

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 6 June 2018

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which this parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

Bills

ROAD TRAFFIC (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 May 2018.)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (10:31): I rise to speak on the bill introduced by the member and shadow minister for police, emergency services and correctional services in respect of an amendment to the Road Traffic Act. Members may not be aware that this was a matter under consideration in the prior government's legislation, which was proposed under the Statutes Amendment (Drink and Drug Driving) Bill 2017. This aspect of the bill, which is replicated in the bill before us, did not pass the parliament. Essentially, therefore, it did not introduce this initiative to allow for police searches of vehicles where a driver tests positive to a drug test. Members ought be aware that the bill otherwise passed in relation to amendments therein.

The matter I will raise for the benefit of the member and the parliament generally is that, since coming into office, we have met with the police commissioner in respect of a number of matters, including reforms that he may wish to see the new government progress and allow for some reforms. Specifically, the initiative in the member's bill was not one of them. However, we have discussed with him how he would like to see some amendments to the way drug testing is done on the roadside, remembering that the drug and alcohol testing on the roadside is part of an initiative for road safety, not for criminal investigation or prosecution.

Therefore, to a large degree, the whole debate on whether people should be pulled over randomly and tested is designed to ensure that, where possible, someone who is under the influence of drugs or alcohol is immediately taken off the road. That was the purpose of it. It was in that context that that wave of legislation passed the parliament with the support of the public, who could see the danger of leaving these people intoxicated or under the influence on the roads in a car that could become a lethal weapon.

Nevertheless, the police commissioner has raised with us how we might have another look at the testing in this regard, including the process of sending it to forensics or, alternatively, the driver being able to elect to seek further analysis and otherwise consider adopting an on-the-spot measure. So we are looking at those matters with the police commissioner because obviously he represents the agency that is principally responsible for the implementation of the obligations under the Road Traffic Act.

Another matter that has come to our attention since coming to office is that the 25 km/h speed limit that has been imposed when anyone passes an emergency vehicle has been identified as not actually being a speed limit, and for that purpose there has been some confusion as to whether a driver can be charged for an offence or expiation. This matter has had recent media attention, so we are working with the legislative services in my department to consider that matter as well.

Other areas that need to be sorted out in the Road Traffic Act are under consideration. The main purpose, therefore, for not progressing the private member's bill is to reduce the time spent in parliament considering this initiative, which, as I say, has not been one on the list requested by the police commissioner. Nevertheless, we need to fix up a number of other matters that, regrettably,

appear not to have been attended to, together with initiatives that are new from the police commissioner that we are proposing.

Bearing in mind that we also have extensive use of the services that Forensic Science SA provide, we are also keen to make sure we streamline things to ensure we minimise that cost and put taxpayers' well-earned dollars to better and more immediate use. I acknowledge the member's contribution in presenting this bill; nevertheless, it will not have our support at this stage, but I indicate that we are considering that matter, together with other matters, further and will come back to the house as soon as practicable.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (10:36): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 21
Noes 17
Majority 4

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Habib, C.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	McBride, N.	Murray, S.
Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G.
Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.J.	Teague, J.B.
Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Brock, G.G.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.
Weatherill, J.W.	Wortley, D.	

PAIRS

Gardner, J.A.W.	Rau, J.R.	Marshall, S.S.
Brown, M.E.	Wingard, C.L.	Gee, J.P.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

Motions

WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:42): I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges that 5 June was UN World Environment Day;
- (b) acknowledges the importance of a healthy environment in South Australia; and
- (c) commits to protecting South Australia's environment.

In moving this motion, I would like to talk about just how serious the challenges facing our environment are and how important it is that we use every measure we can, particularly an

appreciation of the importance of science, in dealing with the challenges of the environment. Let's talk about why we care and why it matters. We are utterly dependent on this planet. We are utterly dependent on a number of the features of this planet and the environment within it for the way in which we sustain our lifestyles. Predictable weather is one of those elements.

The last glacial period ended about 10,000 years ago, and we have had what is in world history a relatively peaceful and stable 10,000 years of climate. That has enabled humans to establish agriculture. It has led us to be able to have settlements, to not have to lead peripatetic lifestyles, where we are hunting for food that moves and exist through famine and drought, but to establish and rely upon agriculture to sustain settlements, which means that we have been able to create the immense complex civilisations that we now live in. I suspect that, until very recently, we have taken that for granted—10,000 years is a long time—and humans have become accustomed to being able to expect the seasons and the rainfall within a tolerance of variability.

We are utterly dependent on plentiful fish stocks. The oceans have from time immemorial supported human existence through the bountiful and plentiful supply of fish stocks that have fed us. We are dependent on pollination services performed by bees, other insects and birdlife, which have enabled us in this agricultural revolution to be able to sustain the health of the plants on which we depend and with which we feed the animals that many people eat. We have become utterly dependent for the same reason on arable soil, soil that is healthy, that is able to be tilled and that is able to sustain repeated use by humans for crops.

We are dependent on clean water, water that does not poison people, that may require some purification or effort but is healthy and potable. We require clear air. If anyone thinks back to what London was like in the beginnings of the Industrial Revolution or looks at the way Beijing has been until very recently and sometimes still is, we see the impact of not having clean air on the health of the population. Coal has killed countless numbers of human beings through their lungs both in mining and then in living too close to unhealthy factories.

We are dependent on renewable resources being plentifully available, such as timber for manufacturing our settlements and for creating heat. We are dependent on the service of carbon sinks: the capacity that this planet has shown to absorb the amount of carbon that we have been releasing since the Industrial Revolution, to absorb that and recycle it.

There are many other services that the planet provides to us, but these are just a few of the very significant ones on which we are dependent. That is what we need. There is also the question of what humans love. Humans love the wilderness. Humans love to see and experience nature. If you have had an opportunity to go snorkelling over a coral reef, you know what that experience is like; not only is it important to the health of the ecosystem in the ocean on which we are dependent for food but it is a pleasure that is hard to compare.

Humans are inspired by nature, some less than others. Some like to see nature through the television screen and some like to know that nature exists but not have to experience it themselves, but there is something fundamental to being human to appreciate the value of nature and to experience it. That is why World Environment Day exists, because at least on that one day across the planet we acknowledge and celebrate what the environment gives us. However, there are many serious threats, and I have discussed these previously, glancingly, in this session of parliament, but I would like to go into a bit more detail.

I know that not every person in this chamber accepts the reality of human-caused climate change, but I think the vast majority do, and that pleases me. Let's look at some of the evidence. The 2016 year was the warmest year on record. The record started about 1880. Within that year, eight of the months were the warmest months on record for each of those months. The planet's surface since about 1880 has, on average, risen by 1.1° Celsius. Sixteen of the last 17 years were the warmest on record. We have seen an increase in extreme weather events, some of which are extreme cold some of which are cyclones, some of which are droughts, which this state in particular has suffered from, and of course droughts and hot winds later in the season also beget the most awful fires of which we live in constant fear.

We are also seeing mass extinction. Most scientists now concur that we are experiencing for the planet, since life began, the sixth of our great extinctions, and this one it seems is almost

completely, if not completely, caused by human activity. The loss of habitat, the increase in feral or pest animals and plants, excessive hunting and the poisons that we are putting into our planet all have contributed to escalating the natural rate or the non-extinction event rate of extinction.

Some scientists estimate that we are now at a thousand times the natural rate between mass extinctions of losing our animals and plants on which we are so dependent. If this sixth mass extinction conforms to the experience of the previous five, we are likely to lose something like 75 per cent of our species. We see fisheries collapse, fisheries that are not managed the way we manage South Australian and Australian fisheries, where we manage for sustainability. We see in some other countries the catastrophic collapse of fisheries where the taking of the animals is done recklessly and without a view towards sustainability, towards making sure that the next generation can be born.

The threat of pollution and the concomitant threat of waste is absolutely to be taken seriously. While in Australia and in many advanced industrialised economies we have enormous gains in our standards, regulated through the EPA, of what is acceptable in pollution, we are all interconnected on this planet. Those countries—many from where we buy products—that are polluting their rivers, their air and, of course, the ocean, are causing difficulties, challenges and the threat of catastrophe for the whole earth.

I recently saw a documentary called *Blue*. It was shown at Semaphore at the Odeon, a magnificent cinema if you get a chance to pop by. It was a fundraiser for a local estuary group. *Blue* is all about the challenges and threats to our ocean. One that we do not talk about nearly enough is the way that plastic has made its way into the waste stream and out into the ocean such that shearwater babies on Lord Howe Island are having plastic given to them by their parents. They are trying to fish for squid, but are force-feeding their chicks with bits of plastic.

Scientists are able to manipulate the stomachs of these birds and hear the rustling and crunching of plastic. Those birds are not thriving. Those birds are not migrating successfully. To see a chick having to regurgitate a pen nib or the cap of a bottle says everything you need to know about how wanton we have collectively been and what we have taken for granted. These products make our lives easy but are not necessary to us. We must get on top of our management of waste.

That can sound gloomy—and it is. We face very serious challenges, but we have a state and a nation full of people who care about this: people who have gone before who have established environment agencies, environment protection agencies and environment laws; landholders who have gone from being paid to clear to understanding the importance of native vegetation to the health of their farms; and Aboriginal people, who have learned for tens of thousands of years to live peacefully and sustainably within this environment and who have so much to teach us. We see in the effort of NRM the way in which landholders, Aboriginal people and people who just care about the health of the environment have been able to work together.

I pay tribute to all those people who have worked so hard on NRM. I pay tribute to people who are part of a local planting organisation, who go down to the Semaphore dunes, say, and help make sure that those dunes are kept coherent and in place through vegetation. I pay tribute to the people who work in the environment department, who are often criticised—and often in the past, when I have been sitting here, criticised in this chamber—but who have dedicated their working lives to making sure that our environment is as healthy and sustainable as possible and that landholders and land users are able to extract maximum benefit and so, too, their children, their grandchildren and so on.

I would also like to pay tribute to those who advocate for the environment, those who are in environment groups that pester politicians. It can be a thankless task. I was very active in the environment movement when I was a university student. Although I was a member of the Labor Party, under the end days of the Bannon government lobbying did not feel any different whichever party I was lobbying. It was about making government change its mind on an issue.

While we in this chamber can sometimes be irritated or dismissive of people who lobby us, we should never allow ourselves to feel that way. People who have dedicated their working lives, their volunteer lives or their professional lives to trying to make our laws and institutions stronger are doing all of us a service.

I would particularly like to acknowledge the importance of the Conservation Council as the umbrella body in South Australia. Many years ago, I was on the board of the Conservation Council and I know that it is a very broad church. It covers a very wide range of environmental organisations, each one of them dedicated to sustaining our lives in the best possible way alongside the ecosystems and individual species that we share this planet with.

I would also like to pay tribute to the Wilderness Society, an organisation that I was very involved with many years ago. They brought in an act called the Wilderness Protection Act—our predecessors in parliament brought in the act, but they lobbied for it. It happened in a bipartisan way because of the effort of that organisation and the fact that the community agreed that there should be parts of this state that are completely protected.

Here is the challenge to the present government. Although it was brought in immediately before the previous Liberal government came into office, it was not once used by that government. The state Labor government then used it and declared many areas protected. The challenge to the new government is whether they will add to the wilderness protection areas, and whether they will make sure that no threat is ever made to those areas. Without making sure that the very best of our wilderness is protected, we will be unable to sustain that complex network of ecosystem services and landscape protection on which we—farmers, Aboriginal people, people who live in regional communities and, of course, we in Adelaide—are all so dependent.

Adelaide would be nothing without the bush. Adelaide would be nothing without primary producers. We all have a stake in that being healthy, not just now, not just for this time, but forever, and that means dealing with climate change, dealing with ecosystem destruction and dealing with extinctions. I have high hopes that across this chamber we will be able to do that together.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (10:57): I thank the deputy leader for bringing this motion to the house to recognise World Environment Day and, more broadly, to reflect on the value and the importance of our natural environment here in South Australia and across our nation and internationally. We should never underestimate the value of protecting our natural environment. Our environment not only sustains the health and wellbeing of our society in South Australia, but the sustainability of our environment also underpins a significant portion of our state's economy.

I believe that for a long time we have overlooked or perhaps not placed enough value on the sustainability of our agricultural landscape in this state. We need to place value on the knowledge and understanding of those who manage that landscape on a day in, day out basis. We need to partner with those people around the concept of sustainable agriculture. We need to recognise that those people who manage our landscape for the production of food and other resources have the most to lose when it comes to the potential decline or collapse of the productivity of those landscapes.

The new government does place significant value on our natural environment, but perhaps our approach will be slightly more nuanced when it comes to valuing the knowledge and understanding of those people who work our environment day in and day out. The new state government has made it very clear that natural resources management in our state is an area in which we want to undertake some significant reforms. We believe in integrated natural resources management, the bringing together of water catchment management, the work around sustaining the quality of our soils, and dealing with pest plants and animals. That is a good approach, and the first principles of that approach are incredibly valuable.

However, what we had real concerns about under the previous government—and I am not taking away from the first body of work to create integrated natural resources management—what I am critical of, is the increasing centralisation of decision-making around natural resources management that took place in the previous government and a feeling, intentional or not, that the knowledge and understanding, particularly of regional communities and of people working on the ground, was diminished. This led to a reduction in goodwill and a reduction in healthy, successful working partnerships with people working on the ground, not just farmers and land managers but also friends groups and conservation organisations.

It has been really interesting to hear the across-the-board, united resolve from the environmental sector—from producers right through to advocacy groups which may or may not be

seen to be aligned with my side of politics—the united concern that under the previous government that centralised approach to environmental management got worse and worse throughout the 16 years of Labor government. There is an opportunity to reset that with the repeal of the Natural Resources Management Act.

