are our court assistance service, our early warning service, the contributions that we have made to the White Ribbon campaign, commitments around the DV perpetrator database and data on DV, the Family Safety Framework, our MAPS, which has delivered quite significant results, and the Coroner's Court DV position. The list goes on and on.

The body image campaign is only one element in an armour of a wide suite of commitments and funding, including the contribution to sponsorship to Our Watch, a foundation which of course has a very important part to play in changing social and cultural attitudes around women and cultivating respectful relationships. It also reinforces issues around body image, as well.

We have quite definitely put our money where our mouth is in terms of our commitment to these issues. I think the campaign to try to pressure the federal government into reversing some of its outrageous and draconian cuts is also money well spent. The proposed cuts have a devastating impact on people's lives and it is important that we do whatever we can to put the federal government in a position to revise their decision and reverse it.

BODY IMAGE CAMPAIGN

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:26): Supplementary question arising from the minister's answer: do we therefore take it that the minister believes that the campaign that is about to be embarked upon is more important than this particular body image campaign for young women, given the massive, disproportionate amount of funding allocated?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:26): That is absolutely outrageous, and I would have thought the Hon. Michelle Lensink would have approached this in a far more sensible way. I have already outlined the significant financial contribution we have made to women and violence towards women. We know that that is about a continuum: on one extreme end we have violence against women and domestic violence, and at the other end we have attitudes that are cultivated around disrespect and devaluing women, and we know that body image is linked to that. We have contributed significant resources and will continue to contribute significant resources to looking after our women and particularly our young girls.

BODY IMAGE CAMPAIGN

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:28): Supplementary question: when I asked questions in relation to this program on 28 October, I specifically questioned the evidence base for the teen body image program. The minister took on notice three questions: could she give details of the US study, who had provided advice on the South Australian strategy, and thirdly, who will be undertaking the South Australian valuation? Considering I asked that on 28 October, I was wondering if the minister might give us those answers now.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:28): I thought I had actually written to someone about that.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: No, I haven't got an answer.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Well, I have certainly signed off on one, so that must still be in the pipeline. As we said, body image dissatisfaction is something that is a key element of this particular campaign. We know, as I have reported in this place before, that this particular campaign was inspired by a campaign run in New York called the NYC Girls Project, which featured a public education campaign aimed at girls aged seven to 12 appearing on buses and trains and phone boxes, etc., showing a diverse range of girls performing activities like reading and playing sport.

Associated with that were words like: 'I'm a girl, I'm smart, I'm a leader, I'm adventurous, I'm friendly, I'm funny, I'm beautiful the way I am'—so reinforcing words. The NYC Girls Project is a widely regarded program and distinctive in tackling the issues with a city-wide focus. The appeal of this wider focus is that it reaches more girls than traditional programs. It is also unique in targeting girls aged seven to 12 in recognition that many of the social attitudes about women's bodies and body image are embedded in a woman's psyche at a very early age. An evaluation of the girls' self-esteem curriculum produced as part of the NYC Girls Project, 'Full of Ourselves' campaign, found that participants showed sustained positive changes in body image, body satisfaction and body esteem.

The Office for Women through the Women's Information Service has partnered with the YWCA in the development and delivery of a digital media campaign. The campaign will be delivered through the Women's Information Service digital media presence on social media sites such as Facebook, Twitter and suchlike. Three workshops to support the creation of content by the young women have already been held. These provided the content creators and mentors with information about body image and the factors that contribute to positive body esteem in order to provide a context for the creation of campaign content.

The women were then partnered with mentors with relevant professional skills in a variety of digital content areas in order to workshop their ideas and create a plan for completing their content that will deliver a strong message that a girl's value comes from their character, skills and attributes, not their weight and size. The content creators were asked to reflect on being aged seven to 12 and they talked about messages, and peer education approaches have been successful in a number of contexts, apparently around smoking, preventing substance abuse, HIV, etc. So it is a technique that is incorporated in those sorts of areas.

In terms of the YWCA, the Office for Women is very pleased to have the YWCA Adelaide as a key partner in the Body Image Campaign. The YWCA of Adelaide has a long history of successful projects and campaigns for young women and girls, and they run a successful Go Girls! group, a mentoring program for young people aged 11 to 14. Workers from the YWCA who are experienced in the delivery of body image content will be providing information to volunteers about body image, body esteem and suchlike.

The Office for Women will undertake an internal evaluation at various phases of the campaign. Evaluation will be undertaken by the Office for Women once the project is finalised. I will obviously be happy to report those outcomes once I have received them. Workers from the Centacare PACE program who deliver body image workshops as well as peer workers who have a lived experience of recovering from eating disorders attended the January workshops, and

discussions are currently taking place as to the potential for PACE workers to facilitate further workshops in regional areas of South Australia in support of that campaign. I will follow up where my written response is and make sure that honourable members receive that as soon as possible.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wade has a supplementary question.

BODY IMAGE CAMPAIGN

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:34): The minister today has been focusing on peer education in her comments, so could I ask her:

1. Is peer education part of the New York program? Because there has been no suggestion that I am aware of up to this stage that there is a peer education element in New York.

2. Is it appropriate to call the South Australian program 'peer education' when, as I understand it, we are talking about young women of the age of 13 to 18 preparing material for young girls of the age of seven to 12, and vague references to peer education being empirically based hardly validate peer education when it is not even peers?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:35): I thank the member for his further supplementary. I believe that the peer element comes from assisting very young girls to identify positive messages about body image. They work with older young people as well who are the enablers, if you like; they have the skills and expertise to help them express those ideas. The messages are, in turn, focused back to young girls—their peers. My understanding is, in that respect, it is peer education.

BODY IMAGE CAMPAIGN

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:35): A supplementary question, sir.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary question, Ms Vincent.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: Does the body image project also touch on what is a normal body for a woman and, particularly, the unhelpful standards that are sometimes perpetuated by things like Photoshopped magazines and pornography? And does the project specifically touch on issues of beauty in terms of people whose bodies may not always be considered normal, such as people with disabilities or women from ethnic backgrounds?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:36): I am not aware of all of the content of the course, but I cannot imagine that the potential to consider those sorts of elements would not occur in an initiative such as this. The issue of what is normal and what is not to me is quite central to body image. So, I can't imagine how you would conduct a course like this without addressing at least some of those issues.

SKILLS FOR ALL

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (14:37): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to directing a question to the Leader of the Government on the subject of Skills for All.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: A number of journalists and commentators have commented to me how embarrassing it was to see and read the minister's nonanswers to a series of questions put to her about a central facet of her ministerial portfolio, and that was the Skills for All program and the series of questions that were put yesterday. I am sure, Mr President, even your good self would have been shaking your head at the minister's lack of response.

A series of questions were put to the minister yesterday, such as how many registered training organisations had been asked to return subsidies paid under the Skills for All program in relation to the alleged incorrect use of bridging units and what was the total quantum of funds that the department was seeking to recoup through the process. She was also asked whether or not bridging units were noncompliant, and had RTOs been asked to repay the money.

Further on, the minister was asked whether it was correct that individual RTOs had actually received a letter from the minister's department which said 'The minister'—that is, minister Gago—'believes that the bridging units claimed are not compliant with the Skills for All contract.'

The minister's responses—as you would be aware and other members would be aware—to all of this was a combination of: 'This is an operational issue', 'I am not aware of the detail of this', 'I will need to be briefed on the particular issue', 'I don't have that detail with me', 'Yes, it's very important, but I want to bring accurate and detailed information', and 'I don't have that depth of detail with me.' There were a variety of other phrases, sentences and comments along those lines.

My question to the minister is: given the importance of this particular issue to registered training organisations and to the South Australian community, and given she has now had 24 hours to be thoroughly briefed on the detail of the questions that were put to her yesterday which she was unable to answer, will she at least today treat this chamber with some respect and provide some answers to these important questions that were put to her yesterday?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for his questions. As usual, we saw the Hon. Rob Lucas come into this place badly informed and his question poorly researched. Indeed, I've been able to ascertain information about the bridging unit questions that were raised yesterday.

Honourable members would probably know that a bridging unit is a unit of competency which assists a student to successfully complete a qualification in the course that they are enrolled in. An example of that might be where a student, for instance, requires additional assistance such as literacy or numeracy skills. Bridging units are undertaken in parallel with higher-level training to ensure that a student has the necessary basic skills to obtain that qualification.

Like all programs receiving government funding, which is public funding—the hard-earned taxes of mums and dads—it's extremely important that government funds are spent for the purpose that they were intended. In the case of bridging units, they must be spent on units that provide the additional assistance that a particular student needs, as I have outlined. Every Skills for All provider is required to retain evidence to support any determination that a bridging unit is needed for a particular student.

As part of a monitoring process, the department identified an increase in the number of bridging units being claimed by some training providers so, consequently, 20 Skills for All training providers were written to by the director of Skills SA and asked to provide evidence to validate selection and use of bridging units. She was exercising a delegated ministerial authority on my behalf. Just for the benefit of other matters currently occurring, I am advised that HGT was not one of the Skills for All training providers written to by the department.

I am advised that, to date, evidence provided by training providers has resulted in the identification of a small minority of training providers potentially claiming bridging units that are in breach of the Skills for All funding contracts, so timely action has been undertaken by Skills for All to work to reclaim these funds.

I am advised that the department has identified three training providers that were in breach of their Skills for All training contract in relation to these matters. One training provider, in late 2014, repaid moneys owed on receipt of correspondence from the director of Skills SA. The other two training providers have entered into deeds of settlement. The deeds of settlement, again, were signed on my behalf by the director of Skills SA with those individual training providers.

I am advised that the total amount being sought from these three training providers is approximately \$1.9 million, and this action obviously is being taken to ensure that quality training provided to students in South Australia continues to remain of that excellent quality. It ensures that public funds—the hard-earned money of, as I said, mums and dads—continue to be used appropriately and for the purposes that they were intended.

SKILLS FOR ALL

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (14:44): A supplementary question arising out of the minister's answer?

The PRESIDENT: Yes.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Is the minister indicating that, with something as serious as \$1.9 million being sought in repayment for incorrectly paid subsidies, the first time she was aware of that was after question time yesterday when I put questions to her in this chamber?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:44): No.

SKILLS FOR ALL

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (14:44): Mr President, if the minister now concedes that she was briefed prior to yesterday in relation to this \$1.9 million, why did she indicate variously yesterday that she did not know the details, she did not have any information, and this was an operational issue for TAFE to handle?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:45): I did no such thing, sir; no such thing at all. Mr President—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: I just read it out—

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Mr President, what I said yesterday—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: —'I don't have that level of detail.'

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Lucas, let the minister answer.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: —was that I did not have that level of detail. I never said—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You didn't have anything!

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: You come into this place and you just say things that are wrong—that are blatantly incorrect.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: No, I didn't; you're not telling the truth.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: The Hon. Rob Lucas comes into this place day after day—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You are not telling the truth!

The PRESIDENT: Minister, sit down, please. We do not want a debate across the floor. The minister is giving an answer. You might not like the answer, but that is her answer. Minister.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: She's not telling the truth.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Suck it in. You are squealing like a stuck pig; that's what he's doing.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, please keep your colourful language down also.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: Thank you, Mr President. Again, he comes into this place and just says incorrect things. I never said I did not have any information; what I said is I did not have detailed information to answer the questions that were asked of me. And, as you can see from the response I have given today, there is a great deal of detail there of specific figures and specific processes. I had some information but felt that it was inadequate information to answer the level of detail that was asked by the Hon. Rob Lucas.

SKILLS FOR ALL

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (14:46): Mr President, my question to the minister following on from her answer is: yesterday, the minister was asked whether bridging units were noncompliant, and have RTOs been asked to repay the money? I asked the minister: did she not know the answer to

that question yesterday? Were they noncompliant, and had they been asked to repay the money? There is no detail in that question: it is a simple yes or no.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:46): I answered the question. I only had partial information yesterday—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: You didn't have anything; you were asked—

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I was asked a series of detailed questions—

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: How incompetent are you? What is there between those two ears?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: —that I did not have detailed responses for, and I have brought them today, Mr President—

The PRESIDENT: Sit down, minister. Hon. Mr Lucas, if I remember rightly, the minister, in answer to your question, said that she would get a detailed response to that, and this is what she has done. It is not about incompetence or whatever; the minister has come to this chamber now with a detailed response. The Hon. Mr Wade.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order in the house! The Hon. Mr Wade has the floor.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The minister and the Hon. Mr Lucas will allow the Hon. Mr Wade to ask his question.

TAFE SA

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:47): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question relating to fee-free courses.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I understand that TAFE does not currently charge a fee for its Diploma of English Proficiency. My questions to the minister are: can the minister assure the council that TAFE will not be imposing a fee for this course, reportedly forecast to be as much as \$3,000; and secondly, can the minister advise whether any other TAFE fee-free courses will incur a fee from next year?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:48): I thank the honourable member for his questions. Those questions need to be referred to TAFE SA, who are responsible for setting their own fee structures, independent of government. In relation to any information about their current fees or any future fees, the honourable member—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Maher, it is very disrespectful to talk while your leader is on her feet, giving an answer, so desist. Minister.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: So, Mr President, in relation to any information the honourable member wishes to know about current fees or future TAFE fees, he would need to address those questions to the appropriate organisation, which is TAFE SA.

TAFE SA

The Hon. S.G. WADE (14:49): Supplementary question. Whatever the minister's interpretation of the operational independence of TAFE, they are still part of the ministerial accountability of this minister before this house. I ask the minister: what relevance is the operational nature of that information to the legitimate right of this house to be informed through the responsible minister?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:49): It is the responsibility of TAFE SA. The honourable member needs to address his question to TAFE SA. They set their own business structures, which includes fee structures, accordingly. The South Australian government is the funder and TAFE SA is the service provider. I'm happy to take questions about government funds, the funding that we provide to service providers, one of whom is TAFE. I am responsible for answering those questions.

I am happy to take questions about funding to these institutions, but the service providers not only participate in conducting government-supported training through Skills for All, and there are some other programs as well, but they have other business training structures completely independent of that. Many of them have fee-for-service type courses, international students, all sorts of arrangements with universities and partnerships with other organisations. They have business elements completely separate to that, and they are entitled to do that and encouraged to do that. But in relation to my responsibilities, we are the fund provider and I am happy to take questions about the funds that we provide for subsidising public training.

TAFE SA

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:51): Further supplementary, or a supplementary?

The PRESIDENT: Very close there. The Hon. Ms Lensink.

The Hon. S.G. Wade: I've already had a supplementary so it must be a further one.

The PRESIDENT: I've just given a supplementary. I don't need your help. The Hon. Ms Lensink.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: My question to the minister is: why is this an operational matter when the question is asked in parliament, when on Matt and Dave's show on ABC the minister can attempt to give a response?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (14:51): That's nonsense, absolute nonsense. It's just incorrect. It's blatantly incorrect. I was not asked that question on Matt and Dave. It's just blatantly totally incorrect that I was asked about a fee, Mr President, in terms of the question. It's just not correct.

TONSLEY PARK REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation. Can the minister give us an update on the state government's Tonsley Park redevelopment?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (14:52): I thank the honourable member for his very good question, and I am able to find some information about that to answer his question. The Tonsley redevelopment is a glimpse into what the future of manufacturing in South Australia will look like: high value companies that are globally competitive, working closely with research and training organisations. In the last 18 months since the Tonsley vision was launched in May 2013, we have seen tremendous progress onsite in terms of both the physical delivery and economic activity.

The 20-year \$253 million redevelopment is a long-term investment by this government in South Australia's future. This development will welcome 8,500 students each year and is forecast to leverage more than \$1 billion in private investment and deliver more than 6,000 jobs over the next 20 years. Already, Tonsley has attracted significant investment from: TAFE SA, Flinders University (where 6,000 students will attend from March), Siemens Australia, Hills Innovation Centres, Signostics and ZEN Energy, along with a memorandum of understanding with MAN Diesel and Remote Energy to develop large-scale hybrid power generations and to cluster with like-minded companies.

Tonsley also now houses a unique training facility in the Onshore Petroleum Centre of Excellence. Santos, Senex Energy, Beach Energy and TAFE have partnered with the government of South Australia to provide accredited training to oil and gas workers. Just last month, construction of the new \$32.2 million state drill core reference library commenced. This world-class information and data resource will lead to new discoveries and energy developments over the next 20 years, generating an estimated \$6 billion in royalties.

This development is changing how traditional business is carried out. Everything at Tonsley has been designed and built to encourage a collaborative environment, right down to the central food and retail precinct encouraging researchers, students, companies and entrepreneurs to share their ideas for new products and develop solutions to existing problems. It is a lot like the Blue Room but without the French onion soup, where many people can come together and—

The Hon. T.A. Franks interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, it is there every six or eight weeks. I thank honourable members for their interest in French onion soup particularly. I have been lucky enough to visit Tonsley a couple of times in the past few weeks, and on the most recent of those visits I was able to announce that Origin Energy, in partnership with our Tonsley tenant ZEN Energy, has been selected to deliver the roof solar installation on top of the main assembly building at Tonsley. For those members who are familiar with the old Mitsubishi plant, that is the saw-tooth roofed building that housed the main assembly part.

This project has the potential to be the largest solar roof installation in South Australia and, if fully realised, will cover an area larger than the playing surface of Adelaide Oval and provide relatively cheap renewable energy to those businesses under the main assembly building roof at the Tonsley development.

Over the coming months (sometime in April) we will see new retail outlets, the opening of the main entrance from South Road and the completion of the urban forest, which will continue to stimulate the site and draw in the local community. The development of approximately 850 dwellings in coming years will also provide contemporary living options built to 21st century environmental and design standards, attracting people from a range of backgrounds to work, live and spend time at Tonsley.

This world-class development is an outstanding example of what can be achieved through partnership and collaboration. When government, industry, the research sector and community work together, very big things are possible.

EPILEPSY CENTRE

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (14:56): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Minister for Health questions regarding an Epilepsy Centre South Australia proposal to establish a northern hub for epilepsy education, treatment and support in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT: Approximately 224,000 Australians and 50 million people worldwide live with epilepsy. A seizure may range from brief attention lapses, muscle jerks and repetitive movements to severe and prolonged convulsions and loss of consciousness. Epilepsy can occur at any age, but is more common among infants and children and those over 65 years of age.

South Australia is the only state in Australia never to have provided government funding to the local community epilepsy body. Despite this, The Epilepsy Centre actively reduces pressure on many public health services and in fact provides integrated, in-house and multi-disciplinary support to a range of public hospitals and government departments with regard to epilepsy. In a typical year, The Epilepsy Centre will assist people living with epilepsy and also the broader community through things such as counselling and support to over 1,950 of its members and over 350 families, seizure first aid training to schools and families, home visits on a regular basis to 200 clients, and so on.

At present, there is significant unmet need for epilepsy support in the northern suburbs, in particular since the clinics that The Epilepsy Centre currently partner with to offer support are at the

Royal Adelaide, Women's and Children's and Flinders hospitals. It leaves a large population without any adequate support. The Epilepsy Centre put forward a proposal to the Minister for Health in March 2013—two years ago. There has been silence from the minister since the proposal was made. Transforming Health is also silent on this proposal. My questions to the minister are:

1. Is the minister aware of the unmet need in regard to epilepsy support, services and education in the northern suburbs of Adelaide?
2. If not, why not, given that this proposal was brought to his office two years ago?
3. Is the minister planning to address the issues of unmet need in the northern suburbs?
4. Why does the Transforming Health document remain silent on the issue of epilepsy support?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:59): I thank the honourable member for her important questions. I will refer them to the Minister for Health in another place and bring back a response.

NORTHERN ECONOMIC PLAN

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:59): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Automotive Transformation a question regarding the northern economic plan. Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: First, as this is my first question to the minister, I extend my congratulations to him, particularly as a former member of the Whips Union. The 30-year plan for Greater Adelaide indicates that by 2036 the population growth of the northern suburbs will require an additional 79,000 jobs to be sustainable. With the imminent closure of General Motors Holden and potential effects on supply chain businesses, the northern suburban region, which is a major economic driver for our state, is facing major challenges.

In response the government recently announced the development of a northern economic plan to create jobs in the region, source new opportunities for businesses' growth and diversify the local economy and ascertain from where resources to support these programs will come. I recently read with interest a document that overviewed the government's objectives for the plan. I noted with pleasure that the state Labor government in this document spoke positively about partnering with the federal Coalition government specifically to deliver a \$155 million growth fund, which is helping companies affected by the automotive closures take up other opportunities and growth sectors.

It appears the development of this plan is in its infancy, but the potential for success is great and, for the people of the northern suburbs, much required. My questions of the minister are:

1. When will the draft plan be ready and put out for public consultation?
2. Other than state and local government agencies and industry bodies, from who else will the minister seek feedback or input for the plan?
3. When does the minister expect the final plan will be ready to be released to the public and become a working blueprint for northern economic development?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for his very important question and his long-term interest in matters to do with northern Adelaide, which obviously includes the area in which he lives and represents. I will start by giving a bit of background about this plan. As the honourable member has pointed out, it is about a plan for northern Adelaide, particularly in the wake of the announcement that Holden will end its manufacturing business in South Australia.

As tempting as it is to talk about why Holden is leaving, as I did when the Hon. Andrew McLachlan helpfully asked me a question on my very first day as a minister, I will not go through all of that right now at the start of my answer, but I make very clear that the reason this plan is so crucial is because the federal government is chasing the automotive industry out of this country, putting in jeopardy so many jobs. This new approach is needed as Holden prepares to leave the state and, as

honourable members know, this goes beyond the mere closure of Holden but affects supply chain industries and other service industries.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: If you don't mention that I won't mention that Nick Champion said that he'd saved Holdens.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his interjection and note his new-found confidence, with his hipster beard, in being able to interject so ferociously as I give an answer. The northern Adelaide economic plan will be led by the government of South Australia, but has been and will continue to be developed in collaboration with local government, industry and the community.

The action-oriented economic plan will provide a road map that focuses on job creation and providing new skills. The work of the Automotive Transformation Taskforce will feed into and complement the northern economic plan. In fact, the Automotive Transformation Taskforce is just one of the resources available to help activate the plan. There are many other resources, particularly through state government departments, that will be used.

It will feature short, medium and long-term initiatives including, but not limited to: industry diversification by identifying and capturing new opportunities in a range of sectors, such as food and beverage, horticultural research, advanced manufacturing, construction and new building materials, health services, aged care and disability, mining and energy services, defence, transport and logistics and urban infrastructure.

It will also look at small business capabilities and development to encourage entrepreneurship, including improving industry links with research institutions, product development, productivity and business models. The plan will utilise university and research capabilities already in the northern suburbs, achieving a better return on these activities.

It will renew the region's existing assets and identify potential opportunities to generate employment and community outcomes from these existing assets. It will look to identify opportunities for urban regeneration and infrastructure to optimise the economic development in areas such as Technology Park and the Mawson Innovation Precinct, and it will provide new skills and workforce development to match job opportunities in the north.

Just in the last two weeks, I addressed the Northern Economics Leaders group which met at Mawson Lakes and whose members represent many industry sectors across the north and will make a significant contribution in directing the plan, preparing it and implementing it. Strong partnership, I think, as the honourable member identified in his questions, is required between all levels of government, industry, universities and the community, including regional groups, providing social and community support.

Central coordination across government will be done through the Department of State Development, while other agencies will be asked to contribute from their areas of responsibility. In the last two weeks, I have met with local mayors who, with industry and government representatives, will form a community leaders' group that will seek to lead the development and then the implementation of this plan.

The honourable member asked a number of questions in relation to the timing of this plan. I expect to meet with this community leaders' group sometime in the next two to three weeks where we will look at a schedule to set out time frames, but I would anticipate certainly within the coming few months that there will be a draft plan, and I will be happy to talk to the honourable member about that plan and how it affects the regions that he represents.

AEROSPACE ALLIANCE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation. Can the minister inform the house about the recent launch of the advanced manufacturing aerospace alliance and the impacts this will have on South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:07): I thank the honourable member for his question, and I can provide him with some information.

The Hon. S.G. Wade: It's impressive—a new approach from a new minister.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the Hon. Stephen Wade for his interjections and I am very pleased that, in the absence of a couple of his colleagues, he is having an opportunity to spread his wings and interject in such a forceful manner as well.

The Hon. S.G. Wade: I'm encouraging you.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I think he is taking a step—

The PRESIDENT: Come on, Mr Maher, just answer the question, please.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I do apologise, Mr President. I do acknowledge that the rumours of a leadership challenge in this house in the opposition ranks are completely untrue and he is not trying to—

The Hon. S.G. Wade: I'm impressed the government is asking questions without notice of their own ministers. That's great.

The PRESIDENT: Answer.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Thank you, Mr President. South Australia is embarking on a period of significant economic transformation, as a number of the questions that have been directed to me today indicate. But with some of the challenges that face us comes opportunity, and we know that there are many pathways for our state's industries to achieve global competitiveness through innovation and high-value products and services.

The government is strongly committed to working with industry to facilitate the transformation of our manufacturing sector, providing targeted support and investment in the areas that we believe can make the greatest difference to our economy and our community. As part of our jobs plan, we are committed to developing the future industries for South Australia.

A core component of this plan is to support the development of clustering, precinct development and entrepreneurship. We have committed almost \$5 million over the next four years to support clustering across a range of industries, including aerospace, creative industries, medical devices, mining and resources and clean tech. Recently I had the opportunity to launch Australia's first aerospace cluster which will ensure South Australia's status as an international leader in aerospace development will be enhanced and places the sector in a position to capitalise on opportunities that come our way.

The alliance, which currently consists of 20 members, is focused on capturing work from the global defence and commercial aerospace sectors through its collective strength, innovation and capacity. This alliance is a collaboration project between the Defence Teaming Centre and not-for-profit association established by industry, the Department of State Development and other members of the local defence industry. It will assist small and medium-sized companies to link in with global defence giants such as BAE Systems.

It is expected that, over the next 20 or so years, one-third of the total estimated 33,500 new wide-bodied passenger aircraft, worth about \$4 trillion, will be delivered in the Asia-Pacific region. The Australian Aerospace Alliance presents an excellent opportunity for local industry to meet some of this demand through the alliance's network of companies that are well placed to deliver in this very competitive industry. Already, the alliance has assisted Cobham Airlines to secure a \$640 million contract, which will see the company supply, integrate, maintain and operate search and rescue aircraft for the Australian Maritime Authority.

This government will be providing almost \$1 million of both direct and indirect support over three years to assist the advanced manufacturing Aerospace Alliance to become an independent and self-sustaining cluster, a cluster that will continue to secure growth from within the global defence and commercial aerospace sectors. We will continue to work to position South Australia as a focal point for the development of clusters which can link small to medium-sized enterprises, large businesses, research organisations, financiers, government agencies and support services together to maximise our capacity in an increasingly competitive global market. In relation to our defence contracts, I must pay tribute to the very good Minister for Defence Industries and member for Waite, who is doing exceptionally good things in this area.

NOARLUNGA TAFE

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (15:11): I was actually going to ask the Minister for Water and Environment a question, but given that he is not here, I would like to ask the Leader of Government a question regarding TAFE at Noarlunga. I seek leave to make a brief explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE: Until about 2002 to 2004, TAFE at Noarlunga was almost iconic in the provision of advanced education services that they offered the students of the south. Unfortunately, I am advised by people who both use the college and have worked in the college that the college is virtually only a shadow of what it was back then when this government first came into office. One of the important areas for the south is agriculture, value-added food, tourism and hospitality, and there was a significant amount of money spent on the John Reynell Training Restaurant. My questions to the minister are:

1. How many courses are now provided at the John Reynell Training Restaurant?
2. Is the John Reynell Training Restaurant still utilised and available to the public?
3. Does the government have any plans, if it has not already done so, to effectively cut to zero the opportunities that that facility has been providing for hospitality?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for his most important question, and indeed, our TAFE Noarlunga campus is a very important campus and has a tremendous reputation. I was fortunate enough to be able to visit there just recently. As members are well aware and I have said many times in this place, TAFE SA is a statutory authority and operational matters such as decisions about staffing, training and individual courses are made by the TAFE board independent of government. However, TAFE has advised me—I know there have been lots of rumours about Noarlunga campus closing—that they have no plans to close the TAFE Noarlunga campus. In fact, I understand that in 2015 more than 60 lecturing staff will teach approximately 125 courses from that campus.

I have also been advised that programs like automotive, hospitality and cookery, and women's education are growing. There are vacancies occurring in aged care, hair and beauty, business, information technology, tourism and events. Those vacancies are progressively filling. I have been advised that TAFE SA's creative industries and arts program will be reviewed in 2013 and, based on the low demand at Noarlunga, it was decided that music, graphic design and printing would no longer be offered from that campus and would be consolidated elsewhere in the TAFE SA network. I have also been advised that all 51 students enrolled at the time the decision was made have now completed their studies.

As I have said, TAFE SA are independent and they make these decisions based on a wide range of factors, including demand. They seek to continue to improve efficiencies, respond to changes in demand and obviously remain a contemporary vocational education and training provider into the future. That means that the services they offer and the way they do their work are forever changing. We know that developments in information technology have significantly changed the face of teaching. We have become less and less reliant on physical structures and face-to-face teaching, and the internet, video conferencing, webinars and those sorts of IT-reliant communication exchanges have increased. So TAFE and other training providers need to keep changing the way and shape that they do business.

NOARLUNGA TAFE

The Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE (15:17): I have a supplementary to the minister based on her answer, and I appreciate the answer. The supplementary question is: given the minister says that TAFE is autonomous and the board is autonomous, does the minister therefore give me permission to write directly to the chief executive officer and, if so, will the minister assure me that the response will come directly back to me from the chief executive officer?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:17): I have already in this place encouraged—not just invited; I have encouraged—the honourable member to raise the operational matters that he persists in bringing into this place and really wasting all of our time. I have encouraged him to raise them, just as I did with the Hon. Stephen Wade today. They are operational questions, and the appropriate organisation to answer them is TAFE SA. I am only repeating myself, because I have already encouraged the Hon. Robert Brokenshire to directly—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: You have never done that.

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

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: You have never repeated yourself.

The PRESIDENT: No debate across the chamber.

The Hon. G.E. GAGO: I yet again encourage the honourable member to raise these issues directly with TAFE SA. I am surprised, if he is really genuine in his concerns, that he did not take me up on my original invitation for him to contact TAFE SA. I cannot believe he has sat on his hands for all these months and done nothing, and brought more operational questions back to me. Is he really genuine? Does he really care about what is happening there? One has to question it.

I encourage him yet again to write to the chairman of the board. As I have said before, they are independent of government. Does he think that I can direct the chairman of the board to respond in a particular time frame to him, or anybody for that matter? What a bizarre question! I really think that the honourable member has lost the plot.

The PRESIDENT: I would like to make the point: as frustrating as it is, ministers have the right to answer a question the way they see fit and members have the right to ask the questions they see fit. The Hon. Ms Lee.

The Hon. R.L. Brokenshire: She is a very good member.

The PRESIDENT: She is a great member.

UNEMPLOYED MIGRANTS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills a question about unemployed migrants.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: It was reported in InDaily earlier this week that migrants in South Australia are devastated by high unemployment. There are more than 15,000 permanent resident migrants settling in South Australia every year and over the past five years, 9,265 skilled migrants were successfully nominated by the state government for the Skilled Occupations list. The article stated that, 'Much of the job readiness training for migrants in Adelaide is useless, with limited vocational application.'

According to ABS statistics in January 2015, there were 54,442 unemployed South Australians born in Australia and another 15,651 unemployed people who were born overseas who have migrated over here in the last five years. Premier Weatherill announced at the 2014 state election that his main focus is on innovation, diversifying and growing the South Australian economy to create jobs and attract more people from interstate and overseas who come to work here. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister believe the government is doing enough to find employment for skilled migrants?

2. What policy changes will the government introduce to address the large unemployment figures for migrants in South Australia?

3. The state is entering a phase of mass unemployment. How does the government intend to honour its state election policy of attracting additional international and interstate people when there are no employment opportunities available?

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:21): I thank the honourable member for her most important question. The South Australian government participates in initiatives designed to help state and territory governments address skill shortages to attract overseas business people and encourage a more balanced settlement of Australia's skilled migrant intake.

While the South Australian government considers it essential to use the skilled migration program to fill some of its critical needs, we are committed to the training and upskilling of South Australians to ensure that locally trained South Australians have improved employment outcomes, and the Hon. Kyam Maher outlined one of those programs around the automotive industry in answering a question today.

Reflecting current labour market conditions since 2011-12, South Australia's share of overall skilled migrants has reduced and, while South Australia's national share of the program is small, the share we get is still important and supports growth in the economy. The South Australian government nominates skilled migrants from both offshore and onshore and also assists employers to sponsor skilled migrants.

Onshore applicants include graduates from South Australia's institutions who are generally only nominated where they are already in skilled employment, and onshore applicants may be nominated following temporary skilled work arrangements in South Australia. When nominating offshore applicants, obviously they cannot realistically be put in a job at the time of their arrival and, over time, the employment outcomes for these migrants increases the longer they have been here.

The most reliable survey available for skilled migrant outcomes for South Australia is the Continuous Survey of Australia's Migrants, run by the commonwealth government. This survey was first undertaken in late 2013 by nearly 9,000 migrants, and I am advised that further data will be available soon. The results highlight some employment challenges for skilled migrants, but it is not all doom and gloom.

At six months after settlement, 8.3 per cent of skilled primary applicants were unemployed, but these unemployment rates must be taken in the context of the participation rate. New skilled migrants living in South Australia had a labour force participation of 95.3 per cent—far higher than that for the Australian population, which was 64.8 per cent, and so that was a considerably higher rate of participation. Combined with employment rates similar to national rates, the labour force participation rates highlight the very strong contribution of skilled migrants to our economy.

We indeed provide a range of support services for skilled and unskilled migrants. We link them to service providers, particularly those who settle in our region, and provide information about Skills for All funded training and case management arrangements. Information and services to help skilled migrants are promoted to intending and newly-arrived migrants, including information about industries and opportunities in South Australia's regions.