This is a reform that I hope can work across the chamber in a bipartisan way and across politics in this state to create a piece of legislation which is more likely to cement, in legislative terms, those partnerships with our communities and with key stakeholders in the community, from conservation groups to friends groups to ag bureaus to NRM groups and Landcare groups. In particular, it is important to value the role of local government when it comes to on-the-ground environmental management and try to cement those relationship in legislation, valuing those partnership and realising that those partnerships can potentially deliver more bang for the buck, more effect of use of resources on the ground.

Our NRM reforms will be worked through in a detailed engagement process across the state, particularly focused on regional communities, and done in a way that respects those who use the land on a day-to-day basis, acknowledging that they have the most to lose by the failure to sustain our natural environment and creating a framework in which they can sustain their livelihoods but also feel that their input into environmental management is valued. I want that to be the hallmark of my time as environment minister, and I hope it is the hallmark of the time the Liberal Party spends in government in this state.

I also hope that the reforms we undertake when it comes to natural resources management in our state are undertaken with a bipartisan spirit and that I can work alongside the deputy leader in developing those reforms in a way that underpins those first principles of integrated natural resources management, which I believe was actually the aim of the previous Labor government when they brought these into being in the mid-2000s.

Much of our approach to environmental management in this state will be based around practical environmentalism. We are very keen to partner with the community to undertake work from which our communities can see tangible outcomes. NRM reform forms a significant part of that, but so does our focus on coast protection. I see—and many people share this view—our coast as the first frontier when it comes to climate change adaptation and mitigation in an immediate sense of what happens in our state.

So the new government is looking very closely at how we manage our 5,067 kilometres of precious coastline in this state and has made a very clear commitment to increasing investment in the preservation and management of that coastline. In the short term, we will be looking at more sand replenishment, but in the medium term we will be looking at a significant increase in research and development along our coastlines, specifically looking at how we can sustain our beaches and particularly our metropolitan beaches, because that is the real pinch point when it comes to the pressures of climate change due to the significant population of Adelaide which uses and enjoys those coastal environments.

There is also an opportunity through our increased funding to restore seagrass meadows, and trigger potentially a blue carbon industry as well, and enhance the opportunities for carbon sequestration. It is thinking which had begun under the previous government to an extent and which I am certainly keen to drive forward.

I want to talk briefly about the creation of Glenthorne national park, the valuing of a huge open space corridor which stretches from the foothills behind Happy Valley through to the sea at Hallett Cove and Marino. It is an area that has languished for a couple of decades with no clear vision for it. This government is absolutely committed to saying that that land must stay as open space. It must be invested in when it comes to revegetation.

The community must be able to access that land, to enjoy it, to help us with that restoration work and to be able to create a corridor of some 1,500 hectares of open space which is preserved for future generations. I think the previous premier two premiers ago, premier Rann, described that site as the 'lungs of the south', and what an opportunity that creates for the urban environment to have a lasting tract of open space created.

The Liberal government is going to have a significant focus on valuing our national parks, putting them at the forefront of the work of my department and of the government. We will be investing in national parks, looking where we can create opportunities for the community to value those where possible and to really push forward those natural assets and say, 'We value these. We want to invest in them. We want to build them up. Their preservation is critical.' Wilderness areas form part of that. The deputy leader mentioned the value of wilderness areas, and that will be part of the focus of this government as well.

We will be increasing the number of rangers by more than 20 per cent in the coming years, valuing coalface environmental activity. Our focus is unashamedly around practical environmental outcomes. I look forward to updating the chamber on those and working with the opposition in a bipartisan way to sustain our natural environment.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(11:07): I rise to support this motion. I congratulate the deputy leader on bringing this forward to acknowledge that yesterday was UN World Environment Day, to acknowledge the importance of a healthy environment in South Australia and of course other places as well and to commit to protecting the environment. I think it is a terrific motion that we all support. It is a pleasure to follow also the Minister for Environment and Water, who is off to an outstanding start in this new role. It is a pleasure to work with him. He brings genuine interest, genuine care for the environment and also a very important practical approach to the job.

In the electorate of Stuart, every day is Environment Day. It is not just 5 June; every day is Environment Day in our electorate. I have never actually counted them up, but I suspect that in our electorate we would have more national parks, conservation reserves and other types of public land set aside with protections focused on the environment than probably any other electorate in this state. I value that and the people of Stuart value that very highly. We have some extraordinary places in the outback, in the Flinders Ranges, in Upper Spencer Gulf, and moving down into the Mid North, some very large and very well-known and some very small places like Appila Springs near the small town of Appila between Booleroo and Jamestown. It is a remarkable and very special and very small protected area.

As the member for Stuart, I wholeheartedly support this. I also recognise that the most important people, in regard to humans having a connection with the environment, are Aboriginal people, who hold a long-term and ongoing connection to their country. They are people whose immediate families, recent predecessors and ancestors for tens of thousands of years have had a connection to their country and their country going back more than a couple of hundred years ago, when it was actually pure country with no weeds, no feral animals and the environment was as we would expect it to be.

Those people lived in, worked with and were part of that country in a pure way, which, unfortunately, we will not see again on our planet. We can work to restore things as much as possible and working with Aboriginal people, to understand and benefit from their knowledge to make that restoration as successful as possible, is very important.

The deputy leader mentioned climate change. I agree with her when she says that most people here would believe that man-made impacts are changing the climate. The reality is, though, that even if a person, hypothetically, does not believe in that, we should reduce pollution as much as we can anyway. Even if we do not think that pollution is changing climate, guess what? It is still making a mess. It is still damaging our environment even if, hypothetically, it is not changing our climate. Let's just put that stuff aside, which can be a divide in society and politics—not much in this chamber to be quite blunt—and let's commit ourselves to reducing pollution as much as we possibly can. I will come to a few practicalities about that in a few minutes.

I would like to touch on our government's intention to rearrange the way the environment is dealt with from a government perspective, at least, and the move away from the existing NRM boards towards more of a landscape and integrated approach. That is our government's intention. It is what we are doing and it is what we support for a range of reasons, because we want to get some better results and we want to have a government-led process that contributes to communities as well.

In my discussions with the Minister for Environment and Water, I made it very clear that, in my experience in my electorate the people who work in NRM boards are overwhelmingly appreciated by the communities, no more so than in the pastoral area, where, at times, there is some friction about business objectives and environmental objectives. It is not that environmentalists deny the importance of commerce and not that business operators deny the importance of the environment, but sometimes it is challenging to address both simultaneously and get results for both.

Even in the midst of those discussions, pastoralists in the north of our state, and I am sure it is true in the electorate of Giles as well, genuinely appreciate the work that the people on the NRM boards are doing. That is true in the southern parts of Stuart as well. I know that the people who are skilled, capable, focused and making a terrific contribution under the system that we are moving away from will have an important role to play in the system that we move towards over time, albeit a system that we think will be better for our state.

I would like to come back to the issue of balance and practicality. I am not a purist in the sense of saying we should surrender everything to benefit another side of the argument as much as possible. We are humans, we are living on the planet, there are some realities about us being here and we just have to find the very best way for us to get on in a comfortable, productive, socially responsible and sustainable way that damages our environment as little as possible. A varying range of views on where the balance should be is really what creates most of the debate around the place.

I touched on pastoral people before and the benefit that they see in existing departmental staff. They and I and my colleagues on this side of the chamber had been very disappointed in the centralisation of NRM boards. They were distinct, individual organisations with their own operating responsibilities. They still maintain some of that but within what has until now been the Department of Environment, Water and National Resources. That centralisation has not helped the environment and has not helped communities in the country either.

The Minister for Environment and Water touched on landholders, farmers, graziers, croppers and pastoralists. They are the people most in touch with the environment in a commercial sense. They are the people living on it; they are the people who require it. Let me say that responsible farmers and responsible graziers overwhelmingly make up farmers and graziers. Where would we be without them in an environmental context, particularly in the pastoral zone? Where on earth would we be with regard to protecting our environment if it were not for pastoralists operating in that part of the world? I can tell you: we would be overrun with weeds and we would be overrun with feral animals. We need those people and we appreciate those people.

There are some really practical opportunities that have been missed, though, by the previous government. I remember that one of my colleagues put forward a bill to allow freehold landowners to clear the vegetation between their fence line and the roadside, which would reduce fire risk and improve visibility for drivers. That was knocked back. I do not think our environment is going to suffer at all if an adjoining landholder is allowed to clear the vegetation, native and otherwise, between the fence and the road for those benefits—that thin, thin strip. That is something that I think is important.

I think there are other road clearing issues from a safety perspective, particularly on the outback highways: the Barrier Highway, the Stuart Highway and the Eyre Highway. Some greater clearance of the vegetation on the sides of those roads would not damage the environment but it would make travelling on those roads, particularly at night, much safer. As the Minister for Energy and Mining, of course, this is a very important issue for me.

In my short time in this role, it has become clear to me that the department of energy and mining has a very good constructive and positive working relationship with what has been DEWNR and is about to be the Department for Environment and Water. We value that relationship. We value the contribution of that department towards the work that we do to try to responsibly unlock the resources that we have in our state—mining, petroleum and otherwise—for the benefit of South Australians.

We on this side of the house will never support projects that are environmentally irresponsible, and we welcome the contribution of people both when it comes to an operational aspect and what is actually happening on the ground in those industries, but also with regard to their

impact on pollution more broadly. I wholeheartedly support the motion and I thank the deputy leader for bringing it to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:18): I also rise to support this motion. In doing so, I feel somewhat conflicted. When we look at the environmental challenges that we face, there is a part of me that is a pessimist but there is also a part of me that is an optimist. I know that the intelligence and creativity of people as a species is almost infinite, but because we are flawed I know that there are parts of our character that find it very difficult to get beyond the short term, to get beyond the desire, if you like, for convenience, for profit and for a whole range of things that have the potential to put at serious risk the biosphere that we are so dependent upon.

It was one of my incredibly pleasurable duties, when first re-elected, to visit just beyond Olympic Dam to Arid Recovery. Arid Recovery is an example of a small area of land that has been dedicated to the reintroduction of species that used to be rampant in South Australia and elsewhere in Australia: the bettongs, the bilbies, the stick-nest rats, and a range of other species.

Part of Arid Recovery has an electrified fence, and there is another fenced area where there is an attempt at the reintroduction. In about 1996, when the calicivirus was released, which reached up into the Roxby Downs area, it provided an opportunity to do some real work when it came to feral animals, especially when it came to rabbits, but of course there are also cats and wild dogs. We actually support the initiatives that have been taken by the new government when it comes to the wild dog baiting program and the employment of two extra trappers. I think that is a worthwhile initiative.

This small area near Olympic Dam is a demonstration of the sorts of challenges that we face because it is just a small area. The impact of feral animals and feral flora has been incredibly significant in this country. We should be out there supporting these efforts. It was good to go up there to open the education centre. The Arid Recovery is an example of the private sector, the public sector and non-government organisations working together to get good results. We see that sort of effort all throughout our state.

However, the pessimistic part of me comes back to the sheer scale of the challenges that we face, and these are global challenges. We can talk about doing the small practical stuff, but there are major systemic issues that we have to address. There have been some recent biomass studies carried out on a planetary level, and there is always a significant margin of error in these studies, but as a species, when it comes to biomass, we represent 0.01 per cent of the biomass of the planet.

This 0.01 per cent of the biomass has managed to destroy 83 per cent of the wild mammals that existed on this planet. That is a profound impact and we are going on having these profound impacts. There are now 7.6 billion of us on this planet, and that number is going to grow to just under 10 billion, possibly over 10 billion. In countries like Australia and the United States, in Europe and Japan, we do live in a way that places enormous strains on the planet. This is not getting on a soapbox and saying, 'Aren't we terrible?' because in a way we are all part of this. I look at my household and the material demands that we have. All those material demands come at a cost if we do not get sustainability right.

The impact is profound, and the environmental questions that we face as a species are the most profound questions that we face. Increasingly—and we have already seen it when it comes to climate change—there is going to be a clash between the accumulation of the scientific evidence about our impacts and the economic and the social systems that we have developed in recent centuries. That is going to be a profound clash, because there are incredibly powerful vested interests that will want us to continue on the path that we have already adopted.

Back in 2009, in order to assist with decision-making processes, a group of scientists got together and started working on what the planetary boundaries are. They asked, 'What are the things we cannot pass or if, we do pass, there will be incredibly negative consequences?' They came up with nine of these planetary boundaries. Climate change was the first, and that is a boundary that we have already passed. In their work, they said that we have to try not to go past 350 parts per million of CO₂ equivalent in the atmosphere, and we are well beyond that now.

The empirical evidence is out there in the changes that we are starting to experience. These are unprecedented changes. It is incredibly disturbing. The merchants of doubt are still out there doing their incredibly destructive work. Climate change is one of those boundaries. The change in the biosphere integrity was another one, and that was about habitat loss and species loss. We are entering into the sixth great species extinction. The rate of species loss is massively beyond the normal background rate that you would expect. This is potentially going to have profound consequences.

One area where we are having a bit of success is stratospheric ozone depletion. We are slowly turning that around with some of the international agreements that were entered into. God knows, if we had had the Trumps of the world in power back then—because it was Margaret Thatcher and others who were heavily involved in this, some with a scientific background—we would have got absolutely nowhere. Ocean acidification, of course, is really related to climate change.