Job search support information for skilled migrants is available on the Skills for All website, and job readiness workshops are also available. The newly-arrived skilled migrants are assisted to obtain recognition of their skills and qualifications gained overseas, so we provide assistance in that. They also access Skills for All funded training to improve their English language communication skills and are helped to gain an Australian qualification. Skills SA works with Skills for Jobs in Regions, and managers in regional South Australia work to help link migrants to job vacancies, with a particular focus being placed on matching skilled migrants in the area of, obviously, skill shortages.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 24 February 2015.)

The Hon. A.L. McLACHLAN (15:26): I am pleased to support the motion for the adoption of the Address in Reply. I acknowledge the service of the Governor, His Excellency Hieu Van Le AO, and congratulate him on his appointment. I express my appreciation for the service of the previous Governor, Rear Admiral Kevin Scarce AC, CSC, RANR.

I would like to acknowledge the service to this chamber of the Hon. Arthur Whyte AM, former President of this place. I did not have the privilege of meeting Arthur, but I have heard much about him and extend my condolences to his family on his recent passing. I congratulate my colleague Sam Duluk on his election as the new member of Davenport in the other place. I am confident that he will make a great contribution to the life of this parliament and the people of this state.

South Australia has a proud history of social harmony which has been founded on a strong economy. The strength of the economy has delivered not only prosperity but opportunities for its citizens. While other colonies were established as convict settlements, the vision for South Australia was a community with political and religious freedoms together with opportunities for its citizens to prosper through enterprise and farming. Since its founding, the state has largely relied on the produce from its fields and the minerals beneath these pastures. As the Governor has said, the state faces the challenge of transitioning its economy and finding its niche in the global economy.

We must seek to diversify our economy if we are to provide the generations coming after us with the opportunities for employment enjoyed by South Australians in the past. But things are not well in this state. Our state GDP growth is poor. Businesses are closing. The resource sector is struggling. Real unemployment is growing and youth unemployment in some areas is appalling. People are leaving to seek opportunities they cannot find here.

It is all very well to promote a vibrant city. Those who dwell in this city can have a drink in a small bar, listen to live music or walk across that stark, cold, chaste and expensive concrete bridge and witness a sporting contest, but I do not necessarily see what this offers our communities in the regions or the unemployed in the north. How do the most disadvantaged in our community benefit from the oval? I suspect they cannot even afford the trip into the city, let alone a ticket to an event.

One cannot help but recall the fate of ancient Rome. Rome suffered from high unemployment and a growing gap between the rich and the poor. To prevent civil unrest, gladiatorial games were used to entertain the people. Public infrastructure like the Colosseum was built to accommodate the bread and circuses campaign. Are we rambling along the same trail?

A key role for any government and the parliament is to support and encourage the citizens in times of change. The retreat of manufacturing in this country must be followed by the creation of new opportunities. It is the role of government to not only explain the change and its consequences to the community it serves but also create the environment for new enterprise to flourish and innovate.

We all understand the angst and uncertainty felt by the workers at Holden and the other businesses that will be impacted by its closure. This industry and its operations have been struggling for some time. I do not accept that its closure should be portrayed as a surprise. Those of us in parliament that have had corporate experience (although I acknowledge we are increasingly a rarity in modern political life) know these types of decisions have a long gestation. We should have been preparing for this event a long time ago. More money should have been and be spent on preparing and assisting the community for change that has long been known to be coming.

It disheartens me that this government only reacts, and seems unable to anticipate, cloaking its neglect with false indignation. We must all work together to urgently implement initiatives to reinvigorate the north of our state. Our northern communities are an important part of the capital for which all Liberals have a great affinity, for their very existence are a product of the imagination, drive and vision of the great Liberal, Sir Thomas Playford.

It is not the characteristic of a strong and capable government to simply blame others—in this case, the federal government. I remind those that inhabit the government benches that the current federal Coalition has only been elected for a relatively short period. Much of what we have been experiencing can be attributed, using their logic, to the poor decision-making by earlier federal Labor governments.

I will take the high ground and not press the point, but I cannot help thinking, each time that I am berated from the government benches for mentioning one issue or another, of the Charles Dickens novel, *Oliver Twist*, and the memorable phrase, 'Please, sir, I want some more.' The government should cease its begging for funds from the federal Treasury and learn from Oliver's experiences: always be pure of heart and self-reliant. Our goal as a state should be to shape and secure our own future.

I welcome the initiative to debate the expansion of the nuclear industry in this state. I do not profess to be well read in the industry, so my own views are therefore not settled. Like some honourable members in this chamber, I query the need for a royal commission, which has powers to compel witnesses and seize documents. The inquiry should be embracing the community debate, not compelling evidence; nevertheless, I wish the endeavour well. But, we should ask ourselves—that is, all of us in the community—do we really want to live in a state that boasts of fine food, wine and green pastures in the shadow of a large, industrial complex that is guarded by high fences, razor wire and armed security guards?

There may be great economic benefits, but all initiatives carry risks and costs. We must have our eyes wide open to the risks, not just covet the revenues. Nor should we rely solely on the platitudes and assurances of global corporate executives. Understanding the right balance between protecting the environment and creating a new industry will be one of the key responsibilities of this commission. I support all initiatives that sensibly seek to protect our environment. It is a noble ambition to build a new industry on sustainable industries.

If it is going to have any chance of success, it will require the involvement of our universities, which I believe are the real engine rooms that will drive the growth of our state. As the Governor has advised us, a key to ensure our prosperity is to seek out trading opportunities in the Asia-Pacific region. Our universities already have strong links into Asia. My own university (the University of Adelaide) enjoys a deep relationship with the people of Singapore. Before the people of this state elected me to serve in this place, I had the privilege of working in the business school. The business school teaches into Singapore, as well as attracting students from all over the region to Adelaide.

We should seek to build on these successes. New bureaucratic bodies will not bring success by themselves. Governments do not trade and create wealth; business trades and creates wealth for the community that nurtures them. Only sustained community commitment and enterprise will bring success. This government should aim to be one of the smallest employers in the state and overshadowed by industry, rather than proudly declare itself as the largest.

I welcome the government seeking dialogue with the community on tax reform, but the debate in this state should not just be about taxation, but also the services we need as a community as well as the efficiency of our public sector.

I know that many in this parliament see the Nordic countries as a role model. I encourage the government to investigate the workings of the modern Nordic state. They offer a blueprint on how to reform the public sector, making the state more efficient and responsive. The Nordic countries learnt that a tax and spend strategy did not work and they changed their ways. They managed with an eye on the long term. Taxes were cut, the books were balanced and the reform pursued. The performance of government, especially in the areas of health, were measured. In other words, the governments held themselves and their bureaucracies to account. I do not suggest the model adopted by these countries is perfect, they still have challenges, but their collective experience can inform us on the best way ahead.

I note the initiatives in health and education. I offer a word of warning to this government: both appear to involve an element of consolidation. There are proposals for super schools and the rationalisation of health infrastructure. Aggregation always looks good on paper, or should I say PowerPoint, the medium so favoured by the consulting class. Magical phrases such as 'economics of scale', 'efficiency dividend' and 'improved resource utilisation' have, no doubt, been bandied about in the halls of government.

Even a light reading of history will teach you that the merging of operations often leads to failure. What inevitably occurs is that the management team grows to manage the new entities at the expense of the frontline services. We have seen this in health with the growth of managers

outstripping the growth of nursing staff. If we are to aggregate bodies in an effort to make the public sector more efficient and responsive then superior and committed leadership as well as management will be required. If these attributes are lacking then success will be threatened.

We in opposition do not wish upon the government the curse of failure, rather we wish you well, but we will hold you accountable to the people for your decisions and we make plain from the outset that we are not attracted to the mantra that bigger is better. We instinctively favour localism over centralism.

I do not have much to say on the issue of time zones. I find it hard to categorise this issue as visionary. It is a topic that has enjoyed much debate in the past. I have spent a large portion of my life travelling to the east hunting business opportunities for the benefit of our state. I have never found central standard time an encumbrance.

I agree with the sentiments of the government that we must do all that we can to guarantee the independence of our parliament. However, I am not convinced that there needs to be any reform of the workings of this chamber. I have not observed any serious community push for reform of the upper house. In my short time in this place I have not experienced the wilful obstruction of the government's agenda, rather I have witnessed noble compromise and the forming of consensus for the benefit of the people of this state.

I acknowledge the valuable work of the crossbenchers and greatly respect the diversity of their views and opinions which enrich the democratic process and life of this sovereign chamber. I can only suspect that the suggestions of reform originate from the darker corners of the government's consciousness. They will be forthrightly resisted by me. I aspire to contribute to the life of this chamber. I did not come here to tear it down or emasculate it. It is inconsistent to argue, on the one hand, for measures to strengthen our democracy and, on the other, advocate for a measure that makes parliament a body that simply acquiesces to every government decision.

Seeking to undermine a chamber that is elected by proportional representation is not consistent with the desire to encourage all South Australians to fully participate in our democracy. A strong, confident, dynamic government embraces accountability, it does not shy away from debate or seek to undermine a chamber that its people do not wish it to control.

I support the government's new-found desire to review the justice system. While this government has travelled a long way down the road to Damascus before its conversion it has much to do to repair a system which has suffered from the government's own aggressive policies in the name of being tough on crime. All of us in this parliament want to work to ensure our people are safe to live their lives. Many in the legal community believe the callous policies of this government have contributed to the higher crime rates. Judges should be allowed to judge individual matters on their merits. Rehabilitation after sentencing should be a major feature of our prison system.

I urge the government to rediscover its progressive social values and revisit the benefits that can flow from compassion. I strongly support the government's initiative that all departments obtain White Ribbon accreditation. I have recently undergone the training to be a White Ribbon Ambassador and thank the Hon. John Dawkins for sponsoring me.

The government noted the contribution that premier Don Dunstan made to multiculturalism in this state. I wish to also acknowledge the contribution of former premier David Tonkin, who also made a significant contribution to multiculturalism in this state. David Tonkin was one of the state's great leaders. In 1974 he successfully introduced a private member's bill to outlaw sex discrimination, the first such law in Australia. He also introduced legislation leading to the establishment of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission in the 1980s. I reflect that their leadership and vision may well have derived from the schooling that they both shared. It may also account for my own pursuit of ensuring justice for all citizens of our great nation state. I support the motion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. T.T. Ngo): Thank you, Hon. Mr McLachlan, that was a very balanced speech. The Hon. Mr Lucas.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (15:40): I rise to support the Address in Reply and thank his Excellency the Governor Hieu Van Le for his opening speech, which of course he makes on behalf of the government. I had intended to address two broad issues. The first was going to be a defence

of the Legislative Council from the infidels in another place and within the government who might seek to destroy (from within and without) the magnificence and the value of this chamber. There will be other occasions for that when the government's proposals are more fully explained, and I will reserve my contribution for that occasion.

Instead, the first issue that I want to address today, which was brought about as a matter of happenstance, was the judgement brought down today in the District Court of South Australia by her Honour Judge McIntyre in the very important case of *De Poi v Advertiser-News Weekend Publishing Company Pty Ltd*. Mr Acting President, you may or may not be aware that the catalyst or the commencement of this particular case started with the now infamous—and I am delighted that the Hon. Mr Kyam Maher—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order, Mr Acting President. There being previous rulings after points of order taken by the Hon. John Dawkins about relevance in these speeches, I would ask you to consider whether what the Hon. Rob Lucas is speaking about is at all relevant to the Governor's speech.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. T.T. Ngo): I tend to agree with the Hon. Kyam Maher, that the previous acting president, the Hon. John Dawkins, has ruled in that way. So, I would invite the Hon. Mr Lucas to get to the substance of the Governor's speech.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Point of order, Mr Acting President. What was the ruling by the Hon. John Dawkins? I thought it was simply that, yes, you have a wide gamut in Address in Reply. In the Hon. Rob Lucas's terms, he has not even begun his speech yet, so how could you make a ruling that it is not relevant to the Address in Reply?

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. T.T. Ngo): As far as I remember last year's contribution from different members of the government, the Hon. John Dawkins questioned the President about the relevancy of each member's speech relating to the Governor's speech. I can clearly remember that I had to change my speech because of that, too. I remember that the Hon. Kyam Maher had to stop halfway through his speech because it was ruled that way. I am happy to keep listening but, if it is irrelevant, I will have to rule that way.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I think he is only just getting started.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. T.T. Ngo): He did mention something.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Mr Acting President, I am very happy to have an argument in relation to the Address in Reply. I am happy to bring back to this chamber many rulings where presidents past have accepted some less than eloquent Address in Reply speeches from members in this chamber railing against federal governments of both Labor and Liberal persuasions.

It is the only opportunity that members of the parliament have, and this particular chamber has, to speak on any particular issue. Back in my office there are many examples of contributions to both the Address in Reply and also the Supply Bill debates in relation to that. But, if one wants to talk about connections to the Governor's speech, there are a number of references to significant reforms that the government is proposing in South Australia.

One of course is in relation to parliamentary and electoral reform, and this particular court decision today is important in relation to both parliamentary and electoral reform in terms of the integrity of our electoral system and in terms of the integrity of our parliamentary system. So, I am very happy to have an argument in relation to the capacity for members in this chamber to be able, in the Address in Reply debate, to canvas issues far and wide.

I acknowledge that there may well be differing views in this chamber, both on my side of the house and perhaps on the other side of the house as well. The point I was about to make was that I am delighted that the Hon. Mr Kyam Maher—and the reason I guess that there is some sensitivity from the Hon. Mr Maher is that he, together with others, were active supporters of what is known as the Family First dodgy votes scandal of the 2010 election.

If we are looking at issues for reform in this period coming up, there are proposals from the government for a joint house committee, proposals from the opposition for a commission of inquiry and proposals from the House of Assembly—the Premier I think—for an inquiry into recent by-

elections in relation to electoral practice, and also I understand potentially there are to be amendments to that to canvass recent elections as well, which may or may not be moved by members of the opposition. So, all of those canvas these particular areas of electoral and parliamentary reform. I quote from page 26 of this judgment today, in reference to this strategy:

That the strategy had the capacity to mislead is corroborated by the evidence of Mrs Bennie—

Mrs Bennie was a Family First volunteer—

who spoke of the confusion caused by the ALP cards at the Hackham West polling booth. Also received in evidence were numerous complaints made to the Electoral Commission in relation to the scheme, and various letters to the editor and commentaries published in the week after the election, all of which indicated a view that the tactic was misleading and, in some cases, had misled.

The scheme was a deliberate strategy implemented by the ALP to gain second preferences from Family First voters in a seat where Family First had given its second preference to the Liberal Party. It seems clear that there was disquiet about the possible implications of the strategy, given Mr Gray's evidence. He said that the ALP had sought legal advice about the scheme prior to the election. He spoke about selecting volunteers prepared to do it, the steps he took to reassure the volunteers that the process was legitimate and the instructions to volunteers in the event of complaints.

Dishonesty is defined in the Macquarie online dictionary as, '1. lack of honesty, a disposition to lie, cheat or steal. 2. a dishonest act as a fraud or theft'. Whilst the scheme did not breach the Electoral Act, it was in my view outside the spirit of the law. It objectively offended the standards of ethics accepted by the community and the standards of morality underlying the law and is accordingly dishonest.

So, Her Honour Judge McIntyre of the District Court has found this this particular practice was dishonest, and she has referred to the definition of dishonesty as being 'a lack of honesty, a disposition to lie, cheat or steal, or a dishonest act as a fraud or theft'. The learned judge also went on in various parts of her 32 page judgement to say:

I find that the plaintiff—

That was Sandra De Poi—

knew that she was participating in the scheme and that the scheme itself was dishonest when objectively considered.

Further on:

It is my view that the plaintiff, notwithstanding her denials, was aware of the capacity of the strategy to mislead voters.

And then further on:

I consider that the plaintiff did know that the scheme was dishonest at the time she participated in it.

One of the issues that will need to be explored by this chamber over the next four years—potentially by either a joint standing committee of the parliament, if the government has its way, or a lower house committee or a commission of inquiry, whichever vehicle, ultimately, is decided upon by the parliament—is the learned judge's findings in relation to this particular case and the capacity for this parliament to seek to prevent it in future.

As I said, it is important because we now have the minister in this chamber who is inextricably bound with the tactics, the strategies and the decisions that were taken, which have now been roundly condemned as misleading and dishonest by Judge McIntyre. The other issue, finally, in relation to this particular issue is that it also raises some questions in relation to the accuracy of statements made by another minister, and that is in relation to minister Bignell. I understand, according to the judgement, that it is no longer the case but, at the time, minister Bignell was Sandra De Poi's partner.

In the public defence at the time, minister Bignell or Mr Bignell was reported as saying in defending Ms De Poi that Ms De Poi had undertaken this particular work in handing out the dodgy how-to-vote cards 'on the spur of the moment for about 15 minutes'. That is referred to on page 12 of the judgement. When you and others get a chance to have a look at this judgement, I refer you also to page 22 of the judgement where it is made quite clear that that particular statement from Mr Bignell was in fact not correct.