Another planetary boundary is biogeochemical flows, essentially, those great cycles, the phosphorus and the nitrogen cycles. Nutrients are incredibly important. We put a lot on the land, but the plants do not get to use most of what we put on the land. Most of it ends up in riverine systems, ocean systems or the atmosphere. A lot of land system change is being driven by agriculture, especially in countries overseas. We are starting to get on top of that in Australia, but we still have some way to go. Freshwater use was another one of the boundaries. Atmospheric aerosol loading and submicroscopic particles in the atmosphere affect climate and also health and organisms. There is also the introduction of novel entities: organic pollutants, radioactive materials, nanoparticles and microplastics.

On a number of these boundaries, in fact four of these boundaries, we are already exceeding what the science is saying. I will say that there is a degree of uncertainty about that science. It is not black and white. So when I say that we are facing incredibly profound challenges as a species, we are. We can come back to that local level. We can do a lot of things that are good on that local level, but if on a state level, a national level and a global level we do not have robust frameworks that we can really implement then we are going to hand this world on to our kids and their kids in a highly degraded state.

I do not think there is any question about this. I think scientists are tearing their hair out because our political system is not responding in the way that it should. It is not putting the long-term public interest ahead of some of the shorter term gains to be generated.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (11:28): I also rise to speak to this motion, and I thank the deputy leader for bringing it before the house. I will talk a bit about the environment and the importance of the environment and open space to my community, which is home to so many wonderful reserves and places such as the Belair National Park. I will also talk a little bit about the new government's agenda and the new minister's agenda in this space. I must commend him for his zeal for protecting the environment and ensuring that South Australia has the best environmental policies going forward.

In the lead-up to the 2018 state election, the Liberal Party took a comprehensive suite of practical environmental policies to the people of South Australia. I think it is very important, as we continue through these debates over the coming years, that the hallmark of the Liberal government in this policy space, I hope, will be practical environmentalism. We took reform of natural resources management to the people of South Australia: coastal protection; more park rangers, which is really important in my electorate; and, of course, the establishment of the Glenthorne national park.

In watching the debate over previous years, I was reminded that the then Labor government was more about noise, platitudes and appealing to the PC brigade than actual practical environmental outcomes. As I said, we are going to be very much dedicated to practical environmental outcomes. The one that sticks out to me the most is when former minister Hunter made all this noise about the River Murray and used foul language at a restaurant in Adelaide to get a headline.

That is what the former Labor government was about: it was about a headline on the River Murray, a headline on climate change or a headline on so many issues. Of course, the biggest hypocrisy of the then Labor government was in energy when they backed up South Australia's energy

system with dirty diesel generators, the dirtiest of energy producers known to man. But this new government will not be focused on PR: it will be focused on practical environmental outcomes

World Environment Day began in 1974 and is now celebrated in over 100 countries. The theme for World Environment Day 2018 is Beat Plastic Pollution. I think the deputy leader, in her contribution, had some very wise words about what we can do to tackle plastic pollution in our environment, especially our waterways.

The Department for Environment and Water has a three-year grant agreement with the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society to stage the World Environment Fair and this year it was held last weekend. I know that the minister was at the Royal Showgrounds for the fair, spruiking the important work that it does. The first World Environment Fair was held in 2017 in Adelaide and held again, as I said, on 2 and 3 June. About 10,000 people attended the fair in 2017.

The World Environment Fair aims to promote lifelong positive engagement with our environment; celebrate our environment on local, national and global levels; promote consistent engagement with our local environment throughout the year; increase awareness and understanding on conservation issues, which is so important; provide accessible and effective actions for positive contributions to the environment; and highlight environmental initiatives in South Australia, including the activities of the department.

Something that I want to touch on at a local level is the establishment by this government of Glenthorne national park, which is so important, and also the investment in more park rangers. That is something that will really play out in my community, as I said, with Belair National Park, Wirraparinga and Warriparinga reserves, Brownhill Creek reserve, Sturt Gorge and many other fantastic reserves in my electorate.

If there was ever a group of people who provide solid, community-focused, practical environmental support and expertise to people of all ages it is our park rangers. The previous government's obliteration of the number of park rangers damaged our national parks—something the new government now needs to fix. The Weatherill government slashed the number of park rangers from over 300 in 2002 to only 93 in 2018, leaving our national and conservation parks open to a range of problems.

In a park of such importance as the Belair National Park, if it were not for the dedicated work of the Friends of Belair National Park—led so well by their president, Mark Pedlar—who on Tuesdays, Fridays and Sundays do working bees to eradicate feral pests and plant species from the park, work that in previous years would have been done by rangers, we do not know where we would be at the moment. I am very proud that this government will increase the number of rangers by 20 per cent across South Australia.

I am also pleased that this government will be responsible for establishing another national park in our southern suburbs. I can attest to the value of having open space in my community and I, like most South Australians, am extremely excited by the prospect of a new national park at Glenthorne. I must commend the minister, the member for Black, for his efforts in prosecuting this case. An amount of \$10 million has been committed over four years to make the new Glenthorne national park, which will link a number of discrete but geographically linked portions of land in Adelaide's southern suburbs that have the potential to be converted into an environmental and recreational community asset.

It is good that the Labor Party has finally come to the table in supporting this program because I can remember when the member for Bright—now the member for Black—at the time proposed this and we heard very little from those opposite.

The Hon. D.J. Speirs: Silence.

Mr DULUK: It was a deathly silence and then we had a quasi policy rollover and then a half-baked, half-pregnant hopeless, as the minister would say, Glenthorne Farm plan. Finally, we have seen them capitulate and realise the benefit of supporting our policy idea. If only they had been so bipartisan earlier, we could be talking about different things and not about Labor's failures.

Another important reform will of course be the reform of natural resources management and the introduction of the landscape SA act. Natural resources management is being reformed to increase community ownership, decentralise decision-making and focus on practical programs to deliver tangible results for landholders and key land players. This follows significant centralisation over previous years, a lack of community focus and increased NRM levies under the previous Labor governments. The existing NRM boards will be replaced by eight landscape boards and Green Adelaide.

The new landscape boards will have seven members, with three of these members to be elected by the community. I think it is really important that community members have an opportunity to partake in grassroots action, direct and viable action, because it is people who live in communities and volunteer who know what is best for their communities. It is not bureaucracies in the CBD that know what is best for our communities. So a \$2 million grassroots grant program will be established to enable on-ground works in local communities.

One issue that is of big concern in my electorate at the moment is the ongoing viability and sustainability of the Belair golf course, which sits within Belair National Park. It is another issue that highlights the inept attitude and the lack of proactive management by those opposite when they were in government. Despite signs of financial difficulties, surely apparent to the previous cabinet when the deputy leader was a member, no action was taken by the then Labor government to be proactive in the management of the Belair golf club site within Belair National Park.

After the private group running the course and function centre went into voluntary administration, there was no plan in place to keep the greens alive. Instead, as with many things in this area, the previous government has left the new government to fix it up; it was in the all-too-hard basket for that government. That is what we are doing now. Last week, I attended a round table of like-minded community groups who are keen to see the Belair golf club revitalised and that asset restored. It was a very informative session, coordinated by the department because we are committed to it.

There are so many things that are important to my community that we are getting on and fixing. I will touch on some others, including the Wirraparinga Trail Loop in Brownhill Creek and our \$100,000 investment, over the next five years, in the nature trail, which will become the focus of Indigenous tourism, recreation, heritage and education.

In and around my electorate of Waite, the grey box grassy woodlands are a feature of the foothills, which provide a natural habitat for native animals and plants and which also need to be protected. Unfortunately, due to clearing, the woodlands are now endangered. I welcome the work of the City of Mitcham along with the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM Board and their efforts to protect those woodlands by removing weeds in the Mountbatten Reserve and Randell Park most recently.

Something the City of Mitcham is doing really well is water sensitive urban design. It is involved in an innovative technology program around this design in the City of Mitcham. The program is designed to manage stormwater through rain gardens, reserve soakage trenches and permeable paving. We will see this in areas such as my electorate, in Kingswood, and in the member for Elder's electorate, in Melrose Park. If we can get this right, in terms of sustainability, with water retention and urban design, I think we are going to go a long way to providing practical solutions for our community as we promote the importance of our natural environment.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:38): I rise also to support this motion brought forward by the deputy leader, acknowledging that yesterday, 5 June, was World Environment Day and the importance of a healthy environment here in South Australia and our obvious commitment to protecting South Australia's environment.

The new government has already started important work to secure the future of our natural environment. Yesterday was not only an opportunity to celebrate and recognise the importance of our diverse natural environment here in South Australia and in the great electorate of Colton but also an opportunity to look forward to how we can all, each and every one of us, take ownership and responsibility for protecting our local environments.

I am extremely proud to be part of a government which took to the last election a comprehensive list of practical environmental policies, policies that have the potential to make real differences to the lives of South Australians and to the many people in the electorate of Colton. Coastal protection is an issue that is very dear to my heart, something I care deeply about and something my electorate cares very deeply about. I know that it is also extremely important to our Minister for Environment and Water, the member for Black, and I thank him for his time and commitment to improving our coastline.

This government recognises that our coast and our marine area are precious assets, assets that need to be protected for the present and, importantly, for future generations. This government also recognises that there are better opportunities for properly managing these assets so that they can support more jobs and economic activity as well. Unfortunately, our coasts—particularly the coastline in my electorate, most notably West Beach—have suffered from almost two decades of mismanagement.

The natural processes of sand transport along the coast have been disrupted and this has made our coast vulnerable, particularly to storm damage and winds. Natural seagrass meadows have been damaged, and often polluted water is discharged from our rivers into the sea, leading to local beaches having to be closed frequently. I recall two or three years ago one instance of this when the Pink and Blue Swim that the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club runs every year to raise important funds for both breast cancer and prostate cancer had to be cancelled. The whole group of 400 people instead walked the coastline instead of the traditional swim, and it is just one occasion where this discharge has caused issues with water quality at West Beach and Henley Beach South.

These coasts are important resources, obviously made clear by that example, for my local community which uses them often for recreation. Our community feels an enormous connection to our coast's beauty but the coast is also a hub for tourism, local business, biodiversity and our fishing industry. The coast truly is the economic driver underpinning my local community. As the member for Black has informed the house previously, our coastlines face mounting pressures, particularly our metropolitan coastline, from increasing urbanisation and population, foreshore development pressure, climate change and visitors.

The new government has committed \$5.2 million over four years to coastal protection for a range of important initiatives. The investment is focused on five platforms: sand replenishment, research and development, seagrass meadow restoration, wetlands, and artificial reefs. It will be directed towards practical measures as well as important research and development, acknowledging that things must be done differently to sustain our coastal environment.

This government will be increasing funding for sand replenishment in the short term by \$500,000 per year on Adelaide's beaches, particularly at West Beach which has been vulnerable in the past, as I have said before, to winds and storms. Clearly, the sand pumping line that was put in place by the previous government was completely inadequate for solving this issue. We must also continue to make decisions into the future. For this reason, we have dedicated \$1 million over two years for research and development, particularly around coastal processes. We must take a fresh new approach to coastal management. We need to continually innovate and, at the very least, try something different and attempt to do better.

This fund will enable the government to further maximise the research effort and opportunities for protecting our coastline into the future. Seagrass is incredibly important for marine life habitat and protecting our coastlines from damage, which is why the government is providing \$1 million towards seagrass restoration. As the member for Black informed the house recently, seagrass restoration may also present some opportunities for a blue carbon industry in South Australia which is an exciting opportunity for our economy—yet another example of how the government that I am part of is taking a lateral approach to maximising environmental protection but also adding value to our economy.

In regard to artificial reefs, I am aware that the government is having productive discussions with stakeholders, other levels of government and the not-for-profit sector on how to best leverage the \$1.2 million that the government has committed to new reefs, particularly shellfish reefs. This is yet another excellent example of policies which not only improve the environment but also benefit

industry, jobs and recreation. The government has also committed \$1 million to a plan for new wetlands in the metropolitan area to improve the water quality of run-off entering Gulf St Vincent from our urbanised areas and minimise the damage to the fragile marine environment from sediment and pollutants.

Another exciting initiative this government is committed to is the introduction of Green Adelaide, a new natural resources management body for Adelaide. The creation of Green Adelaide is an important part of the government's landmark reforms for this state's broken natural resources management system. Green Adelaide represents an exciting new vision for connecting Adelaide residents with their natural environment. A central focus of the government's reform is empowering local communities to be directly involved in sustainably managing their region's natural resources, something that I believe is incredibly important and something that was sorely missed under the previous Labor government.

Coastal management is one of seven key priorities for Green Adelaide and recognises just how important the coastal environment is to many of our metropolitan residents and, as I have said before, many of those living in my seat of Colton. It is just so important to all metropolitan residents, local businesses and tourists alike.

It must be said that there are so many people who care about this issue, so many people who advocate strongly for the improved condition of our metropolitan Adelaide coastline. I wish to thank so many of those people who have loudly and very proudly advocated for the improvement of our coastline. Their calls have certainly not landed on deaf ears, something that frustrated them for many years previously.

I would also like to take this opportunity to indicate my support for other significant environmental policies soon to be introduced by this government, including the incredibly popular and, ultimately transformative, Glenithorne national park policy, opening nearly 1,500 hectares of land to the local community and keeping it as open space in the future. The Landscape SA reform agenda, harnessing and increasing nature-based tourism opportunities, is something that I think is an incredibly large opportunity here in South Australia. We have seen over the years an increase in tourism numbers coming into South Australia, many of those around nature-based tourism.

We have so many great regions in South Australia, whether that be across our metropolitan coastline—I know the member for Schubert often takes his family holidays in Henley in my electorate—or others far wider, including Kangaroo Island, obviously our peninsulas and the Flinders Ranges, just to name a few. We have so many great regions, and nature-based tourism is something that we have seen increase particularly from European markets. It is a huge opportunity for our state into the future.