The judgement does refer to the fact that Ms De Poi knowingly entered into the arrangements and then, secondly, disputes the fact that it was only for a matter of 15 minutes as Mr Bignell has indicated. In fact, the judge indicates that she was at the Hackham West booth for about 30 to 45 minutes rather than the 15 minutes claimed by Mr Bignell or minister Bignell, as he is now. Given that this judgement has only just been made public today, anyway, it is an issue that this parliament, through those various bodies, will need to address over the coming four-year period. The second issue or topic that I wanted to address—and I hope this does not upset the Hon. Mr Maher as much as the first topic did—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Reckon it probably will.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —as the Hon. Mr Maher indicates, it is possibly the case that it will upset him as well. In responding to the Address in Reply by our first Vietnamese-born Australian Governor I think it is important to acknowledge the importance over many years of bipartisan support for our policies of multiculturalism in South Australia. Indeed, my colleague the Hon. Mr McLachlan referred to the contribution dating back to the Hon. David Tonkin, but he could have mentioned many others over a long period of time in South Australia who have publicly endorsed our policies of multiculturalism.

Generally, over many years in South Australia, that has been the case, although there have been occasions when that bipartisan support for multiculturalism has been challenged and, on those occasions, it is important for community leaders, in my view, to speak out on the issues. In my party, I recall in the late 1980s that prominent federal Liberal MPs spoke out publicly when the then Liberal leader John Howard raised concerns about the level of Asian immigration into Australia and the capacity for our Australian society to absorb the numbers of Asian migrants at the time—views that, I am pleased to note, Mr Howard later recanted.

The *Hansard* records show that, at that particular time, soon after those statements were made, I joined those federal Liberal MPs and also spoke out, publicly expressing my concerns at the statements that had been made by the then federal leader of my own party.

There have also been exceptions to this general rule or convention of bipartisan support for multiculturalism within the Labor Party in South Australia as well. In the late 1990s, the then Labor leader Mike Rann tried to fan concerns about the fact that a Chinese company had bought one of our electricity companies as part of the electricity privatisation debate. On that occasion, I was pleased to note the then federal Labor senator Nick Bolkus spoke out against Mr Rann's statements, even though he was a member of his own party.

In the last 12 months, we have seen two further examples. Most recently, we saw statements—shameful statements, I believe—by federal Labor leader Bill Shorten attempting to fan anti-Japanese sentiment in the community about the potential for Japanese involvement in the submarine industry in Australia. Of course—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I have no concerns about an argument about where submarines should be built and that particular argument, but the particular statements made by the federal Labor leader Bill Shorten went beyond that when he visited South Australia. Before the Hon. Mr Kandelaars and the Hon. Mr Maher go too far down the path of defending those particular statements, I would advise them to look closely at the statements that were made at the time by Mr Shorten.

Of course, 12 months ago in South Australia, we saw the most disturbing and even more distressing example of blatantly racist material used by the Labor Party against our Liberal candidate, Carolyn Habib, in the state election in the seat of Elder. I understand today a number of Liberal members were thrown out by Speaker Atkinson from the House of Assembly for, frankly, calling a spade a spade. They referred to the material as racist and they referred to the people who supported it as racists. If indeed that is the case, I express my concern that Speaker Atkinson could have adopted that particular position.

Even more concerning for me at the time was the fact that the Labor leader Jay Weatherill and now Treasurer Tom Koutsantonis and many other Labor leaders in South Australia publicly defended the use of this clearly racist material and denied that the material was racist. Sadly, on both

those occasions, no South Australian Labor MP had the courage to speak out against either Mr Shorten's statement, or indeed Mr Weatherill's and Mr Koutsantonis's defence of clearly blatant, shameless, racist material. The only acknowledgement we could see was of Labor members in Sydney, for example, like Ed Husic, who spoke out publicly against the material.

The important point in all of this is, if we are genuinely claiming that we support a multicultural state, then it will occasionally be important to have the courage to speak out when someone, perhaps from your own side of politics, expresses views which are counter to that particular goal of truly bipartisan support for a multicultural state.

In celebrating our multicultural state, I am pleased to acknowledge that not only are we responding to a speech, as I said, from our very first Vietnamese-born Australian Governor but also our Legislative Council has now had four members elected who were also born in Asia. The Hon. Tung Ngo was born in Vietnam and was elected in 2014. In his maiden speech he graphically illustrated the many challenges that he met to come to Australia and also to be elected to this chamber. Prior to that the Hon. Jing Lee was our first Malaysian-born Chinese member elected in 2010, who also outlined the many challenges that she met through our systems and society in, firstly, moving to Australia and then being elected to the Legislative Council. Prior to that we had the Hon. Bernice Pfitzner who had a Chinese background and was elected in 1990. Of course, in 1982 I was elected to this chamber, having been born in Japan.

Whilst acknowledging and celebrating that record of the diversity that we have in this chamber, I now want to pay tribute to a remarkable person in the community and someone whose life story was a magnificent example of how our society has changed over the last 60 years. I have to confess that I am a little biased as to this particular remarkable person because she is in fact my mother. I also note that I believe in my 32 years in parliament this will be the first time I have ever spoken at length about any member of my family.

My mother Yvonne, who passed away late last year at the age of 87, was one of the first Japanese war brides to come to Australia after marrying my father Bob, who was an Australian serviceman serving in Korea and stationed in Japan. My mother was born Yoshiko Inouye in 1927 and was born in Mukden, Manchuria. Her family were from Japan (Japanese nationals) and they moved to Manchuria because her father took a job as a stationmaster with the Manchurian railways. In the early 1930s, the Japanese had not only invested significantly in Manchuria but they gradually and systematically took control of Manchuria.

After the atomic bombs were dropped in Japan towards the end of World War II and as World War II was coming to an end, Russian soldiers moved into Manchuria and communist Chinese took over Mukden and took over the running and control of the major cities in Manchuria. At that time the Russian soldiers and the communist Chinese made it difficult for those Japanese nationals who continued to live in Manchuria. All the banks were closed. All the families' money was frozen so that families such as my mother's lost everything. For two years my mother's family survived, given that her father had passed away, by firstly selling all their jewellery, then her mother's kimonos and, finally, all their furniture.

When eventually the Russians and the Chinese agreed that some Japanese nationals could leave Manchuria and return to their homeland of Japan they were told that they could only take whatever belongings they could carry themselves and put in a large pillow sack.

My mother and her family, with her grandparents, walked for many days to the nearest port carrying their pillow sacks of materials and belongings, and they were allowed to take 1,000 yen each back to Japan. According to my mother, they wore as many clothes as they could put on themselves because that meant they did not have to pack them and carry them in their pillow sacks. My mother said that her mother carried her husband's ashes around her neck for the whole journey because the family could not bear to leave him in Manchuria by himself.

My mother had a very special piece of jewellery which had been handed down through two generations to her on her 18th birthday—a ruby ring—which she concealed by wearing gloves for the whole of the trip so that the soldiers would not see the jewellery and take it. That family heirloom, the ruby ring, is being passed down through two further generations to the eldest daughter of the eldest daughter in the family.

My mother met my father, Bob Lucas, when they both worked in the British Commonwealth Occupied Forces (BCOF) in Japan. As I said, my father was a member of the Australian army serving in Korea and Mum had a job as a teletypist and interpreter in the BCOF offices. She met my father there.

She changed her name from Yoshiko to Yvonne and when we asked her why, she said the soldiers in the camp either could not or would not be bothered remembering Japanese names—it was too hard for them—so they used to give out the names of Charlie or Doris or 'whatever it is' to the Japanese workers. Mum said she did not want to be called 'Doris' or 'whatever it is', so she chose her own name—Yvonne—and when we asked her why, she said it was because one of the actresses in one of the black-and-white movies she had seen was Yvonne De Carlo, and she thought she looked nice. So, she took the name Yvonne so that the soldiers could not give her a name that she did not like.

There was great difficulty during that particular period for Australian servicemen to marry Japanese wives. Mum recounted that they had to make application to the authorities. They had to go through various interviews with various people before approval could or could not be given for a serviceman to marry a Japanese national in Japan at that particular time.

When my mother married my father in 1952, she converted from her family's faith of Buddhism to my father's faith of Catholicism, because she had to undertake to raise all of the children as 'good little Catholics'—as was the way in those days. She recounts that with all the complexities over there, and just to make sure that it was right, my mother and father got married three times. They were firstly married in the Catholic church, then they were married in the British Consul's office, and then they were married in the Japanese city council office. So, she had three separate occasions and she believes she was well and truly married under whichever jurisdiction someone wanted to ask any questions.

Six months after I was born, in December of 1953, my father flew back to Australia having completed his service, but the army would not allow Japanese brides and their children to be flown back with their servicemen. They were told they had to hop on the boat to come back to Australia. That boat trip of December 1953 to January 1954, which was over a period of about a month, was the first group of Japanese war brides who came back to Australia.

My mother recalls that there were about 27 brides and fiancées and 17 children who took that trip on the ship. My mother recounts that she lost 10 pounds on the trip through a combination of sea sickness and morning sickness, as she was pregnant. She was not only nursing me but was pregnant with my brother Peter at the time.

I recall our Governor's recollections of his first visit to Australia, and they have been recounted often. The Hon. Tung Ngo has talked of his recollections. My mother's first recollections were of a brief stopover in Cairns. They were meant to be going to Sydney, but they had to stop at Cairns. Having been sick for almost a month, the Japanese war brides hopped off the boat for a brief visit and raced to the greengrocer to try to buy some fresh fruit to eat.

They were very embarrassed because they were unable to make themselves understood to the greengrocer. My mother, who spoke seven languages and English, and obviously thought she could at least make sense to my father and the other servicemen at the time, could not make herself understood to the greengrocer, so they had to go off to the milk bar and buy Minties instead because they could not make themselves understood.

Anyway, when they went back to the ship, the ship's purser told them not to worry, because the greengrocer they had been speaking to was actually Italian. He was speaking Italian—he could not speak English. With the Japanese war brides speaking to the Italian greengrocers, neither of whom could speak English, they were unable to transact any business at all.

The first real recollection of visiting Australia from her viewpoint as part of a group of Japanese war brides was the welcome off the ship in Sydney Harbour. She described—a bit different to His Excellency's recollections of the tinnie off to the north of Darwin—the magnificence of the Harbour Bridge and the magnificence of Sydney as they came into Sydney Harbour.

She said the first longstanding recollection she had was of something which I guess those of us these days do not see much of: the good neighbour council ladies who welcomed them. They came onto the ship, threw their arms around the Japanese war brides and welcomed them. My mother's recollection of that particular time was that she had been welcomed to her new country.

After being welcomed in Sydney, my mother then flew with my father, who had waited for her there on the docks, to Adelaide. I guess, just as a sign of the times, the story, which I only just tracked down since my mother's passing in November last year, was a story dated 7 January 1954 in the Adelaide *Advertiser*. They were obviously not politically correct in those days, because the headline is 'Jap brides in SA with soldier husbands'. The story was:

Two Japanese brides are not likely ever to forget 1.10p.m., Thursday, January 7, 1954—today.

At that moment, they set from a Sydney plane, with their soldier husbands onto South Australian soil for the first time, and to live here.

It then goes on and talks about the other soldier Sergeant J.J. Morris and Mrs Morris, their daughters June and Kay, and then:

Cpl. Lucas—

that was my father—

met his wife, formerly Miss—

they got it the wrong way around, but anyway—

Inouye Yoshiko, now 26, when she became a teletype operator and interpreter in the Army Public Relations office in Kure.

The story does note that 'Mr. and Mrs. Lucas, who live in Mount Gambier, went through three separate marriage ceremonies' prior to leaving Japan. When my mother arrived in Mount Gambier, there was a story (I notice the Hon. Kyam Maher is still here) in *The Border Watch* dated 12 January 1954. They were a bit more politically correct; it was not 'Jap bride', it is was: 'Japanese Bride Welcomed To Mount Gambier by Her Husband's Parents', and stated:

Corporal G. R. Lucas, accompanied by his Manchurian-born wife, and son, who is just seven months old, arrived in Mount Gambier by Friday's train from Japan, and are staying with Cpl. Lucas' mother, and stepfather...of Commercial Street West.

There is a background to it. I was intrigued by this one paragraph, which I will quote:

LATE CHRISTMAS

Mrs Clark did not intend to let the young couple go without their Christmas celebrations altogether, and had planned—

this was, of course, 12 January—

roast turkey and other good Christmas fare for the day after their arrival. An illuminated Christmas tree stood in one corner of the lounge last Saturday, which the baby regarded with solemn eyes.

I think that was my first media hit. Allegedly, I regarded the Christmas tree in the corner, at the age of seven months, with 'solemn eyes'. I suspect I would not have known too much about what was going on at all.

Mr Acting President, Australia and South Australia in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s was much different to the Australia that you and I enjoy, and that we hope our children now enjoy, especially for a Japanese woman—a war bride—living in a small regional community, anywhere in Australia at the time, after a world war which involved conflict between the nations must have been a challenge for anyone.

I know that, as a child, at school I was called a 'Jap', a 'slope', a 'slanty-eyed', a 'Yellow Peril', and a variety of other unfavourable descriptors that other members from Italian, Greek and Asian backgrounds I know from their contributions in the parliament have previously referred. They would have been various versions of that; I am sure they were not called 'Japs', but they were called 'wogs' and a variety of other unfavourable descriptors at the time.

I know that my mother, who is even more physically distinctively Japanese than either my brother or I were, must have, through that period of the '50s and the '60s, and even in the '70s, found many challenges from clearly discriminatory and/or racist attitudes expressed from some members of the community. But, I have to say, in all that time, she never, ever complained. If she was saddened or distressed by it, she would have always, as is the way of the Japanese and many Asian communities, suffered in silence and not shown in any way a public display of emotion.

I recall her telling us as children that when she went back to Japan for the first time, 15 or 16 years after she had come to Australia, in the late 1960s to look after her then sick mother, that she had, in her terms, disgraced herself.

As she came off the airport tarmac, she saw her elder brother and she raced to embrace him publicly. She said that that was just not done—public displays of affection. Her brother did not know what to do and stood coldly, wondering what on earth had happened to his sister; had she forgotten everything that she had learned as a child and young adult in Japan about the inappropriateness of public displays of affection? She was much chastened, and walked a metre or two behind her older brother until they were in a private location and could then enjoy each other's company.

Whilst my mother did not discuss it at the time, subsequently, as she got older and we spoke about her past, I am sure she faced many challenges. The isolation from members of her own community. Those who were lucky enough to come to Australia but still had challenges if they came, as the Italians or Greeks did, with others, at least had the comfort and knowledge of their own clubs, groups and families for support. But, as the only Japanese citizen in a small country city, my mother had none of that support. There was, of course, the isolation of family which many migrants experience, having tearfully said goodbye to family members, never to see them again, or not to see them again for many, many years.

My mother told me, in those early years, that other than letters her only contact with her mother was that they saved up £10 each year for a three-minute phone call to her mother in Japan at Christmas time. She recounted—not that we ever knew at the time—one year having spent their £10 on the phone call only to get the wrong number, so the £10 was wasted, they were unable to connect to my grandmother and she missed verbal communication with her mother for another 12-month period until the following Christmas. In recent times, of course, the joys of mobile phones, telephones and computers means that connection for a family separated by countries and distance is much easier.

Little things, Mr Acting President, which I am sure you would be familiar with, things like food, the fact that her diet became meat and three veg as opposed to rice and fish and those staples, has an effect on your body. I know that when she went back to Japan, after 15 or so years, she had an upset stomach for a couple of weeks as she got used to a diet of fish and rice again after the meat and three veg diet that she had become used to in South Australia. In those years, as compared to now, there was no such thing as Japanese restaurants or takeaway sushi, which of course is the flavour of the month amongst many in the community, and clearly not just those from a Japanese background.

The other thing I noted at the time, if I can put it on the record, is that you become used to the accent of your own family members. I remember my very first telephone call with my mother at the age of around about 16. I was at my girlfriend's place and she had rung me for some reason, something was urgent, from a public phone box and this strange person was on the other end of the phone speaking to me.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. T.T. Ngo): I'm surprised she allowed you to have a girlfriend at that stage.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Indeed, Mr Acting President. There was a strange person on the end of the phone and I could not make hide nor hair of it. I could not understand what she was saying. I had to keep asking her to repeat herself. She said, 'It's your mother. It's your mother.' I said, 'Can you speak slowly?' Because you live with someone you understand, you get used to their accent, but when you are detached, and for the first time when I had that telephone call I was unable to understand.

So, while we could not understand why anyone could not understand what mum was saying, with her accent, others in the community I am sure, particularly older people with failing hearing, would have struggled to understand her. These are the things that people take for granted. As I said, it is much easier these days with better lines of communication with computers and emails, text messages and all of the mod cons, but in those days none of that existed in terms of family support and technology support, etc.

Over the years, my mother gradually became a respected member of the Mount Gambier community, in our view. In the early days, she was asked to translate various things. She tells us it was mainly people who would just drop in and say, 'I've got these instructions for the latest electronic goods product and it's in Japanese, can you tell me what I'm meant to do and how you are meant to do it?' Then the Mount Gambier Rotary Club, which was establishing relationships with Japanese businessmen, would ask her to translate letters and sometimes come to their meetings to formally translate or interpret between the Japanese businessmen and the Rotary Club.

In later years, she went on to—which she used to laugh about—lecture or teach at the Mount Gambier TAFE. She taught lessons in Japanese. She had struggled to get us to learn Japanese as children. The last thing we wanted, as children, was to be reminded of our Japaneseness. We were little Aussies and we did not want to be learning Japanese. It is much different these days in terms of learning a language other than English, but there were young people and older people, members of the community, who were wanting my mother to lecture them and teach them, both beginner and advanced courses, in Japanese at TAFE.