Lastly, we will be increasing the number of park rangers who care for our national parks, our reserves and other areas that are just so important. It was obviously a great loss, under the previous government, to have those numbers dwindle, but I think all on our side of the chamber are excited about seeing those numbers rise in the future.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (11:48): I rise to support the motion raised by Dr Close:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges that 5 June was UN World Environment Day;
- (b) acknowledges the importance of a healthy environment in South Australia; and
- (c) commits to protecting South Australia's environment.

I want to take this opportunity to reflect on World Environment Day and outline to the house how the new government is already working further to build up our environment through common sense, practical and environmental policies. The new government, of which I am part, recognises that here in South Australia we are extremely fortunate and privileged to have on our doorstep a wide array of stunning natural resources that we need to steward, support and grow.

The new government is committed to protecting our environment through practical environmentalism that ensures the long-term sustainability of our precious natural habitats rather

than creating unnecessary challenges for our environment and resources, as occurred with the previous Labor government.

The new government's policies include a commitment to nature-based tourism, more park rangers, increased coastal protection and a vast reform to the broken natural resources management system. We are committed to ecologically sensitive development in our parks and more nature-based tourism. A key example of the Liberal Party's commitment to our environment and the economy is the focus of growing our state-based tourism industry, while seeking ecologically sensitive development. This is important to drive sensitive investment that will deliver high-quality, nature-based tourism experiences that visitors can see and experience, while protecting our environment.

I note the recent upgrades undertaken by the Department for Environment and Water to our local Para Wirra Conservation Park in my electorate of King. They have recently been completed, and I know the new government is keen to further progress important works in this regard. It is such a beautiful park, one that I grew up in. Our whole family made annual visits to use the tennis courts and have lunch together, and there are many families in South Australia who made an annual pilgrimage to do the same.

These days I go up with our local walking group to walk around the stunning lake, and in the near future I will be making use of the new camping grounds with my friends, but what is really important is how we go about using that park and leaving it intact, not disturbing the habitat around us, and that is what I will be focused on protecting.

While the previous government may have made some upgrades to the Para Wirra Conservation Park, it failed dismally with its slashing of park ranger numbers, which has been to the detriment of our precious park regions. Over the last 12 months, numerous concerns were raised with me about how we would protect the environment there. I ask why a government would seek to invest significant amounts of money, only to take away the very people who can keep these investments safe and help everyday South Australians access and enjoy these benefits.

The friends of the park have raised concerns with me about the risk to the natural habitat of introducing new visitor activity without any ongoing governance. Only a couple of weeks ago, when walking around the lake in Para Wirra with my family, I came across a new camp fire set up right next to the lake, which we reported to the Friends of Para Wirra. This is the kind of irresponsible stewardship we saw time and again under the previous administration. To resolve this, the government is committed not only to reinstating park rangers but also to increasing ranger numbers by over 20 per cent. More park rangers will ensure the parks across the state will be better preserved for generations to come.

Rangers have been trusted by South Australians and visitors to our state over generations, and they play such a valuable role in managing our parks and caring for our wildlife. They build partnerships with community groups and provide leadership for programs and projects, which in turn leads to more volunteer hours and financial support from community organisations that are invested in our parks. Despite this, the Weatherill government slashed the number of park rangers, from over 300 in 2002 to only 93 in 2018, leaving our national and conservation parks open to such a range of problems. I am proud to be part of the new Liberal government, which will increase the number of park rangers by 20 per cent and by 20 people.

I am proud to live in the electorate of King, where our conservation parks have the opportunity to thrive while strong and sensible protections are put in place to ensure their longevity. I commend the member for Black for his vision to see practical and sensitive development in our regions, and greatly look forward to seeing his vision realised for the state's beautiful parks. In addition, I applaud the member for Black for the collaborative way he is advancing plans for our parks.

The natural resources management policies established by the previous government resulted in ridiculous levels of bureaucracy and added cost-of-living pressure for households through levy increases. When I was campaigning in the rural region of King, high levels of frustration and concern were raised with me over the NRM board and the way staff went about their local activities. Concerns were raised that generations of knowledge amassed by local families working on the land were being overlooked. Concern was also raised over the cost of the solutions being imposed by the NRM staff.

Our government will act to reform natural resources management to increase community ownership, decentralise decision-making and focus on practical programs to deliver tangible results for landholders and levy payers. This follows significant centralisation, lack of community focus and increased NRM levies under the previous Labor government. The existing NRM boards will be replaced by eight landscape boards and Green Adelaide. The new landscape boards will have seven members, with three of those members elected by the community. A \$2 million grassroots grants program will be established to enable on-ground works in local communities. These changes will overhaul a broken system that Labor introduced.

The Liberal Party has undertaken an extensive statewide consultation prior to the election regarding the NRM structure, how land and water levies should be calculated, and where the levy money should be spent. From consultation, it was clear that people in our regional communities want more of the decisions affecting them to be made by the people who live in and understand their communities.

The desire across our state for people in South Australia to be heard and consulted with on key issues is confined not just to NRM, and I will be proud to be part of a team that will not only deliver landmark reform but will listen and act in the best interests of our constituents, including those in King. We demonstrated this very clearly during my campaign, with the member for Black coming out to listen to my community as these issues were being raised.

Through the new government's environmental policies and a commitment to practical environmentalism, we want to restore, protect and enhance our natural and built environment. We also want to look at ways to open up our environment for greater access that allows South Australians, as well as interstate and overseas tourists, the ability to experience and enjoy. Done sensitively, this will drive further economic benefits, which is a key commitment of our new Marshall Liberal government. The new government is focused on delivering improved environmental outcomes—not empty symbolism and token gestures but real lasting results that people of South Australia can see and experience.

Furthermore, the new government's policies will create jobs and growth in South Australia. Nature-based tourism contributed to \$1.3 billion to the state's \$6.6 billion visitor economy in 2017 with more than a 40 per cent visitor expenditure occurring in the South Australian regions, making a real contribution to regional economies. The Marshall Liberal government will work on delivering nature-based visitor experiences in Adelaide and regional South Australia that are unique to our state. In closing, I congratulate minister David Speirs on his plans, leadership and policies.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:58): I rise also to support this motion, and I thank the deputy leader for bringing it before the house. I want to take the opportunity to reflect on World Environment Day and outline to the house how the new government has already started important work to secure the future of our natural environment at the state level, and how it will apply to Morphett.

World Environment Day began in 1974 and is now celebrated in over 100 countries. Since it began in 1974, it has grown to become a global platform for public outreach that is widely celebrated across the globe. The theme for yesterday's World Environment Day was Beat Plastic Pollution. Of course, we are always encouraged to think global and act local, so it is worth reflecting that Morphett is bordered on the western boundary by approximately five kilometres of pristine coastline, which takes in the coastal suburbs of Glenelg, Glenelg South and Somerton Park.

When residents of these suburbs and adjoining suburbs even, such as Glenelg East, are surveyed on what they most enjoy about living where we do, a significant majority list the beach as a key factor in the enjoyment of the area so, understandably, maintaining this coastline is very important to those who not only live in Morphett but also visit.

Worldwide, the continuous growth in the amount of solid plastic waste that humans produce and the very slow rate at which this waste degrades are together leading to a gradual increase in the amount of plastic litter that is found floating not only in the sea but also on the sea floor and along coastlines around the world. Human activities on land are really the biggest source of this marine pollution. These include not only dumping the waste along the coastlines but also littering on beaches.

Additionally, floods and other storm-related events flush waste from further inland into the sea where it sinks or is carried away by currents. A number of members have spoken about what this contaminated material does to the ecosystem, with marine animals and birdlife seeing this as a food opportunity, which is eaten and deposited in their stomachs, to all intents and purposes, for all their life, and how this contributes to the health of that ecosystem because of humankind.

If I reflect back on Morphett, constant attention needs to be paid to managing the impacts of this stormwater run-off that comes from inland because in Adelaide, South Australia, we live in a heavily urbanised area. In Adelaide itself, the stormwater can come from streets and households within the electorate but, because of Sturt Creek, Keswick Creek and Brownhill Creek, a lot of waste can find its way into the Patawalonga Lake system, which is on the boundary of Morphett and feeds into the ocean via the Barcoo Outlet.

This means that the coastline effectively is at the end of Adelaide's drainage system, meaning that litter, cigarette butts and chemicals that people dispose of incorrectly often make their way to the coastline. This stormwater carries not only litter, including plastics, but also nutrient-rich and oil-based pollutants that end up in the marine ecosystem. In response to this issue, attention needs to be paid to conducting a thorough foreshore and beach cleansing program, which includes litter pick-up and reduction.

One example of how to minimise litter is the ban that is currently placed on smoking in Moseley Square, Glenelg, which I touched on last week here in the house when I referred to World No Tobacco Day. That ban has the impact of fewer cigarette butts being thrown onto the ground that then find their way as litter into the ocean. Other aspects to help maintain the beach cleansing program is to try to make sure that the beach sand itself is levelled not only for safety but also for events, such as the volleyball events we hold at Glenelg.

We have held national and state championships there, as well as surf lifesaving events. This year, we held the junior state lifesaving championships and the senior state lifesaving championships. The world lifesaving championships were held in 2012, and we are looking forward to them returning to Glenelg beach in 2018, so maintaining the environment is important not only for the health of our ecosystems but also for tourism.

Touching on that further, there also need to be education programs that can be run in our local schools and kindergartens where children can be taught how to recycle and manage waste in a manner that will help reduce their impact on the environment. Inspectors can also patrol the beaches and foreshore, educate beachgoers and enforce littering laws. An important initiative that has really cut down on waste entering into the ocean is gross pollutant traps. The local council, the City of Holdfast Bay, can be commended for their work in this area. They currently have seven traps in place, which remove over 400 tonnes of litter per year, so that is litter that does not find its way into the oceans.

I heard just recently that a whale washed up dead on a remote coastline. The radio commentators asked whether the Museum would go out to inspect and try to do an autopsy on this whale. While the answer was no, in previous cases the Museum had gone out and performed autopsies. One of the comments was about the small amount of plastic waste found in whales in South Australia, so there has to be a commendation for the small amount of plastic waste that reaches our oceans compared with what we see in other places around the world.

Street sweeping also helps to reduce the amount of waste entering our oceans, as do community events that help to protect the coastline. These events include National Tree Day and Clean Up Australia Day. It is worth stating the effects of these programs, both of which I have participated in. National Tree Day events can be held in the dunes. Each year, they attract approximately 100 community members, volunteers and school groups as well as local businesses to help rehabilitate the coastal ecosystem by planting indigenous coastal trees and shrubs in the dune system. These sessions also serve to educate participants about the coastal ecosystem, beach amenity and coastal protection.

I have also participated in the Clean Up Australia Day event each year, which again encourages the community to participate in cleaning up our beaches. Clean Up Australia Day groups along the coast collected many bags of litter from the beaches and dunes and from under the Glenelg

jetty. One of the most common items of litter was cigarette butts, and I previously referred to how we can reduce those.

World Environment Day is an opportunity not only to celebrate and recognise the importance of our diverse natural environment in South Australia but to look forward to how we can all take responsibility and ownership of protecting our environment. I am very proud to be part of a government that took to the previous election a comprehensive list of practical environmental policies that have the potential to make a real difference in the lives of South Australians, including the people in my electorate of Morphett. The environment minister touched on his passion for those policies. I share his sentiments and those of the previous speakers who, in their commentary, acknowledged the importance of coastal protection to the state.

The environment minister said that the coast really is the first frontier of our climate change adaptation plans, with over 5,000 kilometres of coastline in South Australia. We need to recognise that our coastal and marine areas are precious assets that need to be protected for both present and future generations. We also need to know that there are better opportunities for properly managing these so that we can support more jobs as well. In this house, the environment minister has talked about how environmental tourism can help grow the economy.

Our coasts are an important resource for our community, who use it for recreation and also feel an enormous connection to its beauty. Coasts are important for tourism, biodiversity and supporting our fishing industry, but the coastline faces mounting pressures, particularly the metropolitan coastline. The new government has committed an initial \$5.2 million over four years to coastal protection for a range of important initiatives. This investment is on five key platforms, which are sand replenishment, research and development, seagrass meadow restoration, wetlands and artificial reefs. Right now, the government is engaging with the community, and we look forward to delivering on these plans over the next four years.

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (12:08): I am pleased to rise today to speak on the motion that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has put forward. That motion is that this house acknowledges the importance of UN World Environment Day on 5 June and the importance of protecting South Australia's environment so that it continues to be healthy and productive for generations to come.

I am particularly pleased to speak on this motion as, being a rural member, I am well versed in the important role our seas and soils play in sustaining life as we know it and ensuring demand for food and water is always outstripped by supply. The Marshall Liberal government took numerous policies to the election under the environment portfolio, as outlined by minister Speirs, whom I know to be a strong and powerful advocate for the environment, none more important than the reform plan for natural resources management and coastal protection.

A plethora of issues is being experienced in Narungga, and they need to be addressed. Needless to say, they are issues which would also prove challenging around the world. Coastal protection is vitally important, particularly in Narungga, with its Yorke Peninsula leg of three coastlines totalling 485 kilometres in the Yorke Peninsula council area alone and with more in neighbouring councils, including the Copper Coast, Barunga West, Wakefield and Adelaide Plains.

Narungga is an electorate bordered almost exclusively by its coastline. There are issues up and down that coastline, with sand drift from Wallaroo to Black Point and Fisherman Bay, and I look forward to working towards a sand replenishment solution with this new government to ensure that our beaches continue to be pristine and beautiful tourism attractions. Unfortunately, I have come across a number of examples of coastal protection which have failed their communities throughout my campaign and my very short time as a member.

The beach at Wallaroo, which I mentioned earlier, in front of Otago Road, is suffering from a drift sand build-up at one end and a severe shortage of sand at the other. The shack holders, some of whom have been coming for generations, blame the poorly managed and designed rock groyne as the source of the issue. I touched on the Fisherman Bay issues yesterday, with their boat ramp, and there is a similar issue being experienced at Black Point. One wonders about the record that the Coastal Protection Board has managed to accrue.

Thankfully, the new Marshall Liberal government has committed an extra \$5.2 million for practical measures to ensure our beautiful coastline and included in this extra investment is a sand

replenishment and sand retention scheme, which will be of wonderful benefit to the beaches of Narungga. We are also committed to establishing three more artificial reefs, after the success of the shellfish restoration reef constructed at Ardrossan, which went on to be named Windara Reef. Of course, Windara is the Narungga name for the eastern area of Yorke Peninsula and is a truly fitting name for that new reef.

Other significant projects include the International Bird Sanctuary and the Rewilding Yorke Peninsula project. I was in beautiful Thompson Beach recently, in front of the bird sanctuary, and I was fortunate enough to be welcomed into the home of a constituent. Karen Malthouse was a most hospitable host and the view from her balcony, out over the bird sanctuary, was truly a sight to behold. However, for me, the most breathtaking thing about that view was the sounds that were coming from the birds that inhabit that sanctuary. It was wonderful to see a beautiful habitat and environment working well.

Innes National Park is also within the electorate of Narungga and nature-based tourism is an opportunity which is ripe to grow our state's economy. In 2017, it contributed approximately \$1.3 billion in tourism visitation value to our state and it is worth nothing that more than 40 per cent of visitor expenditure was spent in the regions. I am pleased with the plans to open up this beautiful part of the world to increased visitation and it is important to note, as we are acknowledging World Environment Day, that this will be ecotourism.

I will not stand by and sacrifice the beautiful Innes National Park without significant assurances that the environment will be preserved, for that would be counterintuitive—people would stop coming if the environment were tarnished in any way. In this case, the tourism centre will be located on the existing footprint of the town of Inneston at Stenhouse Bay. This means that there will be no impact on the environment and I look forward to welcoming increased patronage to Innes in the future.

I also use this motion, acknowledging the importance of environmental protection, to highlight constituent concerns around the collection and use of the natural resources management levy. The concerns have been significant in recent years, leading to the development and announced reform plans which we took to the election and which were, by and large, welcomed by the constituency. Indeed, a statewide survey launched in April 2017 by the Liberal team prior to the election revealed an overwhelming majority of people are dissatisfied with the current natural resources management system, which was introduced back in 2004 after the amalgamation of 27 soil boards, 27 pest animal and plant boards and 8 water catchment boards.

The results labelled the NRM dysfunctional, with 'wasteful administrative bureaucracy, which has disenfranchised effective local volunteer groups such as Landcare', as quoted from the media at the time. The conclusion was that levy payers did not think the structure was working well in their region, and anger only mounted with the unjustified NRM levy increase of \$6.8 million last year, and this was after a 26 per cent rise the year before—shameful.

People in my electorate understand the importance of looking at the environment, given that our region relies heavily on tourists visiting our pristine beaches as well as on agriculture, which requires effective pest and weed control. Issues were highlighted as long ago as February 2014 by then acting president of the LGA Lorraine Rosenberg who said, in local media, that 'the complexity, inefficiency and inequality of the NRM levy is creating barriers against positive outcomes and must be addressed'.

As stated prior to the election, the Marshall Liberal government plans to abolish NRM boards and replace them with a new agency, Landscape SA, which will have a Northern and Yorke board in the Narungga electorate. We will also be capping levies and ensuring that money collected locally is spent locally—a novel idea. It is also recognised that so much of the groundwork is done by volunteers, and we will be increasing the amount of grant funding to be made available to smaller, local groups for environmental projects.

The NRM cannot continue to be another taxation source for the government, and we will be restoring independence and putting control of natural resources management back into our regions. Our farmers and regional communities have been the hardest hit by this arbitrary tax increase in recent years and the reforms will give local communities more control. The \$2 million in levies to be

quarantined each year will help community organisations and not-for-profit groups on Yorke Peninsula to deliver on-the-ground environmental projects for better outcomes.

It is recognised that managing our natural resources is a mammoth job, with the NRM responsible for not only weed control but also all pest plants as well as soil, water quality, native vegetation and native animals. There has been success with fox baiting, rabbit control, controlling boxthorn and weeping broom, and various revegetation projects and there is so much more to be done.

The new government is committed to the protection and restoration of the environment through our significant reform program. The Liberal Party took a comprehensive suite of policies to the election covering key areas including natural resources management, coastal protection, more park rangers and the establishment of a new Glenthorne national park. Done sensitively, this will drive further economic benefits, which is a key commitment of the new Marshall Liberal government.

The Liberal Party is focused on delivering improved environmental outcomes; not empty symbolism and token gestures, but real and lasting results that the people of South Australia can see and experience. I am excited about playing a part in introducing this reform and look forward to supporting the new Minister for the Environment, the member for Black, in doing so.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (12:17): I also rise to support this motion and thank the deputy leader for bringing it to the house. As a farmer, this is an area in which I have had a lot of interest over the years, the environment and managing the environment in a sustainable manner. In one of my roles in the dairy industry, it was my privilege to chair the Australian Dairy Industry Council's Sustainability Framework working group, and I managed the whole framework from that chair.

The environment is a very important part of agriculture. Here in South Australia, 53 per cent—or significantly over half—of the land mass is managed by farmers and 42 per cent is managed by national parks and conservation areas, meaning close to 95 per cent of the area is managed by farmers and the parks. So farmers are a key part of the management of our environment, and I thank the minister for his efforts in this space in developing the policies we are implementing to support our farmers to manage their environment. It is such an important role, and we need to give those farmers the resources to do what is needed, to manage things like noxious weeds on their farms and to manage erosion.

We also need to manage various aspects of greenhouse gas emissions, a big part of the issues the dairy industry faces. The dairy industry has a nice, ambitious target of reducing greenhouse gases by 30 per cent by 2020 from the base year of 2010. They have done about 10 per cent of that so far, so they are getting there. Whether they make it by 2020, it is an ambitious target, but they are working on it. The big gains that can be made in the dairy industry are certainly about feeding animals. Methane is certainly a significant contributor to greenhouse gases, and that is probably the area where we can most improve our impact in that space.

One of the great things about the work that has been done in this space by the research and development corporation Dairy Australia and particularly by the team leader in sustainability, Helen Dornom, whom I acknowledge for her amazing efforts and leadership in this space, is the work around the greenhouse gas management that is going to reduce methane from cows, but at the same time, by changing feeding methods etc. of cows, will actually end up leading to greater productivity outputs. So, it will actually increase milk yields, so there is a double benefit by actually pursuing this avenue of feeding. The dairy industry is working hard to make this work to achieve the outcomes it is looking for. It is something I have been very proud to be part of and continue to watch from a distance now I am in this house.

It is not just the big picture stuff; we also see the management of farmers themselves, managing their individual properties well. The majority of properties are managed well. One of the concerns I do have is in the peri-urban areas, which the seat of Finniss covers a large section of, where we have many hobby farmers who do not quite understand the need to actually manage their environment as well. I think that somewhere we need to actually focus on is making sure they understand the importance and implications to the whole environment going forward and what is needed to be done.

We have a very important role here in helping direct where investment etc. goes into the environment, but we should always keep in the back of our minds that sustainability is the right approach, making sure that we are not just looking at the environment alone; we also need to look at the other aspects, the three pillars of social, environment and—

Dr Close: Economics.

Mr BASHAM: Economics, thank you; it slipped my mind. I thank you for your time here in the house and commend this motion.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:22): I would like to thank everybody who has spoken today, on both sides of the chamber. We are at least united in sentiment. We will discover whether we are united in practical policy as we start to see that roll out from the government. I hope that we substantially will be.

I would just like to make a comment that the geological age we are in at present is called the Holocene. There has been a debate for nearly 20 years now about whether it ought to be re-named or to find a marker to start the Anthropocene—that is, we are now in an era where the fundamental influence on the shape of the earth is our species. Whether ultimately that name comes to be agreed upon by scientists, I think the concept confers a huge amount of responsibility on us.

We are here, we are not going away, and what we need to do is determine the way in which we best manage this planet. The non-native pests, plants, the abundant native species are not going anywhere either. What we need to do is understand how to best manage and be actively engaged in ecological management so that we can at least have competent ecosystems that are functional, if not pristine.

To do this we have really three tools: we have science—we need to listen to the science even when it is inconvenient. We have community care and engagement. While we must of course prioritise local communities, we should not suggest that people who do not live in a particular area have no interest in that area being well managed. And of course our third tool are our laws and institutions for which we in this chamber are ultimately responsible.

Motion carried.

BANGKA STRAIT MASSACRE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (12:24): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the 76th anniversary of the 1942 Bangka Strait massacre;
- (b) welcomes the permanent memorial to honour the sole survivor of the massacre, South Australian Vivian Bullwinkel, and all Australian servicewomen; and
- (c) honours the memory of Australian women killed in all theatres of war.

Australian servicewomen began to play a formal role in the Australian military in 1948, when the Army's nursing service was granted corps status. Prior to this, women, of course, still participated in Australian action, just not formally within the Australian military. Women's participation in the Australian military first originated in 1898, with the creation of the Australian Nursing Service's ANS of New South Wales. The ANS sent 60 nurses to the Boer War.

In the First World War, nurses again played a vital role in the Australian Imperial Force, as it was then known. Women served in Egypt, Lemnos, England, France, Belgium, Greece, Palestine, Mesopotamia and India. The Department of Defence states that 2,562 women served in the Australian Army Nursing Service (AANS) in conflicts abroad, and a further 423 worked in military hospitals in Australia. Unfortunately, between 1914 and 1919, 29 Australian servicewomen died on active service. Of the 2,562 servicewomen, 380 were awarded medals for their service.

In the Second World War, 3,477 women enlisted to serve in the AANS. Of those, 71 servicewomen died on active duty abroad. Let us also not forget the nurses who served in Australia and off the coast of Australia during the war, as Australia was being threatened by Japan. One such example is the horrific end of the second voyage of the hospital ship AHS *Centaur* from

Sydney to New Guinea in May 1943. Whilst off the coast of Queensland, the *Centaur* was torpedoed by a Japanese submarine, even though it was clearly marked as a hospital ship. Of those on board, 268 died, including 11 nurses. Of the 64 survivors, Sister Ellen Savage was the only surviving nurse.

Between 1966 and 1972, 43 nurses served in the Vietnam War. There were also 210 Australian women civilian nurses who served in volunteer medical teams through the Department of Foreign Affairs. Australian nurse, Barbara Black, is listed as one of the Australian service personnel who died on active service in Vietnam.

It is important that today, when we live in a country free of the devastation of war and terror, we recognise the ultimate sacrifice of those servicewomen in their service from the Boer War up to the conflicts that they serve in today. This motion is specifically about commemorating the 76th anniversary of the 1942 Bangka Strait massacre. Of the 71 servicewomen who died in the Second World War, 21 of those were servicewomen horrifically massacred by Japanese forces on Bangka Island in 1942.

The Bangka Strait massacre was one of the most horrific war crimes committed by the Japanese during the Second World War. In February of this year, we marked the 76th anniversary of this massacre. Vivian Bullwinkel was born on 18 December 1915 in Kapunda. She was the sole survivor of the Bangka Island massacre. Vivian had a mission to help her friends who had signed up to serve and defend Australia and she felt that she could serve both her nation and her community as a nurse.

In 1941, Vivian was assigned to the 2/13th Australian General Hospital (AGH) and sailed to Singapore. In January 1942, the 13th AGH was forced to evacuate Malaya to Singapore after the Japanese invaded the previous month. On 12 February 1942, Vivian Bullwinkel and 65 other nurses attempted to escape Singapore on board the SS *Vyner Brooke*. On 14 February 1942, Japanese aircraft bombed the SS *Vyner Brooke*.

As the ship was sinking, Bullwinkel, 21 other nurses and a number of surviving civilians swarmed onto Radji Beach on Bangka Island. One hundred British soldiers joined them on the beach the next day after their ship had also been bombed. It was agreed by everyone that there was no way to get off the island and that the only thing to do was to give themselves up. A small group of men went to find the Japanese to assist them. Japanese soldiers appeared and separated them into groups and, according to the written testimony of Vivian Bullwinkel, she stated:

They separated the men from the women in two bunches and the ship's officer tried to tell them we were giving ourselves up as prisoners of war. They [the Japanese] just ignored us.

The Japanese soldiers forced the 22 Australian nurses, as well as one female civilian, into the water where they were shot from behind with machine gun fire. Vivian Bullwinkel had been hit but the bullet had gone through her body and she feigned death. Vivian found another survivor, Private Cecil George Kingsley, and they survived for 12 days before surrendering to the Japanese. Vivian decided not to tell her Japanese captors that she had been part of the massacre and, as they did not provide medical attention, they did not see her wound.

After arriving at Muntok gaol, Vivian told the Australian nurse what had occurred to those nursing sisters on the island. The story was written down and passed on to Colonel White, commander of the 10th AGH. Vivian Bullwinkel then spent the next 3½ years as a Japanese prisoner of war in Sumatra. The Japanese refused to recognise the Australian nurses as prisoners of war, meaning they were treated as civilian internees, and the Japanese were not following the Geneva Convention.