Then for a mercifully brief period—a 12-month period, I think—and because I had become minister for education I did not become aware of it, she was filling in in a preschool in Mount Gambier teaching early language acquisition and cultural acquisition. She was active in the community, in the Catholic Church, the St Mary's School Parent Club, the St Mary's tennis club and then the Saints United Tennis Club, and various other bodies. She became a very active cake decorator and presented at the local show. Over many years, as I said, we believe she became a respected and loved member of her community.

In closing, as we look back from our vantage point of 2015, as I said, we generally have bipartisan support for our multicultural policies. We have a much different society from the society that our parents experienced in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. Today's society has been enriched by the experiences of our parents and grandparents and hopefully that has coloured our views as their children and grandchildren and shown us the importance of their experiences in shaping the policies that exist for a multicultural state, and hopefully we will have continuing bipartisan support for multiculturalism here in South Australia and in Australia.

Before concluding, I want to place on the public record my thanks to my niece Elise Thompson and to my sister Kathleen. When we nearly lost my mother back in 2006-07 we all realised—and I think this is a lesson for other families—how little we knew of my mother and her background. If she had died, as she might have at that time, we would have known nothing of her life in Manchuria and in Japan and how she met Dad and all of those issues and challenges she confronted as a Japanese war bride in South Australia.

So my niece and my sister over many countless hours put together a collection of memoirs, which they ungenerously described as 'jabberings of grandma'. It has limited publication; it has been published within the broader family circle, but it is a magnificent collection. It is not chronological so it is hopeless to follow in terms of time and sequence. It was just a collection of thoughts as each day my niece sat down with my mother and they talked about her experiences. One time she would be talking about Manchuria and then she would be talking about Japan and then she would be talking about Mount Gambier and all of those experiences.

Nevertheless, in this magnificently rich collection of memories, we, the surviving family, have a collection that we will be able to treasure forever. So, in concluding, I want to say that I am proud of my mother's life and her remarkable achievements and contribution to the community. I am pleased to place on the public record my tribute to a remarkable life.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. T.T. Ngo): Thank you, Hon. Mr Lucas, for sharing your mother's story with us. As a person with a migrant background, you are a credit to your mother, who

as an early migrant had to break down a lot of barriers for migrants, or refugees like myself, who came after and were able to enjoy it. On behalf of all members here, I would like to acknowledge your mother's contribution to the South-East and to South Australia. I am sure she is very proud of your success.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:29): I rise to indicate my support for the Address in Reply speech given by His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le, the new Governor of our state. I commend him for his words, which reflect the vision that the Premier and his government have put before as not just a challenge but an invitation to the second session of the 53rd Parliament.

I also note, as did the Governor, the passing of the Hon. Bob Such, and particularly also note the passing of Heather Southcott, the first woman to lead a political party in this country—two people for whom I had the greatest of respect and I value their contributions, particularly to South Australia's parliament and democracy.

I welcome newly-elected members: the member for Fisher, Nat Cook, and the member for Davenport, Sam Duluk. I wish them well and look forward to working with them in cross-party ventures. Certainly I have had productive discussions with both of them already about where we might have areas of mutual interest and be able to work together.

I note that the speech, given in my relatively short time in this place (just on five years) I believe had more content than I had become used to in the previous speeches, so I welcome that and I certainly welcome the challenges put before us as a parliament and look forward to not just the mature debates on the nuclear industry, the resolution of a possible new time zone for our state or the reform of our taxation system, but in particular I wanted to talk about some points that were touched on with regard to both equality and democracy in our state.

I am certainly heartened to hear the words that were in the speech that the Premier is looking at ensuring that all South Australians are treated equally, regardless of their gender, gender identity or sexuality. Those are very welcome words for me to hear in the Governor's speech, to be put front and centre of the upcoming parliamentary session.

As members are aware, the South Australian Law Reform Institute will be charged with reviewing and proposing options to remedy legislative or regulatory discrimination against individuals and families on the grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity or intersex status. I note also that the speech talked about gender equality, and I would hope to see that the review also will address concerns of gender equality, along with those.

I welcome the Law Reform Institute's review, and I will certainly be putting my suggestions for reform, where we can achieve gains towards equality for these members in our community currently discriminated against, whether it is families with same sex parents, whether it is those who identify as transgender or who have transitioned from one gender to another or do not have a gender identity that is either male or female. So I look forward to both the review and the recommendations but also to furthering the work this year, regardless of that review.

I am heartened that we have seen the advertisement and initiation of the process of the Legislative Review Committee's referral of the bill that I brought to this place last year, the Sexual Reassignment Act Repeal Bill 2014, and certainly that will give voice, particularly to those in the trans community in South Australia, as to how that act either does or does not serve them. I would argue that it currently does not serve them and that it needs to be not just reformed but repealed, and I look forward to that cross party committee in investigating and hearing those voices.

Some of that select committee's work may indeed inform the review and make recommendations that way but, certainly, I would not say that we have to wait for the recommendations of the review to address those issues. I will, in coming weeks, be bringing before this place a bill that will further recognise the situation of same-sex parent lesbian couple families who are currently not appropriately afforded the recognition of their familial relationships with their children. It is an adjunct to a bill I previously brought to this place that was indeed passed by the parliament that recognised lesbian coparents.

The bill I will bring forward will take another step towards equality for those particular families, and I also certainly look forward to the adoption review that the state government has initiated

addressing same-sex couples in terms of adoption, as well as has been previously mentioned, single-parent families.

The Hon. John Dawkins, of course, is presenting surrogacy law reform to us for debate and, again, we need not wait for the review to report to raise issues that affect same-sex attracted individuals and couples and families with regard to any of those debates. There is certainly a long list that the institute will have to present us with to work on in future sessions of parliament.

I will also be bringing a bill to this place to recognise marriages between same-sex couples that have been performed in other jurisdictions and I would note that other states of Australia have already passed and recognised those relationships and passed those laws and, states with Labor governments or Liberal governments—governments of both the old party sides—have taken that step forward and I would hope that we would not need to wait to hear from the review before debating those issues either.

I was very pleased to hear the speech address domestic violence. Domestic violence is, of course, an issue that parliaments and governments of all levels should be seeing as a high priority. The new Victorian Premier's election promise—now a completed pledge—to have a royal commission into domestic violence is a very welcome step from a state government.

I commend the work of particularly the members for Reynell and Little Para in their ongoing commitment to raise areas of possible law reform and certainly cultural reform to do with domestic violence and I note that the Social Development Standing Committee has initiated its inquiry into domestic violence and measures that this state could be taking to ameliorate and prevent domestic violence in our state. That work will, I think, bring a greater deal of equality and fairness and better lives for the citizens of South Australia.

The talk of democracy has certainly got some members of this chamber a little fired up and we have already seen the Hon. Dennis Hood put before us a bill to look at the issue of what is called preference harvesting and microparties and setting as potentially 2 per cent the amount that a party or candidate would have to accrue in their own right before they could harvest those preferences to be elected to this place.

They are welcome debates and robust debates. Certainly, any talk of democratic reform needs to look at the bigger picture and at ensuring that we have a diversity in our parliament. What does sadden me is that we actually have fewer women in this chamber in this council than we did just five years ago when I was elected. In fact I entered as one of three new women in this place, alongside the Hon. Jing Lee and the Hon. Kelly Vincent. Sadly, the number of women has dwindled in this chamber, and that is something that I think is a step backwards that I would like to see righted.

The commitment by this government to not only work against domestic violence but indeed show leadership is, again, something to be commended. What I would say is that, while people say that more women in parliament is necessary for many reasons, I have never seen more women in parliament as a way to ameliorate the behaviour of the male members of parliament. Certainly the role of men and boys in debates, not only about violence against women and girls but indeed in democracy, and in taking a leadership focus cannot be underestimated.

It is no good to expect women to be 'God's police', as Anne Summers referred to our Colonial history as one of the roles that we had. Certainly the other one, being 'damned whores', is possibly a less attractive role for some, but women are much more diverse than that and need not take on a role of ameliorating the behaviour of men. I think it is up to men to police and be responsible for their own behaviours.

The announcement of a royal commission into the nuclear industry has certainly caused some level of angst and a lot of excitement in the business community. I note it is something that Business SA has long called for in terms of having some sort of a conversation. I do question whether it is a royal commission that we need to undertake that conversation. I do think we could have a mature debate without the expense of a royal commission, but now that we are having this mature debate, let's hear all sides of that debate.

I note that, when the speech was delivered, the topic of renewables certainly also seemed to be part of our state's future. I commend the thought being given to the reintroduction of a ministry

that includes climate change, and a promise of a carbon-neutral city—I note that Sydney prides itself on being a carbon-neutral city—has been something that this government is saying they will lead the way in. I look forward to seeing how that will roll out. I certainly do not want to see it being a greenwash. Having a green zone is something that should be there not simply for spin but indeed for a sustainable planet.

The moves that the government has announced—which are a far cry from the days of 'rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em' and recognising that in fact we have racked, packed and stacked and our prisons are now overflowing—that we need to look beyond simply prisons and fines in our justice system are also potentially very welcomed by myself as a Greens MP. Justice reinvestment is something that both myself and Senator Penny Wright brought to this place with a cross-party forum some years ago.

If you can keep somebody, particularly a juvenile, from having contact with the justice system in the first place, before lives are derailed or damaged, that is certainly not only a more positive outcome for that person's life and for those families affected, but of course it is cheaper and less expensive on the state budget option. It will be a win-win if we can turn the spin from 'rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em' into real reform and real value for people to participate fully in society and not needlessly come into contact with the justice system.

Transforming Health, of course, will be a major challenge for this government. It is in its stages of consultation, and at the end of this week we know that the sector has been invited to respond to the government's Transforming Health document. I echo the concerns that were raised last night by both myself and other members of this council, but also those of the AMA, the salaried medical officers and many professionals in this sector, that we cannot get this debate wrong.

If it takes a bit longer, it is better to get the debate right the first time, in the same way that the health minister is arguing that it is better to get the patient to the right service the first time. With those few words, I commend the Governor's speech. I look forward to a productive year, and I am excited by a focus on equality in this place and hope that we can work cross-party to have great achievements for South Australians in 2015.

The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (16:46): I also take the floor to contribute to the Address in Reply. Certainly, there have been some hard acts to follow today. First there was the Hon. Mr McLachlan with his references to everything from Charles Dickens to the road to Damascus, and the quote where he said, 'I would not want to see the Legislative Council emasculated.' I hope I am not misquoting him. I know what he meant by this, in that he was referring to a more archaic meaning of the word emasculated, meaning he would not want to see the council be weakened in its powers.

However, I will take the opportunity to say that I for one would welcome a greater gender balance in this place and in politics more broadly. I can see the Hon. Ms Gago as minister for women fist pumping across the chamber. We also had the contribution of the Hon. Rob Lucas, which was a very important and moving tribute to his family. I have been liaising with my staff and with Hansard as he was giving that contribution. I want to thank him for reminding us all of the importance of remembering where we come from, so 'domo arigato', which is my very poor attempt at Japanese for 'thank you very much'.

I would like to thank the Governor for his first speech at the opening of this session of parliament on 10 February. I would also like to congratulate him for his appointment more broadly to his new role, and extend those congratulations and welcome to his wife Phuong Lan and their family as well. I note that not only were they born overseas, as others have noted, but they came here by boat as refugees. I have had the privilege of hearing His Excellency give a very moving account of that experience and how he thinks that experience will inform him in his new role as Governor.

His life's experiences and those of others, and what we have learnt from those, will hopefully be an excellent fit for the role and inform some empathy for the life circumstances of others who he will meet in his role, and that should never be underestimated. Today in my address in reply I will cover a number of points in response to broad issues canvassed by the Governor in his speech. I would first like to briefly touch on, as others have before me, the idea of making South Australia a leader in the fight against discrimination based on ethnicity, faith, gender and sexuality.

Dignity for Disability certainly welcomes this, and I hope our parliamentary record shows that comes as no surprise. We also hope that leaders will have some awareness in addressing racism against Aboriginal South Australians and the daily discrimination that is often faced by people with disabilities.

I would not mind seeing a start on this by executive directors of every state government department having KPIs on how many people with disabilities are employed within their departments. I would also note that I have been continually disappointed by the government's shirking of its responsibility in terms of disability rights, particularly with the incoming National Disability Insurance Scheme. We welcome the rollout of the scheme. There is no denying that more resources and funding in the disability sector are greatly needed, but the simple fact of the matter is that the National Disability Insurance Scheme will only cater to the very specific needs of a few of the four million of us who currently live with a disability in Australia.

The scheme is not set up to do things like: making public transport accessible; making sure that students with disabilities have the same educational opportunities as those which are offered to our non-disabled peers; fighting discrimination in the workplace based on disability, etc. So, we have a long way to go, and I hope that the new Governor will be very collaborative with local governments and with other agencies to ensure that the state government is fully meeting its responsibilities head-on in terms of fighting those barriers.

I would also like to speak briefly on the nuclear royal commission. In appointing a commissioner for the royal commission, it has been disappointing that the government has sought someone to lead the debate who previously stated a strong opinion on the need for SA to embrace nuclear power. In 2000, there was a people's movement called The People's Conference 2000 to discuss the pros and cons of nuclear-waste storage in our state.

Rather than begin with a slanted process, the organisers sought to have speakers present from a range of views, and Dignity for Disability, as I am sure would many others, would like to see the commissioner actively seek a range of evidence and implore them to visit the current low-level nuclear waste storage facility near Woomera to take an inventory of how successful the current arrangements there are. I certainly do not want to be seen stating a particular view one way or the other, but I do think we need to be mindful that they take into account the broad spectrum of opinions that will be available here.

So, Dignity for Disability would also like to see the commission take evidence about South Australia's geological instability and the likelihood of an earthquake, perhaps, in the remote areas of this state. There is certainly some evidence to suggest—and some not to suggest—but I again hasten the point that what I am trying to say is we need to take equal stock of all of the views on the varying sides of this debate.

The issue of city vibrancy—and this is a term that I for one am rather sick of hearing—is again on the agenda. I am not sick of the aim, I am just sick of that particular turn of phrase. Dignity for Disability certainly agrees, but not on the terms necessarily which the government promotes. Yes, the Festival and Fringe and other events are continuing to improve their access to shows with things like Auslan interpretation and hearing loops and ramps, but the fact remains that many buildings and events that this state uses for these festivals—and also things like Splash Adelaide and the pop-up events—remain very inaccessible.

Even getting a ticket to a show online if you are, like myself, someone who needs to book wheelchair accessible seating, for too many events is still not possible. Even going to the bathroom, once you are at an event, can require far too much effort.

It is essential that the government tender funding to provide accessibility for all, for any event, venue or festival. This is certainly not what initially occurred with the \$600 million spent on the Adelaide Oval redevelopment, and look at the challenges that this has created. Retrofitting is generally not the answer. Factoring it into all plans as a matter of fact rather than a problem we have to deal with once it arises is surely best practice.

Accessibility is not just about ramps and toilets in any old place but about where they are placed, and whether you can enjoy a concert with your friends rather than finding yourself stuck in the special designated wheelchair platform of a venue, stadium or room. Communication accessibility

is also an important consideration in terms of creating a vibrant Adelaide. Is Auslan interpretation and captioning available and capacity to leave if you find yourself in sensory overload, or is perhaps an area available for people to use to deal with their sensory overload and come back? Is a hearing loop available? Is audio description for people with vision impairment available?

I have to say I was very pleased to hear that, in the opening Fringe parade, this year was the first year when people who were blind or had a vision impairment were able to attend the parade ahead of time and do a touch tour where they could touch the floats and have them described to them to get a sense of what was going on visually. I think that is certainly something that I would like to see more of.

The proposed increase in city population is in many respects a welcome one, but having an expanded program of activities so we do not just experience the mad March and then become the sleepy state or the nanny state for the rest of the year is vital. It is all very well and good to have people living there 365 days a year but, if they do not have much to do for the rest of the 11 months, we are not meeting our full potential. There certainly seems to be capacity to expand the program and perhaps spread it out beyond March and, indeed, encourage the live music scene as well.

On the issue of carbon neutrality and cycling, Dignity for Disability would be happy to see a carbon neutral city, but there is serious planning needed for us to reach this goal. It is great that the government want to improve access to cycling, but we would suggest they start by actually having a cycling strategy. The last one expired quite a few years ago. We also have a tiny infrastructure spend on cycling and this must be addressed if people, especially women, if the surveys conducted by the YWCA are anything to go by, are to feel safe cycling and getting about our city.

If we cannot manage the live streaming of our own parliament or operate an efficient online information system on government websites, then I recommend staying indoors if we do get driverless cars in this state at this point in time. I for one, with my spatial awareness and my lack of sense of direction being what it is, welcome the idea of a driverless car. It would make it much easier for me, but I declare that that is a bias, and again labour the point that we are perhaps not ready for that yet.

We also welcome the changes necessary to the Motor Vehicles Act that will be necessary to enable driverless cars, but acknowledge that this is not the only change that needs to happen to that particular piece of legislation or in that particular area. I again flag that we will be moving legislation to deal with the repeated illegal misuse of accessible car parks without a permit. We think that that is a wider part of making people with disabilities feel welcome and respected in our city.