Thirty-two of the surviving nurses from the SS *Vyner Brooke* were captured and placed in POW camps, including Vivian. The nurses who were not massacred had swum and survived in the ocean for about 18 hours and arrived at different parts of the island. Eight Australian nurses died in the POW camps. Conditions in the camps were atrocious and many died from tropical disease and the effects of malnutrition. Upon her release, Vivian weighed only 25 kilograms. Only 24 of 65 nurses who were aboard the SS *Vyner Brooke* would survive to the end of World War II.

Vivian Bullwinkel gave evidence into Japanese war crimes at the Tokyo War Crimes Trial. As the sole survivor of the massacre she was able to let the public know what had happened to her

fellow nurses and also provide answers to the families of the nurses who had died. Vivian Bullwinkel returned to Australia and lived until July 2000.

Seventy-six years after the 1942 Bangka Strait Massacre, it is important that we reflect and remember the 21 Australian nurses who died on Radji Beach, the nurses who drowned following the bombing of the boat, and the eight nurses who died at the POW camps, and to remember the sacrifice they made for Australia so that we can enjoy our freedom today.

The South Australian Women's Memorial Playing Fields were established in 1953 when former premier Sir Thomas Playford GCMG gave 20 acres of reserve land at St Marys. The playing fields are located on the corner of Shepherds Hill Road and Ayliffes Road, St Marys, in my community. Since the 1950s, that site has been used to encourage female participation in sport, as a living memorial to the nurses who were massacred at Bangka Strait Island.

In 1956, the grounds were dedicated to all South Australian servicewomen who served in all theatres of war. The playing fields are the only dedicated women's memorial like it in Australia. Each year on the closest Sunday to 16 February a Bangka Day Memorial Service is held. Once again, it was an absolute honour to be there this year together with the member for Elder, the member for Davenport and the member for Florey who were all in attendance, and many other members of parliament and, indeed, members of returned services.

I would like to thank the officeholders of the South Australian Women's Memorial Playing Field Trust Inc. for their work in honouring the memory of Bangka Island. The patron of the trust is Mrs Lan Le, the president and public officer of the trust is Bruce Parker OAM, the three vice-presidents of the trust are April Williams, John Woodberry and Rod Murray, the honourable secretary is Brenda Calder and Debbie Baker is the honourable treasurer. I would like to thank them for their work.

I am very much enjoying the work at the moment of a fundraising committee set up by Lady Mayoress Spear, from the City of Mitcham. This is a working committee of members of the trust together with the member for Elder and the member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint, to raise money for the permanent war memorial. Members of the community can make donations to the permanent memorial and jump on the website to make a contribution to that fund.

The Marshall Liberal government went to the 2018 election with a multimillion-dollar commitment to upgrading the Women's Memorial Playing Fields, which is so important. By upgrading the ovals at the playing fields and providing adequate clubrooms and change rooms, we will ensure that women's sport is improved in South Australia, as well as undertaking the important task of honouring the memory of Australian servicewomen who made the ultimate sacrifice. We are committed to grassroots sport, and this government wants to live up to the ideals of the then premier Playford in ensuring that the playing fields are a permanent memorial to the memory of Bangka Island.

The clubs that will benefit from our reinvestment in the site at the Women's Memorial Playing Fields include the Cumberland United Women's Football Club, the Sturt Lacrosse Club, the Sturt Lions Football Club, and Woods Panthers Netball Club. Hopefully, seeing about 2,000 women and boys as well participating in sport at the site reflects that permanent memorial.

In terms of some of the clubs that use the site, we have the Cumberland United Women's Football Club, led by their passionate president, Paul Denton, who is a very strong advocate for the continual use of the site by its members and his club. The Cumberland United Women's Football Club has over 230 members and was established in 1931. They became the only women's club in 2004 when they moved to the site on Shepherds Hill Road. They are the largest female-only soccer club in South Australia. They have four senior teams of 15 players, and 11 junior teams. They are an inaugural member club of the Football Federation of South Australia Women's National Premier League. The club has seen previous players represent Australia in the Matilda team and in the women's league. They are a very strong female football club.

The change rooms and the current site at the Women's Memorial Playing Fields are in much need of love and attention. There are shared amenities at the site and there are currently a lot of safety issues, including with asbestos. There is a lack of appropriate facilities for both male and

female change rooms. There are no disabled-access facilities or baby change facilities at the site. As I said, there is asbestos contamination. Also, a big issue for the user groups at the site at the moment is the lack of facilities that can be used for hosting trophy nights and presentations, and the lack of a general club feel.

It was certainly our commitment and plan that we took to the election to have that site redeveloped not only to become a multisport facility but to ensure that the user groups have appropriate facilities for growing grassroots sports participation, because one thing that we can do is support grassroots participation. I know, several weeks ago, at one of the home games for Cumberland United, they played for the Bangka trophy. As a living memorial, we certainly recognise the importance of grassroots sports.

Another one of the very important user groups is the Sturt Lacrosse Club, which was founded in 1899 and has men's, women's, and boys' and girls' teams. Originally, the club was based in Unley, but now is based at Shepherds Hill Road. They use the May Mills change rooms. Once again, they are a very proud club and have about 190 players, including 100 female and 90 male members.

Another important group in my electorate that uses facilities within the City of Mitcham is the Sturt Lions Football Club. They play at Karinya Reserve and are one of the largest soccer clubs in South Australia, with over 400 players. At times, they use the Women's Memorial Playing Fields for their activities as well. When you have 400 members and so many teams, the importance of finding a permanent home is very high.

The growing demand for southern area female sports and sports facilities is only increasing, and it is vital that women and girls can participate in sport with adequate clubrooms and change rooms. As I said, part of our election commitment is to also invest in the upgrading of the existing memorial, ensuring that it remains one of the pre-eminent war memorials in Australia to Australian servicewomen. The upgrade of the Women's Memorial Playing Fields Trust and the memorial will only enhance the commemoration services in February, which go from strength to strength every year.

Since 1898 and the creation of the Australian Army Nursing Service, women have been participating in all theatres of war. From the Boer War up until now, they have sacrificed their lives for Australia and their sacrifice and the significant role they played should always be remembered.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:39): I rise to support this motion moved by the member for Waite on behalf of the opposition. The opposition recognises the importance of the 76th anniversary of the 1942 Bangka Strait massacre, which occurred on 16 February. This horrific event was caught up in the historic fall of Singapore to the Japanese imperial forces. A total of 140 Australian nurses had been stationed in Singapore prior to the Japanese attack. These nurses were part of the hastily prepared evacuation of Singapore ordered on 6 February, which involved three ships, all of which were to encounter enemy attack.

While two of the ships managed to reach Australia despite death and injury, the *Vyner Brooke*, carrying 65 of Australia's nurses, was to meet a more horrific fate. Having disembarked from Singapore on 12 February, the ship was attacked by Japanese aircraft in the Bangka Strait near Sumatra and quickly sank. Many did not survive this attack, but 22 of the Australian nurses made it ashore on Bangka Island, joined by a group of British soldiers. Having decided that their best chance of survival was to surrender to the Japanese imperial forces, the group was split, which exposed the Australian nurses, who were subsequently discovered by Japanese soldiers.

Subsequently, the British soldiers were either shot or bayoneted, and the Australian nurses were forced towards the water and machine gunned. It was amid this horrific massacre that the extraordinary experience of Vivian Bullwinkel occurred, and the opposition welcomes the erection of a permanent monument honouring Vivian Bullwinkel, a famous South Australian nurse and the sole survivor of the Bangka Strait massacre.

Amidst the carnage of the ambush, Ms Bullwinkel was hit by machine gun fire but, very fortunately, the bullet passed straight through her body. Through some miracle, she was able to float in the water, pretending to be dead, until she had an opportunity to escape ashore and into the jungle. Vivian was the only Australian nurse to survive the massacre. She met Patrick Kingsley, a wounded British soldier, while in the jungle, where they stayed for 12 days.

Some accounts of the story say that the two decided to surrender; others suggest that they were captured. In any event, the two were taken to prisoner of war camps on 28 February. Patrick Kingsley unfortunately died as a result of his wounds, but on arriving at the prison camp Sister Bullwinkel found 31 other nurses who had survived the sinking of the *Vyner Brooke*. She and her fellow nurses remained prisoners of Japan until the end of the war, enduring unthinkable hardship.

By the end of the war in 1945, 24 of the 65 nurses on the *Vyner Brooke* had survived. The erected monument is important because it draws attention to the contribution women made to Australia's armed services in all theatres of war. In most conflicts Australia has been engaged in, women were not forefront combatants, so their contribution has at times been overlooked. This monument recognises their important contribution. The opposition also honours all Australian servicewomen who have served in all theatres of war, including those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice in service to our nation. We are all indebted to them.

Ms HABIB (Elder) (12:43): It is with humility and honour that I rise today to support the motion to recognise the 76th anniversary of the Bangka Strait massacre and in doing so pay tribute to the memory of all Australian women who served in all theatres of war and honour those who currently serve. The freedoms that we enjoy today in our great country came at the ultimate price, and that was the sacrifice of many before us who fought and served for our country.

The Bangka Island massacre was committed on 16 February 1942, when Japanese soldiers ordered 22 Australian Army nurses to walk out into the surf, and once the women were waist-deep in water they were shot down by machine gun. All but one nurse, Vivian Bullwinkel, were killed.

I have attended a number of memorial services at the Women's Memorial Playing Fields, where each year, on the Sunday nearest to 16 February, a service is held to honour and remember women who served, whether that was in the Navy, the Army or the Air Force, and to honour those who made the supreme sacrifice for our country.

Often the story of the Bangka Island massacre is recounted, yet year in, year out I am no less saddened by the horror and inspired by the courage of our servicewomen. The thought of one brave woman lying in the ocean after being shot, pretending to be dead until the sounds of troops disappeared, highlights the terror that she would have faced and the courage that she showed. It is incumbent upon all of us to remember our history and to honour those who shaped it, particularly those who were willing to sacrifice their lives in the service of our country and our way of life.

The Women's Memorial Playing Field Trust, currently chaired by Bruce Parker OAM, and its fundraising committee, chaired by Lady Mayoress Tracey Spear, are currently working exceptionally hard to gain DGR status for the trust and to establish a permanent memorial to honour the 22 nurses gunned down in the Bangka Island massacre, to honour the sole survivor, Vivian Bullwinkel, and, more broadly, to honour all Australian servicewomen. I acknowledge their unwavering commitment and hard work over an extended period of time. I wholeheartedly support them in their efforts, and I know that Nicolle Flint, federal member for Boothby, and the member for Waite, who moved this motion today, do also.

I would also like to acknowledge two of the sporting clubs that play at the Women's Memorial Playing Fields, namely, Sturt Lacrosse and Cumberland United Women's Football Club—two great clubs creating a sports community of their own built on integrity, perseverance and inclusiveness. Recently, Cumberland United Women's Football Club held its inaugural Bangka Memorial Soccer Round at the Women's Memorial Playing Fields. It was a special soccer competition in which several girls' and women's soccer teams participated. The competition began with a bugle being sounded and included a minute's silence before each of the five games of the day were played.

Cumberland United Women's Football Club, Salisbury Inter Soccer Club, Modbury Soccer Club, Adelaide University Soccer Club, Metro United Women's Football Club, Fulham United Football Club and Cove Marion all participated in this special one-day girls' and women's soccer competition, honouring our Australian servicewomen. Kudos to Cumberland United Women's Football Club, led by Paul Denton, club president, for creating this innovative one-day soccer competition in which girls and women can participate in sport, learn about our history and be reminded that we are all but a thread in the fabric of our proud history.

We must find courage within ourselves, as Vivian Bullwinkel did 76 years ago as she lay shot in the surf but determined to live. We must find courage to stand for our Australian values and contribute to our great country, starting with our local community in some way, no matter how small or large. I commend this motion to the house.

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (12:47): I rise to support the motion before the house and to reflect, in particular, on the sacrifice made by all servicewomen, but in particular the nurses who made the ultimate sacrifice at Bangka Strait.

As four members have pointed out, on 12 February 1942 at the fall of Singapore, a number of nurses and soldiers endeavoured to escape the onset of the Japanese in the ship, *Vyner Brooke*, which unfortunately was bombed. The end result was that 65 nurses onboard from the 2/13th Australian General Hospital were cast adrift. Two were actually killed in the bombing. The survivors were washed up onto Bangka Island, which was held by the Japanese. I am going to quote some reference to what occurred, and in particular Vivian Bullwinkel's own evidence in the matter, because it is not only poignant but it also highlights the extent of the courage shown by these women and the sacrifice and the poignant nature of what occurred to them:

At mid-morning the ship's officer returned with about twenty Japanese soldiers. Having separated the men from the women prisoners, the Japanese divided the men into two groups, and marched them along the beach and behind a headland. The nurses heard a quick succession of shots before the Japanese soldiers came back, sat down in front of the women and cleaned their bayonets and rifles. A Japanese officer, smaller and more 'nattily' dressed than his men, instructed the nurses to walk from the palm-fringed Radji Beach into the sea until they were waist deep in the waves. A couple of soldiers shoved those who were slow to respond. Twenty-two nurses and one civilian woman walked into the waves, leaving ten or twelve stretcher cases on the beach. Fully aware of their fate, the nurses put on a brave face. Their matron, Irene Drummond, called out: 'Chin up, girls. I'm proud of you and I love you all.' At that point the Japanese fired.