I also labour the point that making the city accessible to cyclists also more often than not has the flow-on effect of making it accessible to many people with disabilities, and that needs to be a primary consideration as well. It is probably worth noting that the recent and current fires at Jeffries soil premises at Buckland Park are being ably managed by the CFS, and I ask: what plans there are to expand the role of the MFS to the more populous areas of the expanded urban growth boundary?

On the proposal to renew all public Housing Trust stock which was build prior to 1968 by the year 2020, this is certainly something that we welcome. Again, too many buildings, including homes, remain inaccessible to people with disabilities, so we certainly hope to see the government joining us in promoting movements like universal design, passive solar, and 8-star energy ratings. We certainly welcome them to join us on that.

As I was saying yesterday in this place, I think we can all agree that there is a need for healthcare reform. We cannot have our healthcare system continue to grow exponentially in the way that it is, particularly when we are not, again, as I said yesterday, getting the return for investment that we need. We all want a better, more efficient healthcare system, but to get healthier people we also need the government to have a healthier contribution and a healthier attitude toward consultation.

The lack of clarity around particular practicalities of the reforms proposed under Transforming Health remain a serious concern for many in the community, amongst patients and healthcare professionals alike. Dignity for Disability also believes that having healthier people includes considering mental health in a serious, consultative and holistic way. What happened to the

mental health council proposal that we heard of, and why is there so little about mental health in the current Transforming Health documents?

When our thoughts turn to services for elderly people, I feel somewhat duty bound to say that the dementia epidemic is beginning, and needs a strong and sustained response from our health service. It is imperative that staff throughout the health sector at all levels have the education as well as the resources to understand and to cater for dementia in a dignified and respectful manner, as well as a holistic one. This is no longer going to be a matter just for aged-care facilities, and I applaud the positive work being done by Alzheimer's Australia in their Fight Dementia campaign.

According to Access Economics, dementia is the single greatest cause of disability in our older population; that is to say, in people aged 65 years and over. South Australia faces a shortage of more than 13,100 paid and unpaid family carers for people living with dementia by 2029. That is in just 14 years, so we certainly need to act upon this now.

Dignity for Disability is aware that the issue of international education is a critical export for the South Australian economy and to make this a place that parents want to send their young adult children to for tertiary education we must continue to work making our society tolerant, affordable and welcoming. Public transport, infrastructure and liveable cities is an important part of this as well, but I again make the point that while I welcome work on making the city welcoming to international students we also have to look at how poorly mainstream education is currently catering to students with disabilities and how much this is squandering their academic and professional futures.

On the subject of marketing for South Australian tourism, Dignity for Disability welcomes the Internode wireless network within the city of Adelaide, but we question why it took so long to get one. We note that in some respects we are still streaks ahead of other capital cities in this regard. We need to promote SA as a go-to destination for people with disabilities, in terms of accessible cities, and promote their tourism dollar. I think this is a part of the debate that often gets left behind, that people with disabilities are taxpayers just like anyone else and we want to be able to get into the shops, to visit McLaren Vale, to visit the Rundle Mall, to visit all of the other attractions that South Australia promotes and spend the money that we have.

Another point that is often left out is that even if you are in receipt of a pension or a welfare payment you are still a taxpayer and have the right to access the community and all of the things that offers and to give back to the economy. We need to understand and implement the highest standards of accessibility in order to achieve this. Accessible cellar doors, for example, is one thing that I would love to see; accessible wine tours, again perhaps I acknowledge my own self-interest in that; accessible beaches; accessible festivals and major events. We could start with an inventory on what is currently accessible and what is not and develop from there, again consulting with the people who know what the needs are.

On the issue of attracting foreign investment, in terms of new industries and business, I think that is something that needs to be thought about very carefully, particularly with the closure of Holden and other companies. We need to look very carefully at how South Australia can focus on niche markets and do those well, such as (perhaps) the growing need for technology to assist people with disabilities and, to some extent, the ageing population as well. In terms of having a new body to attract new jobs, I would be interested to know how this body will work on the appalling participation rate and employment rate that currently exists for people with disabilities. I hope that will be a primary consideration.

On the issue of the state taxation system reform, I note the Treasurer's discussion paper and will respond to that more fully but I would like to note just a couple of points. Will this reform include what I believe is Business SA's only wish that goes ungranted thus far, and that is the issue of payroll tax concessions? This is income that the state needs and uses for the benefit of taxpayers. It is time that those in industry buckled up as part of the community and stopped bullying the government of the day to take up a range of inappropriate policy measures that benefit a few rather than most.

We need a more robust and mature debate about payroll tax alone. Germany has a highly regulated economy together with high wages and they seem to be surviving and holding the entire European economic zone together. There are other moves that I think we need to look at, such as how we incentivise employers to employ people with disabilities or whether incentivising is the way

to go at all. I welcome feedback on that but I certainly hope that this will be a consideration as part of that debate.

On the issue of time zones, my speech notes here actually say 'sigh', and with good reason. Once again it is on the agenda because we are told that business wants it. I have to say that it is on the agenda at a very convenient time, a time when we have a crisis in the education department that is in the media nearly every day. It just seems to be a noncontentious thing that the government can perhaps get a win on; however, I digress.

I again hasten to say that I hope both sides of the debate will be equally listened to on this issue. I think it is important to remember that farmers on the West Coast are businesses too, and I am pretty sure that this debate has been going on since before I was born. If we are going to consider the time zone, surely we will look at going back half an hour to represent our true geographical location, surely not forward half an hour in some farcical attempt to be like the Eastern States. We are not the Eastern States and we have enough to offer as it is. Again, I will wait to see the outcome of that debate. I just say once again that I hope both sides will be listened to with equal weight.

On the issue of freedom of expression, someone once said, 'Lasting changes are only possible if people engage in our democracy.' While Dignity for Disability will be reintroducing our electoral reform bill very soon to ensure that all people, particularly people with disabilities, have a more equal chance at engaging in democracy, we would love to see more people with disabilities participating in our electoral system, both as voters—which is not always possible currently, particularly for people with intellectual disability who are not given the support that they might require to fill out the ballot paper and necessary paperwork due to a presumed incapacity, and that is a great concern to us—as well as candidates. We hope to address some of the barriers that exist currently through that bill, which we will reintroduce.

On the issue of corporate campaign contributions, we are pleased to see that the government has already started this program of reform in some way. Small, grassroots, people-powered political parties like Dignity for Disability do not have the luxury of a big brother national party to bolster our coffers, and we do not have the luxury of a big spend on an election campaign to gain a higher percentage of the vote to ensure that our now not inconsiderable candidate deposits are returned.

In short, this is a very expensive process, this business we call democracy, and it is unfair that legitimate smaller parties are discriminated against in the rush to reform the so-called preference harvesting that resulted in some senators interstate being elected on very small primary votes. If governments are serious about making a level playing field and wanting elections to be about policies and not about who has the most money to spend on ads and putting up posters of themselves, then they will join Dignity for Disability's call to ban corflute electoral advertising. It should be about who you are and what are your policies, not what your face looks like and whether you have the money to spend on big shiny posters of your candidates.

Corflutes in particular clearly disadvantage people with disabilities, not only in terms of the visual aspect but also in terms of the restrictions on how high a corflute must be from the ground. It can be quite discriminatory to some people with disabilities. So, it is clearly time to do away with this visual blight and environmental waste, and we will certainly again be moving forward with our work in that area.

On the issue of reforming the deadlock process between the two houses, there are very few cases of deadlock between these two houses. In fact, there are so few that I feel that it is hardly worth mentioning. It is in fact a testament to our democracy that we do very occasionally have to thrash out some matter or other in the deadlock process.

It is, in my experience, not a very long and protracted affair. If I may allude to Charles Dickens in *Bleak House*, as opposed to *Oliver Twist*, there is no Jarndyce and Jarndyce and no Lady Dedlock here. Nay, if we wish to strengthen our democracy, perhaps there are parties present who should look at their own bleak house and increase the representation of women in office bearing positions as candidates. I think that would be an improvement to look at, perhaps before we get down to the real nitty-gritty here.

On the issue of citizens juries: yes, they are great, but are we ensuring that the jury has a representation of people with disabilities, their family carers and other often disenfranchised groups on these juries? I certainly hope so. On the issue of full participation and equal access to universal education, does this again include ensuring that all university campuses are not only smoke free but have access requirements in place for students and lecturers with disabilities? Dignity for Disability is pleased to hear that a review of the Department of Education and Child Development will occur. We hope that this will examine a culture of workplace bullying that my office has heard about from too many sources to think that it involves merely isolated cases.

For children with disabilities, will staff be relocated to work with school leaders more locally? At present, many families supporting children with disabilities are locked out of the education system either due to a lack of disability access and supports, or because the school cannot accommodate things that are often called 'challenging behaviours'.

On the issue of justice, we are pleased to finally have the Disability Justice Plan being rolled out, and we welcome the holistic reform of the criminal justice system overall. As an alternative to custodial sentences, how about supervised home assistance for people with gardening and home maintenance, for example?

On the issue of discrimination of people from LGBTIQ communities, in the year 2015, being unable, or feeling unsafe or unwelcome, to participate in your community, based on the issue of your gender, sexuality, or indeed, as I said earlier, disability, is no longer satisfactory. We would like to see these recommendations from the commonwealth inquiry about gender and gender diversity implemented.

As with passports now, where a person can specify that they do not adhere to a specific gender on their passport documentation, I certainly believe that this should be rolled out to all government documentation as well, to ensure that people feel welcome and respected. Again, I do not think it should be any skin off the nose of a government department to put an extra box in there that a person can tick, and I do not think there should be any skin off our nose if a person wants to be addressed in a particular way when they receive correspondence from the government or, indeed, society at large.

Lastly I would like to touch on the issue of women, gender-based discrimination and in particular domestic violence. I certainly echo the concerns that have been raised in this chamber on that and would again like to note that women with disabilities are more likely to be victims of domestic violence, and there are many reasons for this. We need to look at this holistically. Is a woman with a disability being denied choice about who her supports are, who provides her with support pertaining to her disability? Does that create a social isolation that can then make her more likely to experience abuse?

We need to look at the supports that are available to women with disabilities in terms of shelters for people experiencing domestic violence. Are those shelters accessible to someone with disability, and is that going to be a barrier to someone leaving an abusive relationship? Public transport might sound obscure, but if this is inaccessible, and the person with disability does not have access to a car, that could again be a barrier to leaving an abusive situation.

So we welcome some of the progress that has occurred in this area in the last few years but we certainly continue to put pressure on the government to look at this holistically and hope that we will keep in mind the needs of women with disability as a particularly—in this context, it is a word I am quite hesitant to use—vulnerable group, and look at how we can do away with some of those vulnerabilities by making a society more accessible to people with disabilities. With those not-so-brief words, I commend the speech to the chamber and look forward to working with all members to make sure that our state is truly welcoming, vibrant and accessible.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (17:24): I rise to support the adoption of the Address in Reply given by His Excellency. It was a great honour to have His Excellency the Governor of South Australia the Hon. Hieu Van Le conduct his first official meeting in the Legislative Council for the opening of parliament. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate His Excellency and express my gratitude to the Governor and Mrs Lan Le on their incredible commitment to the South Australian community.

As the shadow parliamentary secretary for multicultural affairs, I also place on the record my deepest gratitude to the Governor for his commitment to recognise the achievements and contributions of our citizens from culturally and linguistically diverse communities through the work he did previously as the chair of SAMEAC and now as the Governor. He worked hard in his previous role and just as hard now in his new role. That is why he is a wonderful asset to South Australia.

I have had the privilege of knowing both the Governor and Mrs Le for a long period of time now. My husband Eddie Liew and I see them regularly at many functions and community events. There have been many occasions when we will see each other two or three times on the same day. For example, during the Lunar New Year period, we will bump into each other at almost every single function. Let's put it this way: it would be unusual if we did not see each other for more than a week. We have had many photos taken together over the years. It is not surprising that I have a great photo collection of His Excellency and Mrs Lan Le. We often joke that if they were ever going to throw a special party, I would be the one who would readily supply the photos to be used for his PowerPoint presentation.

As all of us already know, the Governor and Mrs Lan Le came here as Vietnamese refugees and had a humble start to a new life in Australia. Their amazing journey is a remarkable story that has been told over and over again to remind all of us of the generosity and openness of Australia as a nation, and that regardless of what your background is and where you came from, if you work hard and if you have the capacity to contribute, you can represent Australia in public office. His Excellency is a great example, the Hon. Tung Ngo is another example, and of course the Hon. Rob Lucas is another great example.

I would like to particularly thank the Hon. Rob Lucas today for opening his heart to pay a special tribute in honour of his beloved mother. I think some of the older migrants certainly have gone through tougher challenges than we have as new migrants, and I think it is remarkable to hear those stories. It is probably the first time I have heard the Hon. Rob Lucas actually demonstrate such a public affection for his family in the chamber. It was a very moving speech and I just want to acknowledge that and commend him for doing that.

From some of the stories we have already heard, including the Hon. Andrew McLachlan calling for a bipartisan approach to and support for multiculturalism, we recognise the role that migrants have played in shaping South Australia into what it is today and the creation and success of the multicultural community that we are so proud of.

I believe South Australia is one of the most successful places in the world where people who arrive here from different parts of the world have become a part of this wonderfully diverse community. Everywhere we look, there is evidence that the multicultural community has had a positive influence on our society and has made a big impact in South Australia.

I place my sincere congratulations to the Hon. Hieu Van Le the Governor for his elevation from Lieutenant Governor to Governor. I think we all agree that is a worthy appointment and great news for the South Australian community. His Excellency and Mrs Lan Le are providing outstanding service and demonstrating a high level of respect and courtesy to the people of this state. They are great ambassadors for South Australia.

Before I make further comments regarding the Governor's speech, I would also like to place on the record my heartfelt congratulations to Mr Sam Duluk as the new member for Davenport. I take this opportunity to welcome him to the Liberal parliamentary team and acknowledge the comments made by the new member for Davenport in his maiden speech. It was an excellent speech that touched on a number of issues and areas which the Labor government has neglected for a long time. We are confident that Mr Sam Duluk will make an incredible contribution to this parliament.

The Governor's address that opened the parliament was following the grand traditions of the Westminster system, as we know. Therefore, he was acting and speaking on behalf of the government. The Governor was reading a prepared speech written by the government of the day and Premier Jay Weatherill. Therefore, from here onwards my comments in replying to the Governor's address are not a reflection on the Governor but are an assessment of the government.

The public needs to be aware that the government used the opening of parliament to paint colourful pictures to distract people from the real, important issues. The Labor government really has not come up with a solid plan about delivering its promises for the people of South Australia. I commend His Excellency in his acknowledgement of our CFS, our SES and volunteer heroes who supported our state in the recent Sampson Flat and Tantanoola fires during the opening of the Second Session of the 53rd Parliament. Special thanks go to the CFS, the SES, the Red Cross, Lions and a range of volunteer groups across South Australia for their compassionate acts and duties to put out the fires and safeguard the safety of our communities.

You would think that firefighters would be treated with the utmost respect by the government, but no. Remember when the Liberal Party and the crossbenchers in this chamber were advocating for our firefighters in South Australia and presented a strong case that there should be no differentiation in terms of cancer compensation between the paid and the unpaid firefighters. The government disagreed. They did not see the need for equality. The Liberal Party stood firm on our position. We continued to fight and we now have equality between those two groups. I want to place my special thanks to all honourable crossbench members for working with us, and I look forward to working with all the crossbenchers this year.

The state debt continues to rise out of control under this government. It will be more than \$13 billion by 2016-17. Every one of us will suffer as a consequence of Labor's poor economic management. By the 2016-17 financial year we will be borrowing \$725 million per year to pay the interest on the debt that Labor has run up. That means we have \$725 million per year less to spend on hospitals, schools, roads—things that are important to our communities. We have the highest taxes, electricity prices, water prices and WorkCover rates in the nation. Every one of these things is chipping away at our opportunity to create jobs in South Australia. It is no wonder we have the highest unemployment in Australia.

We could not believe it when Premier Weatherill outlined his plan to introduce a new tax on family homes in South Australia. He suggests that it will be a broad-based property tax to replace conveyancing duty, costing South Australian families \$1,200 every year. As if it is not bad enough for South Australian families who are facing ever-increasing electricity, water and emergency services levy bills, now the Weatherill Labor government wants to put another tax on the family home. South Australian families should not have to pay for the incompetence of the Weatherill Labor government. The new land tax on the family home will be an additional burden for many South Australian household budgets. The Labor government has once again demonstrated that they have lost touch with the financial struggles of ordinary South Australians.

As the shadow parliamentary secretary for small business, trade and investment, I am very concerned about the lack of support for small business and South Australian exporters by the Labor government. The Sensis Business Index released in January 2015 painted a bleak picture of the outlook of small and medium-sized enterprises in SA.

Metro and regional SMEs are the backbone of the South Australian business sector. The report reviews that just 6 per cent have exported in the past year—the worst result in the nation. The report also highlighted that 44 per cent of South Australian small to medium size businesses surveyed believe that the current Labor government's policy was against SMEs.

SA firms have an active outlook on the size of the workforce and capital expansion reflecting a lack of confidence in future growth prospects. The federal government's tax regime is hurting the state's SMEs and actively impacting on their ability to effectively operate a business here in South Australia. Export is a key driver of the SA economy, and we need our SMEs to be continually assessing new national and international markets and compete on equal footing with interstate rivals. The lack of business investment and confidence in state government policies is a major contributing factor to the ever-increasing rate of unemployment and the cause of SA businesses moving interstate for better opportunities.

The government talks about the long overdue need to increase event funding and the bid fund in South Australia. We have been left without a substantial bid fund to bring events into South Australia for an extended period of time now. Do not forget, Labor closed down the very successful Liberal initiative called 'Australian Major Events' which bid for, and won, fantastic events

here in South Australia—events that are still continuing to this day, such as the Tour Down Under and the Clipsal.

These are events which the government stands up and talks about how successful they have been over an extended period of time. Labor can only talk about the wonderful events which were established under the Liberal government. We certainly do not mind a copycat if the initiative will benefit South Australia, so we welcome the fact that the government finally admits it is putting a proper bid fund back in place.

My family migrated from South-East Asia, so I am fully aware of the opportunities in that region. It is great to see that finally there is an engagement strategy for South-East Asia. We are supportive of this strategy, of course, because it is our Liberal policy to begin with. It has been our policy for an extended period of time. This government has ignored opportunities in South-East Asia for a very long period and that has been to the detriment of exporters in SA.

In relation to taxation review, the Liberal Party has been working with industry and listening to constituents. We have brought up the need for tax reform in South Australia for many years now. Guess what? Only after 13 years in government, Labor is finally putting together a discussion paper to tackle radical reform in our taxation system. The circumstances we find ourselves in are frightening at the moment, with 7.3 per cent unemployment in South Australia. This is the highest rate in the nation. I asked a question earlier in the chamber and presented some statistics which I would like to reiterate now. More than 15,000 permanent migrants settle in South Australia every year—

The Hon. S.G. Wade interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins): Order! The honourable member might just like to keep the conversation down in front of his colleague. The Hon. Jing Lee.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: As I said, more than 15,000 permanent migrants settle in South Australia every year, although not all stay. Over the past five years, 9,265 skilled migrants were successfully nominated by the state government. Many also bring their families. According to ABS data, in January 2015 there were 54,442 unemployed South Australians who were born in Australia. Another 15,651 unemployed people were born overseas.

The state government nominates migrants if they have the skills and experience needed on the Skilled Occupations List and they must stay in SA for two years. Neither the Skilled Occupations List nor the graduate occupations list bear any resemblance for local employment potential. According to the commonwealth department of employment, some of these professions and trades are in serious decline, and that is why we find Indian and Pakistani migrants with masters degrees in IT and engineering working as taxi drivers, cleaners or in telemarketing—what a waste of human potential!

Two cycles are running through the SA economy at the moment. There is a short-term economic cycle of falling mineral prices and tight retail spending. These come and go, but there is a far more serious structural mechanism at work. This is the stagnation and decline of the old manufacturing and construction economy with its allied professions and supply chains. This unwinding of the old economy has far-reaching effects and is hitting the poor the hardest.

Much of the job readiness training for migrants in Adelaide is useless, with limited vocational application. There are no measures to determine whether migrants actually get work after the training or, if they do, how long they stay employed. Migrants are paying thousands of dollars to undertake courses that play no intrinsic role in helping them find career-specific jobs.

While we support this call for multiculturalism, we have got to make sure that the migrants coming to South Australia actually do find jobs and do have better opportunities; therefore, I think we should call for the government to improve business conditions in South Australia by lowering taxes, reducing red tape and encouraging export growth so that South Australia can be rescued and can have a better future. With those few remarks, I support the adoption of the Address in Reply. I look forward to working with honourable members in this chamber in our deliberations for better services for South Australia.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:41): At the outset, I too wish to congratulate the Governor, His Excellency Hieu Van Le AO, on his appointment and his first address as Governor on the opening of parliament. As mentioned by other honourable members, His Excellency's story is truly remarkable and his appointment as Governor is certainly very fitting. His journey fleeing from a Communist regime and travelling to Australia by boat as a young 23-year-old man, and then going on to achieve the things he has, is one that I do not think any of us can truly appreciate.

Some 38 years on since His Excellency's arrival in Australia, the refugee debate is as strong as ever. His Excellency's personal sacrifices, as well as his remarkable achievements and contribution to this state, should serve as a timely reminder of just how much so many people who come to this country have to offer, whether they arrive as refugees or otherwise.

In recent times, I have met a young man—Keyvan Abak—who fled from persecution and came to this country alone, on a boat, at the tender age of 15. Keyvan spent two years in Woomera Detention Centre and a further two years in community detention before finally being granted refugee status. Despite his harrowing ordeal, he has gone on to achieve extraordinary things.

After completing high school in record time, Keyvan completed a Bachelor of Social Work and a Masters in Mediation and Conflict Management. At present, Keyvan is in the process of completing his PhD whilst at the same time working as a counsellor and helping some of our most vulnerable members of the community. At any one time, he has held down as many as three jobs to support himself and his family abroad, some of whom still continue to struggle with their plight for freedom. I know this first-hand because my office continues to help Keyvan in his tireless efforts to have his brother and his family granted status.

Keyvan's strength and determination to make a life for himself here, and to be the best person he can possibly be, is extremely moving. This young man, who is just a few months shy of his 30th birthday, has never asked for anything other than to be free from the violent and oppressive regime that destroyed his childhood and saw his family torn apart. I mention his story because I am sure it is one that His Excellency is familiar with. I am also sure that His Excellency's achievements, his standing in the community and, more recently, his appointment as Governor, have not gone unnoticed by young men and women like Keyvan who have sought refuge in this country.

The Governor's speech, and indeed the Governor's new agenda, comes at a time when many of us are questioning our state's future. But, has anything really changed since the last session of parliament some 10 months ago, or the session before that? In December 2011, the Premier argued that an official opening for the South Australian parliament in 2012 would allow him the opportunity to 'wipe the slate clean' following the Rann era, and present a new agenda to the South Australian people.

In December 2013, the parliament was prorogued, but then of course parliament was dissolved for the 2014 election. The new session of parliament began in May 2014. Some seven months later, in November of last year, the Premier found himself defending plans to prorogue parliament once again to enable all unfinished business to be wiped from the agenda and allow a fresh start and bold legislative action agenda to be revealed in parliament in 2015. In an interview with *The Advertiser*, the Premier stated at the time:

This year we've laid the foundations...I want to lay out a bold legislative agenda, a bold policy agenda. We've been listening...

During another interview, the Premier stated:

Absolutely, because we need a clean slate. We don't want to have the arguments of the past that we've been bogged down and people actually sniping at each other. We need to get on with a clear focus on a future for our kids, jobs for the future...the idea of having these little spats with one another and trying to score political points here and there, I want to lay out a clear agenda which will be bold, it will take people's breath away, we've done the work.

That is two bold new plans within the space of a year. I stand to be corrected, but I also recall the Premier saying something about the need to scrap all of the unnecessary inquiries that parliament has become bogged down by.

The government has certainly managed to take my breath away, but I am not sure if it is for the right reasons. Those little spats that the Premier refers to as attempts at political point scoring are anything but. The matters that are important to this state cannot be swept under the carpet.

Proroguing parliament will not make them go away. We can prorogue this parliament every year for the next 10 years, but so long as issues like the Gillman land deal, electoral reform, and the need for a children's commissioner with real teeth, to name a few, continue to exist, this government will have to deal with them.

The government will have to work effectively with all members of this chamber. All too often, ministers think they are the only ones with good ideas—that it is the government's way or no way. They seem to forget that crossbenchers were elected to this place to represent the views of their constituencies.

His Excellency's speech covered a number of big-ticket items that are sure to stir up debate. I will only touch on a few of those issues today. It may come as no surprise that the first issue that I will touch on is that of tax reform. Earlier this month, the government released the State Tax Review discussion paper, aimed at exploring different ways of making our taxation system more viable. When I read the terms of reference of the discussion paper, the first thing that caught my attention was the fact that consideration was to be given to ensuring that, for households, the tax system should be fair and have regard to people's ability to pay.

This is something that I have argued for over many years and for a fleeting moment I felt a small glimmer of hope that finally the government had woken up and paid attention. As I read on, that glimmer of hope quickly disappeared. Why? Because the government, in all its wisdom, appeared to be considering the option of replacing conveyancing duties with a broad-based property tax, payable on an annual basis.

The discussion paper provides that, under this alternative model, the charge on a median valued home (that is, a home valued at \$410,000) could be around \$1,200 a year, depending on the approach taken to raise the required revenue. Bear in mind also that this figure of \$1,200 is based on a property valued at \$410,000. If you own a property valued at \$500,000, or \$600,000 or even \$1 million, that figure will escalate dramatically. I am yet to speak with a single person who has indicated a willingness to pay this sort of money on an annual basis.

I have to admit, I also remain quite perplexed at the timing of this suggestion. It comes at a time when households are being absolutely belted with rates and charges, whether it be through the removal of the ESL remission, ever-increasing water rates and charges or the proposed removal of the pensioner concession discount for council rates.

We have just had an election. If the government was seriously considering this proposal then it should have had the intestinal fortitude to take it to an election, especially bearing in mind that when the Dunstan government abolished land tax on primary production properties in the mid-1970s and the Tonkin government abolished land tax on the principal place of residence in the 1980s, those measures were sold as election issues. If the government wants to provide relief from stamp duty then it should do just that. It should not contemplate loading one tax base onto another and it should take its agenda to an election.

His Excellency's speech also referred to some big ticket debates that I think need to be had, including debate over changes to time zones, uranium and health. In relation to time zones, I think it is absolutely necessary to consider this issue in the context of the impacts on business. If it can be demonstrated there is a benefit to be had by changing time zones then this is something that we need to seriously consider. Obviously, any such debate will need to be measured and take into account the impacts the current arrangements have on our economy and our ability to trade effectively with interstate and overseas partners and the needs of all other sectors of the community.

My position on the uranium debate is much the same. I know a royal commission may seem a little over the top but if this is the only way of ensuring that we have a balanced debate, no matter which side of the fence you sit on, then it is worthy of consideration.

In relation to health, we have all been witness to the growing number of people, including doctors, who have expressed concern over the government's proposed health reforms. The closure of Ward 17 at the Repatriation Hospital has certainly proved as one of the most challenging suggestions the government is trying to sell. Members were offered a briefing on the Transforming

Health review during the last sitting week, so I am sure I am not the only one still sifting through the final details.

What I will say at this point is that whilst there is absolutely no question that our health system is in need of urgent reform, the government has done a pretty bad job of selling its message. We now have members of the medical profession, who should be at the forefront of this debate, complaining of being silenced by the government. They are being asked to comment on the proposal without all of the detail. The fact that the minister is refusing to extend the time frame for submissions is only compounding people's anger and frustration.

It may very well be the case that some 1,000 submissions have been received, but there are plenty more individuals and groups who are seeking the opportunity to provide comment and they deserve to be heard. The mere fact that so many medical professionals have expressed concern over the current review process should be reason enough to extend the time frame. Whatever the outcome, these are major reforms that will impact each and every one of us. The least the government could do is to extend to everybody a reasonable opportunity to share their views. If it does not, then we face the real possibility of kissing goodbye yet another opportunity of real reform.

His Excellency also spoke about the government's plans to reform its planning policies. There is certainly no doubt that this is an area in need of desperate attention, not only in relation to major planning issues but also in relation to matters that are impacting retailers who are quietly going about their business and trying to earn a living only to be interrupted by bureaucratic madness and mindless red tape.

Members may be aware that, in recent weeks, I have been assisting the owner of my local fish and chip shop, who was threatened with a \$20,000 fine for not seeking approval for an 'open' sign that has been hanging in his store's window for 10 years without incident. The sign, which is illuminated, is literally no bigger than a number plate.

I would hasten to say that, if driving by, you would actually struggle to even see it from your vehicle. In fact, I have been going to this shop for years and I had not even noticed it before it was brought to my attention by the owner. According to council, it poses safety and aesthetic issues for the community and passing motor vehicles. Ironically, flashing lights inside the window of a shop, such as Christmas decorations, do not need development approval. And what is the solution? Take it down or pay \$290.

The shop owner is not alone. According to some people to whom I have spoken, this is a common occurrence that many retailers who are already doing it tough are facing across council districts. It is not just businesses that are being targeted for non-compliance. Just this week *The Advertiser* published an article about a father who was forced to apply for development approval from Mitcham council's Development Assessment Panel for a cubby house that he had built with his two sons—a cubby house.

According to the article, in June of last year Mr Vedova received a letter from the council advising that the cubby house, which he had built together with his two young sons, was a non-compliant structure which needed permission to be torn down. \$300 and some months later, the family's application was approved. The council is quoted as saying that it did not actively investigate cubby houses which did not have approval, but rather reacted on complaints or concerns from neighbours. If these are not instances of bureaucracy gone mad and revenue raising, I do not know what is. This might just be a good starting point for the government in terms of its planning reforms.

We also need to ensure that consideration is given to the impacts that planning laws have on our regional areas. For instance, the issue of appropriate buffer zones and the imbalance that currently exists between dryland farmers and horticulturalists is certainly one that needs addressing. Because of potential spray drift from the chemicals used for controlling weeds, dryland farmers are being penalised by having to provide a buffer zone between their properties and new proposed developments involving new vineyards and residential developments. No regard seems to be had for the fact that those dryland farmers have been grazing and cropping their land for years, and certainly well before these new developments were ever contemplated.

These farmers are in a no-win situation, because if they do not spray their crops for weeds they face potential penalties from natural resources management boards. Their whole livelihood is

being whittled away by them having to provide buffer zones. It would seem more logical that, rather than jeopardise the dryland farming operations, any new proposed development should be required to provide the appropriate buffer zone.

It is important that these seemingly minor matters which are impacting quite significantly on the livelihoods of our farmers and other businesses are not overlooked by the government in any planning reform proposals. His Excellency's comments on the need to redefine the Public Service did not go unnoticed either. Most members would know that for some time now I have been talking about the need for an operational audit for the public sector, and that is something that I intend to pursue in the coming weeks by way of a private member's bill.

As anyone of us who deals with government departments would know, there are those that are over-resourced and those that are starving of resources. The solution is not to implement cuts across the board; this simply does not work. There is also so much overlap and duplication between local, state and federal levels of government that needs addressing. An operational audit would be the ideal way of addressing this issue, by looking at the question of what is the job that needs to be done, how can it be done most effectively and how do we monitor it to ensure that it continues to meet demand without cutting essential front-line services?

I have to admit that I was left shaking my head the other week at the news that some \$500,000 was going to be spent on training for CEOs. It leaves you questioning how it is that they got the position they were appointed to in the first place. What we would expect is for a CEO to be imparting their knowledge and expertise that saw them appointed in the first instance on more junior staff.

There has obviously been a lot of talk about the growing need for electoral reform, and this was also covered in the government's agenda. The last couple of state and federal elections have demonstrated very clearly that preference harvesting has to become a thing of the past. I state for the record that I maintain my position that we move towards an optional preferential voting model, and I will certainly be pushing for that before the next state election. Voters are sick of the current system. People who put themselves out there and stand for election are sick of the current system because it is clearly stacked in favour of the major parties.

On a related issue, I am pleased to see that the government has finally taken steps towards ensuring greater transparency in political donations, and I was also pleased to read the comments by key union leader, Peter Malinauskas, about the need to better scrutinise the Labor Party's membership recruitment and campaign techniques. It is a bold move by Mr Malinauskas, but certainly one that is desperately needed, particularly in relation to preselection for upper house seats.

I was going to speak at more length about reforms to our tourism industry, but I think the Hon. David Ridgway did a fine job of summing up sentiments around the government's plans to abolish the Tourism Commission Board. Our state relies heavily on the tourism industry, yet at a time when other states are doing the complete opposite this government has also decided to cut funding. There is no question that we need to embark on an aggressive campaign to market our state as a unique and attractive destination for tourists, but the solution is not to suggest an absolute sham of a proposal that would do away with the board and leave the minister responsible, and certainly not one that I will be supporting.

Last but not least importantly, I work in an office with three female staff. Let me rephrase that: I work in an office with three extremely competent, young female staff members, and I am constantly reminded of just how far it is that we have to go in order to fill the gender gap and break the glass ceiling that continues to hold back so many from contributing and achieving to their full potential. I have been around a long time, and I know attitudes have changed in the work place, but there is no question that we still have a hell of a long way to go.

Indeed, at the conclusion of the Governor's speech I was quickly reminded that, of the seven judges present that day, only one was female, and of the 14 ministers sitting opposite us in the chamber only three were female. I make mention of this observation, not simply because I am constantly reminded of it by my staff but because it is so very important that we work towards ensuring that gender equality and other forms of inequality and discrimination that continue to exist in our society are front and centre on our list of priorities.

In passing, I certainly echo the sentiments expressed by the Hon. Rob Lucas about the genuineness of the government's attitude towards these most important issues. There are many other issues that I could touch upon; however, there will be plenty of other opportunities throughout the course of this session to do so, and I will leave any further comments until then.