Vivian Bullwinkel described what happened next:

[They] started firing up and down the line with a machine gun...They just swept up and down the line and the girls fell one after the other. I was towards the end of the line and a bullet got me in the left loin and went straight through and came out towards the front. The force of it knocked me over into the water and there I lay. I did not lose consciousness...The waves brought me back on to the edge of the water. I lay there 10 minutes and everything seemed quiet. I sat up and looked around and there was no sign of anybody. Then I got up and went in the jungle and lay down and either slept or was unconscious for a couple of days...

Vivian Bullwinkel, as others have attested, was subsequently met on the beach by another soldier, who had survived being bayoneted. They survived for a further 12 or so days. He subsequently died, immediately after they were taken into a prisoner of war camp.

Vivian Bullwinkel was born here in South Australia, in Kapunda, in 1915. She lived a long and fruitful life. She died in 2000 in Perth. Her uniform, complete with bullet holes, is in the collection of the Australian War Memorial. She gave evidence of the massacre at a war crimes trial in Tokyo in 1947 and spent the remainder of her life devoted to the nursing profession and honouring those killed in the massacre.

In South Australia, the Bangka Day Memorial Service is held every year on the Sunday closest to 16 February. The memorial is conducted at the Women's Memorial Playing Fields in St Marys, quite literally across the road from the boundary of my electorate of Davenport. In 1953, the Women's Memorial Playing Fields came about as a result of the premier, Sir Thomas Playford, setting aside 20 acres of land specifically for women's sport, having been approached by a collection of women who were concerned about the lack of opportunities for women. The fields were specifically set aside to address that lack of sporting opportunities for women in Adelaide in particular.

In 1956, a memorial was erected and the whole grounds, along with a memorial fountain, were dedicated to South Australian servicewomen who had served in World War I and World War II. The Women's Memorial Playing Fields are the only dedicated women's memorial of its type in Australia. The Bangka Strait Memorial Service is conducted at the Women's Memorial Playing Fields on the Sunday closest to 16 February, from memory. That has been conducted at the site since 1955.

I was honoured to attend this year's service, along with the member for Elder, amongst others. It was deeply moving, and I was particularly struck by a PowerPoint-based presentation done

as part of the memorial service itself which detailed each of the nurses killed. It had their photos and their service records, and particularly poignant was the young age of the majority of them. I was struck by the extent to which it doubtless would have had a massive impact on not just their immediate families but their whole community. If you consider we were a nation at war, to have defenceless women of such a young age who were going about their duty caring for the sick and those less fortunate than themselves to be killed in such a heartless and horrific manner, I think is particularly poignant.

The impact on their families has been immense, as was their sacrifice, and as a result it is fitting that we should remember their sacrifice and that of all women who have served our country in all theatres of war and in all conflicts. That is what the Women's Memorial Playing Fields now serve to do; that is what the motion seeks to commend. As the member for Waite has attested to, development is underway with the memorial playing fields which will better commemorate the sacrifice these women made, in particular Vivian Bullwinkel whose selfless contributions typify the contribution made by all servicewomen.

I am delighted that both sides of the house are committed to an upgrade of the Women's Memorial Playing Fields. As part of the development, there will be an enhanced memorial to commemorate the massacre. I endorse the comments made regarding the clubs that call the facility home, in particular the Cumberland United Women's Football Club, ably led by their president, Paul Denton.

As a parent of a daughter who has been a state sporting representative and as a sporting administrator, it is something I am deeply passionate about. The Cumberland United Women's Football Club, in my view, is a particularly apt living memorial to the sacrifice made by women in service of our country. Again, in conjunction with the member for Elder, I was honoured to be in attendance at their Bangka Day commemoration this year. I was particularly taken with the bagpipes being played before each game by one of the young ladies who plays with the club.

In conclusion, I look forward to working with all the stakeholders, in particular the current users of the facility, as the development of the facility in keeping with its status takes place both in terms of enabling young women to play sport and, in particular, commemorating the sacrifice made by the nurses on Bangka Island and all women in all theatres of war. In so doing, I commend the motion to the house.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (12:57): I thank all members for their contributions—the member for Light on behalf of the opposition for his important words, and the member for Elder and the member for Davenport for their contributions. This is an issue and a memorial in terms of the Bangka Strait massacre that not many South Australians or Australians actually know about. It is one that is important to our war history, our history of service and our history of sacrifice. Thank you to members of the house for playing their part in ensuring that those nurses who were sacrificed at Bangka Island were not sacrificed in vain and that their memory, their values and contributions to this nation are remembered. More broadly, I acknowledge the support of the house for the ongoing living memorial at the trust playing fields.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I move on, speaking of Millicent, I welcome today to parliament the former member for MacKillop. Welcome to you, sir. I also welcome a former member of parliament, Mr John Trainer. Welcome to you, sir, too. I am told he is with us today somewhere. He is on his way.

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answers to questions be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Variation Agreement to the Approved Licensing Agreement (Major Betting Operations Licence) between the Minister for Consumer and Business Services and UBET SA Pty Ltd

By the Minister for Environment and Water (Hon. D.J. Speirs)—

Natural Resources Management Board—
 Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Annual Report 2016-17
 Alinytjara Wilurara Annual Report 2016-17
 Eyre Peninsula Annual Report 2016-17
 Kangaroo Island Annual Report 2016-17
 Northern and Yorke Annual Report 2016-17
 South Australian Arid Lands Annual Report 2016-17
 South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Annual Report 2016-17
 South East Annual Report 2016-2017

Question Time

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware of warnings from South Australian small businesses, farmers, main street associations, independent retailers and produce markets that deregulation of shop trading hours will have an adverse impact on their businesses?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07): I am aware that some businesses do not support the government's decision to push ahead with introducing legislation to deregulate shop trading hours, but we are not here, on this side of the house, to represent just a few people but the vast majority of all South Australians, and what we have done—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —on this side of the house is to actually consult with people about what will be in the best interests of all South Australians.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I know that those opposite just pick up the telephone, ring ring, 'Oh, it's the SDA, Yes, what are we doing today? Okay, thanks very much.' Click. 'That's our policy position.' Well, it's not like that on this side of the house. On this side of the house, we are here to govern on behalf all South Australians—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and what we know is that we want to grow our economy. We want to grow jobs in South Australia. We want to keep young people here in South Australia, and that's why we have made a decision—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to do everything we can to put policies in place that will do precisely that. I am quite aware that not everybody likes this, and we have seen all sorts of reasons

offered by those opposite as to why this isn't a good way to go. For example, they say that this is going to destroy all businesses, yet they haven't been able to give us any explanation as to why it hasn't destroyed all businesses, for example, in Mount Gambier.

We have had deregulation of shop trading hours in Mount Gambier for a couple of decades. Guess what? Businesses have still survived. They still can't explain to the people of South Australia why we have full deregulation in Mount Barker, but you drive a couple of kilometres down the road to Stirling and, 'No, you can't make your decision as to when to open and when to close your shop. The union movement, the government needs to be responsible for setting these times.' We don't believe that whatsoever. The reality is that deregulation of shop trading hours—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —will create more jobs in South Australia, it will grow our economy and, more than that, it is wanted by the vast majority of South Australians. The Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —offered to this house a few weeks ago, when he sat in that seat for the very first time—hopefully, he gets to do four years in that task. I'm not sure the member for Lee agrees with—

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be seated for one moment, please.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will listen to the point of order.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier is debating the answer.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is debate. In responding to that point of order, whilst the Premier may be straying in his answer, he had a cacophony of noise before that. Whilst the Premier is entitled to some preamble, I do ask him to please return to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The point I was making is that we have been out talking to the people of South Australia. I was just making the point to you, sir—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —was that the Leader of the Opposition, when he came into this role, said he would go out and talk to people in 47 electorates as if this was some sort of revelation. He had discovered there were more than just those in metropolitan Adelaide with a margin below 5 per cent. The reality is the people of South Australia spoke. They spoke at the election. What they said was that they want an economy that is growing. They want jobs for the next generation, and they voted for the Liberal Party to be in government.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader for any questions, I call to order the following members: the member for West Torrens, the leader and the deputy leader, and I warn the deputy leader.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Welcome, Mr Trainer, to parliament.

*Question Time***SHOP TRADING HOURS**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by his statement that the entire Liberal Party want to deregulate shop trading hours?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11): It is a decision of the Liberal Party, of this government, the cabinet and the joint party room that we will be pushing ahead with the introduction of legislation to deregulate shop trading hours in South Australia. We do this because we know that it is in the best interests of all South Australians. Unlike those opposite, nobody is actually bound to a party position on this side.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sometimes it can cause a little bit of difficulty.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The Premier will be heard in silence. The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are entitled, on this side of the house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to express different views. From time to time, members do have to stand up and say, 'My electorate doesn't support this.' We are entitled to do that on this side. We do not see this as a weakness. We see this as a great strength—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of our party.

The SPEAKER: Yes, it is a broad church. Before I call the leader, I call the following members to order: the members for Light, Wright, Lee and Kaurua. Leader, supplementary?

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): No, a new question. My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier or his office met with former Liberal Party candidate Theo Vlassis regarding opposition to the deregulation of shop trading hours?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:12): Not that I'm aware of.

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member will be heard in silence, or members will be departing the chamber today. Member for MacKillop.

STATE PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the house on what action the government is taking to establish a state-based productivity commission and how advice from the commission will help drive economic growth in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13): I am delighted to answer this question. We on this side of the house want to grow our economy in South Australia. We want to grow jobs. We want to provide a future for the next generation in South Australia, but we know to do this we've got to grow our economy. To do this, to grow our economy, we've got to become a more

productive state. If we look at the economic growth under those opposite in recent years, South Australia has had very, very slow economic growth. In fact, there was around 1.1 per cent economic growth in South Australia over the last five years.

If we compare that to the national growth rate of 2.5 per cent, we see why, at virtually every single opportunity when the national accounts are presented, South Australia is getting further and further behind those fast-growth states. We don't accept that on this side of the house. We say that we should be growing our economy. We have already announced a number of measures that we have either put in place or are putting in place to make sure that we become a more successful, competitive state.

I refer to things like the \$360 million cash injection we are going to be putting back into the economy by returning the emergency services levy remission that those opposite took away when they were last in government, the relief that we are going to be providing in terms of payroll tax relief come 1 January next year and the major focus that we've got in terms of supporting our exporters to sell goods and services interstate and overseas, to bring money into our state to grow the size of our economy.

We have talked about the need to spend money on productive infrastructure in this state, and that's why we have already announced that we will establish Infrastructure SA, which will develop a 20-year productive infrastructure plan for South Australia: road, rail, ports, airports, water augmentation, electricity augmentation. Take it out of the government's decision-making and let independent advice come from the statutory authority.

Yesterday I gave notice, and tomorrow I will be introducing a bill to establish the next major reform in South Australia, which will be the establishment of the South Australian productivity commission. The good thing about the South Australian productivity commission is that it will be established as quickly as possible. We hope to push this legislation through so that we can announce those people who will take up those key roles.

I look forward to support from those opposite because this is an important reform. The Liberal Party has been talking about this reform for the last five years in South Australia, and the reality is that other jurisdictions around Australia have already moved on this issue. I note the most recent jurisdiction to move in this area is the New South Wales government, a good government, but they know that to remain competitive into the future they need to always continuously be improving and becoming more productive, and that's exactly what we are going to do.

We are going to establish a commission with a chair of that commission. The productivity commission will have up to four commissioners who will work within that commission. Referrals will come from the government. The commission will then do an issues paper. That will be published. They will advertise. They will take evidence from the sectors right across South Australia—right across the country, if needed—in submissions that will be received by them. They will hold public hearings and, ultimately, they will be publishing a report to the government on how we can become a more productive, more sustainable state. We want to grow our economy, we want to create more jobs, and we welcome the support of those opposite to actually help us in this very, very important task.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier or his office met with former Liberal candidate and successful esteemed businessman Franz Knoll regarding his opposition to the deregulation of shop trading hours? Former Liberal candidate and esteemed successful businessman Franz Knoll said, and I quote:

Longer shopping hours are not going to give people any more money to spend. What we have now is a good blend that allows people to innovate and expand. If you hollow that out, it's not going to be possible to go into those bigger markets.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:18): No, I have not met—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have met with—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —esteemed businessman Franz Knoll on many occasions—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and you are right: he is a very successful businessperson, but we seek our advice from a range of people. One of the pieces of advice that we have received on this side of the house was from the Australian Productivity Commission. We were only talking about the establishment of a state-based productivity commission in my last answer to the question that was posed by the member for MacKillop, but the Australian Productivity Commission actually looked at this issue of the deregulation of shop trading hours. What they found was that if they looked at the deregulation in the Queensland economy, for example, this would be a benefit to that economy of \$200 million per year. It referenced South Australia in that report, and they said that there would be a similar benefit derived here in South Australia.

My question to the opposition is: why don't they care about creating jobs in South Australia? Why do they want to hold our state back? It makes no sense to us on this side of the house. We want to grow our economy. We want jobs. I have heard all sorts of idiotic ideas from those opposite. One was that kids need to spend time with their parents on Sunday morning. Let me tell you, I've got two teenage kids and they don't want to spend any time with me on a Sunday morning. They want to stay in bed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The only time I would ever see them on a Sunday morning is if I had the opportunity to drive them to work. Unfortunately, those opposite want to block young people getting their first job in South Australia. We want to change that arrangement, like they have in most other jurisdictions in Australia. And guess what? The world hasn't finished because of deregulation.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I call to order the members for Reynell and Lee, and I warn for the first time the member for West Torrens.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier met with former Liberal candidate and Wattle Range mayor, Peter Gandolfi, in relation to the regulation of shop trading hours and what the impact of deregulation would be on Millicent?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:20): I thank the leader for his question. I have met with Peter Gandolfi, the Mayor of Wattle Range Council, on many occasions. I can't recall whether he has raised this issue with me, but my answer is the same: we have formed an opinion on this side of the house that it is in the best interests of this state and future generations and employment opportunities to deregulate shop trading hours.