In closing, the Governor's speech set out a bold agenda, much of which would go a long way towards improving our state. That said, it is not the first time the government has tried to woo us with all sorts of promises.

I have to agree with the Hon. Mark Parnell that, in many respects, it did have the quality of watching a bad movie, and the cynic in me cannot help but question which parts will actually come to pass. That said, I certainly hope the government takes note of the concerns that have been raised in this place and works cooperatively with this chamber towards achieving some positive results. With that, I commend the Governor once more for his outstanding work and wish him well in his new role.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. S.G. Wade.

Parliamentary Procedure

CORONIAL REPORT

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (18:03): I table a report by the Deputy State Coroner on the findings of an inquest into the death of Mr Troy O'Donohoe, tabled by the Minister for Police, the Hon. Mr Piccolo, in another place.

Bills

REAL PROPERTY (PRIORITY NOTICES AND OTHER MEASURES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. G.E. GAGO (Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (18:04): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

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

Leave granted.

- The operation of the national electronic conveyancing system has already commenced in a number of States, with the system initially being used to lodge and discharge mortgages. The first electronic transfer transaction was recently completed in New South Wales. The system operates pursuant to the Electronic Conveyancing National Law in each participating jurisdiction.
- The *Electronic Conveyancing National Law (South Australia) Act 2013*, which enacts the Electronic Conveyancing National Law in South Australia, was assented to by the Governor on 5 December 2013. It provides for the operation of the national electronic conveyancing system in South Australia.
- Prior to the commencement of electronic conveyancing in South Australia, significant amendment of the *Real Property Act 1886* and other State legislation is required. This Bill provides for the first stage of amendments to the *Real Property Act 1886*.
- The Bill introduces the first two of four significant statutory reforms that will lay the foundation for the introduction of electronic conveyancing. These two reforms are the strengthening of the verification of identity regime, and the introduction of Priority Notices. These measures are being introduced now so that conveyancing practitioners can adapt to the changes prior the commencement of electronic conveyancing in South Australia.
- The remaining reforms required for the introduction of electronic conveyancing will be the subject of a separate Bill.

Verification of Identity

- Since 28 April 2014, parties to conveyancing instruments in South Australia have been required to verify their identity in accordance with the Registrar-General's Verification of Identity Requirements.

- The Verification of Identity Requirements are consistent with the nationally agreed standard for verification of identity which will be mandatory for electronically lodged instruments when electronic conveyancing commences.
- The Bill amends the *Real Property Act 1886* to ensure that the enforcement of the Verification of Identity Requirements in relation to paper conveyancing instruments also has a sound statutory basis, providing legislative consistency in both paper and electronic conveyancing transactions in South Australia.
- The Bill also creates new offences in relation to verification of identity: making a false statement, producing a false document, and failing to retain a relevant document for the prescribed period of time.
- By providing a sound statutory basis for the enforcement of the Verification of Identity Requirements, this amendment to the *Real Property Act 1886* will:
 - (a) reduce the risk of land title fraud and other improper land title dealings; and
 - (b) strengthen the security, certainty and integrity of the Torrens land title system.

Priority Notices

- A Priority Notice is a notice which is lodged against a certificate of title or Crown lease to reserve priority for a pending transaction that will affect that land.
- Priority Notices will also:
 - (a) notify parties searching the title that the transaction is pending;
 - (b) increase the likelihood of fraudulent transactions being detected; and
 - (c) improve the accuracy of title searches—as currently no record of a conveyance appears on the certificate of title until the Registry staff have updated the Register Book following settlement.
- A Priority Notice can be lodged by any person who intends to lodge an instrument (such as a transfer, mortgage, caveat or heritage agreement). The lodgement of Priority Notices will not be mandatory.
- Priority Notices will be effective for 60 calendar days from the date of lodgement. This period of effect is consistent with other Australian jurisdictions. In South Australia, it will be possible to extend a Priority Notice (once only) for a further period of 30 calendar days. Unlike a caveat, a second or subsequent Priority Notice can be lodged in relation to the same matter—even if the first notice is still in force.
- A Priority Notice can be lodged for both paper and electronic instruments.
- If a Priority Notice lists more than one instrument, all of the listed instruments must be lodged at the same time in order to gain the benefit of the Priority Notice.
- A Priority Notice will operate by preventing the registration of any instrument not listed in the Priority Notice. However, the Bill lists a number of instruments which will be registered despite a Priority Notice. This list includes caveats, statutory charges, Court orders, land management agreements, transmission applications and instruments lodged by the Crown.
- The Bill grants the Registrar-General the power to cancel a Priority Notice, if he is satisfied that the instruments listed in the notice are unlikely to be registered within 90 days.
- The Bill includes a civil liability provision which states that if a person institutes proceedings for compensation for loss arising as a consequence of a Priority Notice, the person who lodged the Priority Notice bears the onus of proving that he or she was entitled to lodge it.

Crown Leases

- The Bill also clarifies and modernises other provisions of the 1886 Act. Part 9 of the *Real Property Act 1886* deals with registration of Crown leases. The existing provisions in Part 9 are ambiguous in a number of respects and since an amendment in 1990, have not contained an express power to register or record dealings with Crown leases.
- The Bill amends section 93 to clarify that Crown leases, and instruments dealing with Crown leases, can be (and always could be) registered or recorded in the Register of Crown Leases in the same way as dealings with other land are registered in the Register Book. This reflects the current and historical practice of the Registrar-General.

- The amendments to Part 9 also clarify that an instrument affecting a Crown lease cannot be registered if any consent under legislation governing Crown leases (for example, the *Crown Land Management Act 2009* and the *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*) has not been obtained.
- The Bill also contains an express provision clarifying the long held understanding that a registered Crown lease, or a registered interest in a Crown lease, is considered to be indefeasible in the same way as an estate or interest in land that is registered in the Register Book. However, indefeasibility of Crown leases and instruments affecting Crown leases is subject to consistency with the legislation governing Crown leases.

Other amendments

- The Bill provides the Registrar-General with new powers to direct that documents relating to verification of identity, certification and execution of instruments be presented for inspection. The Registrar-General may also require a person to provide information to him in relation to these matters.
- The Bill makes it an offence to fail to comply with a direction of the Registrar-General when he is exercising these powers.
- In order for the Registrar-General to effectively administer the new provisions relating to verification of identity, certification and execution, the Registrar-General may need to obtain documents or information, to which he would not otherwise have access, using these powers. For this reason, the Bill provides that a person is not excused from providing information or a document on the ground that it might incriminate them. However, the Bill clearly limits the use that may be made of such information or documents.
- The Bill also clarifies that certifications given under section 273 of the *Real Property Act 1886* must be given by a natural person with personal knowledge of the matters being certified. These certifications are effectively statutory declarations, and a body corporate cannot possess the knowledge required to provide a certification—a lawyer or conveyancer acting for the body corporate must provide the certification. However, in the case of a certification by a body corporate mortgagee, the Bill provides that the certification may be given by an employee of the body corporate, provided that the employee has the requisite personal knowledge.
- The Bill makes it an offence to give a certification without the requisite personal knowledge. In the case of a certification by an employee of a body corporate mortgagee without personal knowledge, both the employee and the body corporate are guilty of an offence.
- Finally, the Bill amends section 221 of the *Real Property Act 1886* by giving the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT) jurisdiction to review decisions of the Registrar-General. Currently the Supreme Court has jurisdiction to hear these appeals.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Real Property Act 1886*

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause inserts new definitions of various terms. The *participation rules* are the participation rules determined by the Registrar-General under section 23 of the *Electronic Conveyancing National Law (South Australia)*. The *verification of identity requirements* relate to the verification of the identity of a party to an instrument or other document. The term refers to the verification of identity requirements under section 273A.

5—Amendment of section 56—Priority of instruments

This clause amends section 56 to make it clear that provisions of the section dealing with the order of registration and priority of instruments operate subject to new Part 13A (to be inserted by clause 11).

6—Amendment of section 57—Effect of registration of instruments

This clause amends section 57 so that an instrument registered or recorded in the Register of Crown Leases is not deemed to be part of the Register Book.

7—Insertion of section 90G

Proposed section 90G provides a definition of *designated Act* for the purposes of Part 9. The following are designated Acts:

- the *Crown Land Management Act 2009*;
- the *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*;
- an Act that is a relevant Act for the purposes of Schedule 1 Part 7 of the *Crown Land Management Act 2009*;
- any other Act under which a Crown lease may be granted or which regulates dealings with Crown leases.

8—Amendment of section 93—Execution and registration of Crown lease

Section 93(3) provides that a Crown lease is to be taken to be registered when the Register-General allots a volume and folio number in respect of the lease. New subsection (3a) will provide that a registered Crown lease is able to be transferred, mortgaged and dealt with for the purposes of the Act as if it were a lease registered in the Register Book. The new subsection will make it clear that it has always been the case that a registered Crown lease could be transferred, mortgaged and dealt with for the purposes of the Act. Section 93 as amended by this clause will also provide that an instrument lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office that transfers, mortgages or otherwise deals with a Crown lease will be taken to be registered or recorded, as appropriate, on being entered in the Register of Crown Leases by the Registrar-General. The section as amended further provides, in relation to Crown leases, that if the Registrar-General is not satisfied that any consent required under a relevant designated Act has been obtained, he or she may not register a Crown lease, or register or record an instrument that transfers, mortgages or otherwise deals with a Crown lease.

9—Amendment of section 94—Forfeiture etc of Crown lease

This clause makes a minor correction so as to ensure consistency in terminology.

10—Substitution of section 95

This clause repeals section 95 and inserts 3 new sections relating to Crown leases.

95—Indefeasibility of title under Crown lease

This section provides that section 69, which provides for indefeasibility of title, applies in relation to the title of a person who appears by the Register of Crown Leases to be the proprietor of land subject to a Crown lease as if the person were the registered proprietor of the land and the Crown lease were the certificate of title. It is made clear in the section that section 69 is to be taken to have always applied in this way. The section does not operate to protect the interests of a party to an instrument if any consent required under a relevant designated Act was not obtained before the instrument was registered or the instrument is in some way inconsistent with a relevant designated Act.

95A—Evidentiary

Under this section, a document purportedly certified by the Registrar-General to be a correct copy of a Crown lease is to be accepted in legal proceedings as conclusive evidence of title to any estate or interest in land that it records and as rebuttable evidence of any other information that it records.

95B—Operation of Part in relation to Crown leases and other instruments subject to other Acts

This section makes it clear that nothing in Part 9 of the Act (Crown leases) overrides a designated Act. To the extent of any inconsistency between the Part and a designated Act, the designated Act will prevail. The section also provides, for the avoidance of doubt, that registration or recording under section 93, and indefeasibility under section 95, do not prejudice or alter a right or remedy otherwise possessed by the Crown; nor do they have the effect of validating an instrument (or a provision of an instrument) that would not be valid under a designated Act.

11—Insertion of Part 13A

This clause inserts a new Part.

Part 13A—Priority notices

154—Interpretation

This section provides a definition of the term *instrument* that applies only for the purposes of Part 13A. An instrument (for the purposes of the Part) is any document capable of registration in the Lands Titles Registration Office, or in respect of which a record is under an Act directed, required, or permitted to be made in the Register Book. The term includes a document that may be registered or recorded in the Register of Crown Leases under section 93.

154A—Person who intends to lodge instrument may lodge priority notice

This section provides for the lodgement of a priority notice in the Lands Titles Registration Office by a person who intends to lodge an instrument. The purpose of a priority notice is to give priority to 1 or

more instruments relevant to a particular conveyancing transaction. Priority will only be given to the instruments specified in a priority notice if they are all lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office at the same time.

The section provides some detail in relation to the content of priority notices and authorises the Registrar-General to determine that a person is a vexatious lodger of priority notices.

154B—Effect of priority notice

Under this section, if an instrument affecting land is lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office while a priority notice is in force in relation to the land, the instrument may not be registered or recorded in the Register Book or the Register of Crown Leases until the priority notice ceases to have effect. Despite this general rule, the Registrar-General is not prevented by a priority notice from registering or recording an instrument identified in the priority notice if it is lodged in accordance with other requirements. The section does not prevent the Registrar-General from registering or recording certain specified instruments or registering or recording an instrument if necessary in order to give effect to an order, authorisation or event of a specified kind.

154C—Registration of instruments identified in priority notice

This section requires that instruments identified in a priority notice be registered in the order in which they are given priority in the notice. This requirement does not apply if the Registrar-General considers there is good reason for registering the instruments in a different order.

154D—Lodging party need not be informed that instrument cannot be registered or recorded

If a person lodges an instrument affecting land in relation to which a priority notice is in force, the Registrar-General is not required to inform the person that the instrument cannot be registered or recorded in the Register Book or the Register of Crown Leases.

154E—Withdrawal of priority notice

A priority notice may be withdrawn by the person who lodged the notice.

154F—Cancellation of priority notice by Registrar-General

This section provides for the cancellation of priority notices where the Registrar-General is satisfied (on application) that the notice purports to protect the priority of an instrument that is not likely to be registered or recorded within 90 days of the day on which the notice was lodged. The person who lodged the priority notice must be given written notice of the application for cancellation of the notice and is entitled to provide written submissions in response to the application.

154G—Cessation of priority notice

A priority notice ceases to have effect if it is withdrawn or cancelled. If a priority notice has not been withdrawn or cancelled, and all of the instruments identified in the notice are lodged together (as required under section 154A(4)) before the end of the applicable period following the day on which the notice was lodged, the notice ceases to have effect when all of those instruments have been registered, recorded, withdrawn or rejected by the Registrar-General. If the instruments identified in the notice are not lodged together before the end of the applicable period following the day on which the notice was lodged, the notice ceases to have effect at the end of that period. The applicable period is 60 days or, if the Registrar-General has granted an extension of time, 90 days.

154H—Registration of instruments after priority notice is no longer in force

An instrument lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office that cannot be registered or recorded because it affects land in relation to which a priority notice is in force is to be dealt with when the priority notice ceases to have effect.

154I—Civil liability

This section provides for compensation where a person suffers loss or damage as a consequence of the lodgement by another person of a priority notice where the person was not entitled to lodge the notice or unreasonably refused or failed to withdraw it.

12—Amendment of section 191—Caveats

This clause makes a minor amendment to section 191. For consistency with other provisions, the section as amended will state that a caveat is to be lodged in the Lands Titles Registration Office rather than with the Registrar-General.

13—Insertion of section 220A

New section 220A provides the Registrar-General with powers to require—

- the production of instruments, documents or other items;
- the provision of information;
- the verification of the execution of an instrument or document.

The Registrar-General may only exercise a power under the section for a purpose connected to the administration or enforcement of the *Real Property Act 1886* or the *Electronic Conveyancing National Law (South Australia) Act 2013* or to protect the integrity of the Register Book or the Register of Crown Leases.

14—Substitution of sections 221 and 222

This clause repeals sections 221 and 222, which provide a person dissatisfied with a decision or direction of the Registrar-General with a power to summon the Registrar-General to appear before the Supreme Court, and substitutes a new section that provides for review of decisions of the Registrar-General by the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

15—Substitution of section 232

This clause repeals section 232 and substitutes 2 new sections.

232—Certifying incorrect documents

This section makes it an offence for a person to falsely or negligently provide a certification under section 273(1). It is also an offence under this section for a person who is an employee of a body corporate that is a mortgagee to provide a required certification on behalf of the body corporate if the person does not have personal knowledge of the matters to which he or she is certifying. In that case, the person and the body corporate are each guilty of an offence.

232A—Offences relating to verification of identity

This section includes a number of offences relating to the verification of identity requirements and the participation rules. It is an offence for a person to falsely state that another person's identity has been verified in compliance with the verification of identity requirements or the participation rules. A higher penalty applies if the person makes the statement knowing that it is false. There are also offences relating to making false statements in connection with verifying a person's identity for the purposes of the verification of identity requirements or the participation rules, production of false or misleading records and retention of documents or records.

16—Amendment of section 267—Witnessing of instruments

This clause amends section 267 by repealing subsection (4), which provides the Registrar-General with a power to require the execution of an instrument to be verified.

17—Amendment of section 273—Authority to register

Under section 273, an application for bringing land under the Act, and an instrument purporting to deal with or affect land, must be certified as being correct for the purposes of the Act. This clause amends the section so that the certification must be provided by a natural person who has personal knowledge as to the matters to which he or she is certifying. If the party required to provide the certification is a body corporate that is a mortgagee, the certification may be given by an employee of the body corporate who has personal knowledge as to the matters to which he or she is certifying.

18—Insertion of section 273A

New section 273A, inserted by this clause, makes it a requirement for the identity of a party to an instrument, or a person executing a document, to be verified in accordance with any prescribed requirements. A regulation prescribing verification of identity requirements may adopt or apply requirements determined by the Registrar-General as in force at a particular time or from time to time. The Registrar-General is required under the section to make the current verification of identity requirements, and all superseded versions of the verification of identity requirements, publicly available.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. S.G. Wade.

CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION (PRESCRIBED DRUG OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

**PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (ELECTORAL LAWS AND PRACTICES COMMITTEE)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Final Stages

The House of Assembly has disagreed to the amendments made by the Legislative Council.

At 18:06 the council adjourned until Tuesday 17 March 2015 at 14:15.