I note that Mr Gandolfi, who you mentioned in your question, actually has a business in Mount Gambier. In Mount Gambier, of course, they have deregulated shop trading hours. Guess what? He is still able to survive as a small business owner in a deregulated environment. He is still able to operate.

I would just say that I have been to Millicent recently, and what a fantastic part of our state it is. I must say that, on the morning that I was there, I was very fortunate. I arrived there early. I was travelling back to Adelaide from Mount Gambier and I maybe got some of my timing wrong, so I had a little bit of extra time up my sleeve. What I decided to do was to stop off in the fantastic town of Millicent, and what I was really pleased about—and it was early on a Sunday morning; it was before 11 o'clock on a Sunday morning—and the good news was that shops were open.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Shops were open. I couldn't believe it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I couldn't believe my luck when I not only could go—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to a coffee shop but I could also go to the local garden centre—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and it was absolutely fantastic. I'll tell you what happened: the calendar moved on from 1958—not all of those opposite have noticed it—and shoppers want shops to be open when they have the urge to go and spend money. This is in the best interests of not only the consumers who have voted overwhelmingly time and time again, saying they want further deregulation of shop trading hours, but also it is in the best interests of businesses in South Australia.

I will tell you what happens: if you are not open, people will still continue to consume, and where they will consume from is the internet. This is a disaster, an absolute disaster for those businesses in South Australia who have invested in bricks and mortar and who have got their shops. By restricting the time that they can potentially open, it will damage their businesses and will drive consumers to the internet.

I make this point to you, sir, and I am sure you appreciate this: the deregulation agenda, which those of us on this side of the chamber will be advocating for, is not compulsory deregulation.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It provides choice. We are not saying that you must open all of these hours; we are just trying to leave that decision to the individual operator.

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is on one warning.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I say to the store owners in Millicent: if you don't want to open, don't open. I say to Franz Knoll, esteemed business leader in South Australia: if you don't want to open, there is nothing in our legislation which will ever force you to open. By the way, Country SA, which has been deregulated for a very long period of time, still survives with deregulated shop trading hours.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCY DISPUTES

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:24): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney outline to the house the swift steps the government is taking to ensure that residential tenancy disputes can be dealt with in the courts and tribunals of our state?

Mr MULLIGHAN: Point of order: that question contained debate.

The SPEAKER: I will listen to the question again. One thing I will say is that I will listen to the question in its entirety. Member for Kavel.

Mr CREGAN: My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney outline to the house the steps the government is taking to ensure that residential tenancy disputes can be properly dealt with in the courts and tribunals of this state?

Mr MULLIGHAN: Point of order: there is debate in that question, how those matters are dealt with, properly or otherwise.

The SPEAKER: I will allow the question.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:25): It is with pleasure that I answer this question for the member for Kavel, a solicitor in his former life in Mount Barker, in property law and conveyancing, and well recognised in that regard.

An issue has come to the government's attention, initially by the president of SACAT, Judy Hughes, and also Mr Greg Troughton of the Real Estate Institute of South Australia. I want to thank both of them for the work that they undertake. In essence, the government has been alerted to a matter which arose as a consequence of the recent High Court decision—

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: is the Attorney quoting from a government document?

The SPEAKER: That is a bogus point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will be seated for one moment. Is the point of order that in the past Speakers have allowed some reference to public documents, but they cannot read line for line those documents only?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: No, sir.

The SPEAKER: What was the point of order, specifically?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The point of order is this, sir: if a minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will remain quiet.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: —is quoting from a government document, it must be tabled. Ask your Clerk.

The SPEAKER: Is the Deputy Premier quoting from a document?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, Mr Speaker. I have notes in relation to this matter and I propose to—

The SPEAKER: So that is a bogus point of order and I call the member for West Torrens to order. Deputy Premier, please continue.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The High Court decision, for the benefit of members who are interested in this important matter, other than the member for West Torrens, is essentially that the SACAT, which was established a few years ago, is prevented from exercising its jurisdiction in residential tenancy matters, particularly those where either the tenant or landlord resides in a different state to South Australia. The government intends to bring before the house amendments, therefore, to the SACAT Act that will ensure that, where SACAT cannot exercise its jurisdiction, the Magistrates Court will be able to step in and resolve the dispute.

The High Court case, again for members who are interested in reading it from the High Court, is the case of *Burns v Corbett*. The New South Wales dispute involved in that case was a matter of equal opportunity legislation before the NCAT, which is the New South Wales Civil and Administrative Tribunal. The High Court held that there it had no jurisdiction to deal with the dispute in the exercise of judicial powers as distinct from administrative powers in a dispute between residents of different states. In particular, chapter 3, courts need to deal with any of those disputes and in South Australia it could be dealt with by the Magistrates Court.

On 5 June 2018, the president of SACAT herself handed down a judgement on a local matter, confirming the implementation of that decision. Accordingly, as a result, in short, we've got a problem.

Regrettably, the former government, being the last jurisdiction in the country to actually introduce an administrative tribunal, had several different pieces of legislation before us. Disappointingly last year, after the abolition of the position of one of the senior members of SACAT, they then announced that there would be a chance that another 12 jurisdictions would be transferred to SACAT, with funding we were promised.

When we get into office we find, of course, that only a quarter of one person's funding is actually provided. How you have a quarter of a person to actually deal with an extra 10 or 12 jurisdictions is beyond me. In any event, these are the sorts of things we have to clean up but, in this instance, we do need to deal with it. There are 700 to 800 cases a year that this would affect, which surprised me when I first heard that.

Essentially, we have a number of people, landlords and companies, registered interstate who are the owners of property. The difficulty is that in a number of these cases we may not be able to enforce the collection of rent, or indeed the eviction of tenants or the refund of bonds, so we have a problem. We are ready to clean it up swiftly, with the support of the parliament. To ensure that this matter is amended, I will ultimately be seeking their support.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. What is the minister doing to support primary producers who have raised concerns about the impact of deregulation of shop trading hours on their businesses? Respected primary producer, John Magarey from Coromandel Valley, says:

The Liberals' proposed deregulation of shop trading hours will unfairly benefit the big guys, like Coles and Woolies, at the expense of small family businesses. The big supermarkets' low prices don't give growers a fair return. This makes life hard for us and our greengrocer friends.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The Premier will be heard in silence. Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:30): We make it very clear who answers the questions on this side. This is an issue that I am dealing with, and I am dealing with it because it is very important. It is very important to the future of South Australia. Can I tell you that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can I make this point—

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —unlike those opposite, I spend a lot of time in regional South Australia. In fact, last year I think I was on 28 separate regions matters tours, so I travelled the length and breadth of our fabulous state. I spoke to people who were always telling me, to a man and to a woman, that our economy has been sluggish here in South Australia. We went to the election saying that we would do everything we could to actually grow our economy not just in metropolitan Adelaide, not just in marginal seats, not just in seats like Croydon that the Leader of the Opposition lives in, but the reality is—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, you say that, but at the moment it's looking a bit dodgy. We are talking to every single person in this state. We do talk a lot to people in regional South Australia, and we make no apology for that. We make no apology for that. I heard after the 2014 election that some of those opposite—I won't name them—said that it was an error for us to spend so much time in regional South Australia and that what we should have been doing was running around the marginal seats in metropolitan Adelaide. I very proudly am the leader of a parliamentary party—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that is focused on regional South Australia. We see a lot of opportunity for growth, but we need to grow as an entire state, and deregulation is part of that agenda to grow the size of our economy. It seems incredible that those opposite would suggest that this would be a damaging act for regional South Australia because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the very clear reality is that our economy as a total will benefit. As I said in the answer the first time those opposite asked a question on deregulation today, not everybody agrees with us, but that doesn't mean that we should shy away from making tough decisions. That doesn't mean that we should just kick the can down the road because there will be some people who disagree with us.

The reality is that we are making this decision because we want to grow the size of our economy, and when we look at the other jurisdictions around Australia, where they have actually deregulated shop trading hours, they have seen their economies grow. They have seen more jobs being created, and that is a benefit for all South Australians, and that is why we will be supporting the progression of this bill through this parliament.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney outline examples where strengthening the market share of private duopolies works in the interests of consumers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:33): I'm not sure why the opposition thinks that the Attorney-General is responsible to the house for this matter. Clearly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —they have been struggling. I think this is symptomatic of the fact that they are really struggling to work out who is writing their questions here for question time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We saw some incredible situations with questions so far this year. The reality is—

Mr Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the Australian Productivity Commission, not the SDA, not the Leader of the Opposition, not his caucus—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —took evidence from people from every single angle on this issue and they arrived at the position that the deregulation of shop trading hours was, in fact, good and an important reform. As I said in one of my previous answers, we are for reform. For too long the government in South Australia was sitting on its hands. They were not focused on critical reforms to the economy, and not the just the economy but a range of government policies.

They were content to just kick that can down the road, sweep their problems under the carpet. We are not like that. There is a new government in place. Reform will be our agenda, and every day that we are in this place we will be making decisions and advancing legislation, making sure that we put policies in place that advantage our state.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier guarantee that no small business will close in South Australia as a result of shop trading hours deregulation?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right will remain silent. Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:35): This is almost impossible to believe. The most destructive government in the history of this state, thrown out of office by the people of South Australia because of the atrocities they perpetrated on the people of South Australia, in particular small business, and they have the temerity to come into this chamber and ask questions of this government. The reality is, whether we look at it from their taxation perspective, their regulation perspective, their high energy prices in South Australia—

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —every single solitary thing they did—

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be seated. Let's hear the point of order.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Debate.

The SPEAKER: Debate. The question was about whether any business will close. Premier, could you please bring it back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The substance of the question is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And the Premier will be heard in silence, members on my right.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —about who is on the side of small business in this state. And I tell you: there is only one party that represents the interests of the business community in South Australia. Those opposite used to refer to people who put their private capital on the line—

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to create jobs for the next generation as the employer class.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier is not responsible for opposition policy.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order? Is it for debate?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Relevance, sir, and debate.

The SPEAKER: Relevance and debate. Premier, the question was very simple. It was about whether any business will close. I ask you to please complete your answer or address the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Every day that we are on the government benches in this parliament we will be doing everything we can to support business in South Australia, to grow our economy, to create more jobs, to provide hope for the next generation, because under those opposite that wasn't the case. We want to turn that around. We want to create a more attractive environment for every single business to flourish.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can any government in any jurisdiction in the world guarantee that there will not be some business failure? No, absolutely not. I don't know whether they thought this was some sort of clever wedge question. What jurisdiction in the world would say that there would never, ever be any business that would go out of trading under a set of circumstances?

But that's not the question. The question really is: will we be doing everything we can to grow our economy, grow jobs and give a future for the next generation?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And the answer to that is yes.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the next question, I call to order the member for Waite and the member for Chaffey, and I warn the member of the Chaffey as well.

ENERGY SECURITY

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Will the minister please update the house on what steps are being taken to improve the security of the energy system?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:38): Thank you very much to the member for Finniss, again advocating on behalf of his constituents, who are suffering under the previous government's legacy of high—and unacceptably high—cost of living. So what is happening? What is happening to improve security—

The SPEAKER: Yes, tell us, please.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —of our electricity system? Well, to start with, it is important to consider what needs to be improved. The reality is—

Mr Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee will not interject.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —that one of the most important aspects of a secure—

Mr Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —electricity system is having synchronous electricity delivered into the grid, not only having reliable but also good quality electricity going into the grid. Unfortunately, those opposite, through their—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned for a second time. The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —failed energy policies, let down all South Australians and, through their overzealous approach to enforcing more and more wind farms without storage into our electricity system, they drove out base load generation and they made the electricity in our state far less secure than is acceptable. That is the issue that needs to be fixed.

It was fixed to begin with by the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO), which had no other choice but to enter the market and force gas generators in South Australia to turn on when necessary at times when, because of the policies of those opposite, those gas generators may, for their own benefit, choose not to enter the market. AEMO, for the benefit of consumers and for the stability of the market, entered the market and said that they must turn on. In the last 12 months alone that has cost electricity consumers \$20 million, so not only do we have a market failure but we have an additional cost to consumers due to the policy of those opposite.

What is happening at the moment? Thankfully, ElectraNet has been given permission to pursue synchronous condensers. As I am sure you know, Mr Speaker, synchronous condensers support the stability of our grid, support the delivery of 240 volts, 50 hertz, electricity into our grid. There is an overabundance of wind farms, brought on by those opposite, without storage, unfortunately; if they had listened to the Premier they would have brought in grid-scale storage much sooner.

The synchronous condensers allow the delivery of quality electricity into the grid. However, what is really important is that it will save the consumers of South Australia money, instead of what those—

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —opposite have done, which is to force electricity prices up and up and up through their failed policies. We will implement our policies which will contribute to more affordable and more reliable electricity for South Australia, and we are partnering with other organisations like AEMO, like in this case ElectraNet, to make electricity cheaper.

It is estimated that the net cost savings for the typical South Australian household will be \$3 to \$5 per year. Those opposite might scoff, but it is much better than the increased prices—10 per cent, 15 per cent, 18 per cent—that they delivered to the market. We had good news from Origin yesterday, we have good news on security, and there is good news still to come on electricity.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Industry and Skills. What is the minister doing to support South Australian small businesses who are concerned about the impact of shop trading hours deregulation on their businesses? Mr Alex Zizzo, of G. Zizzo and Sons, says:

Deregulated shop trading hours will help Coles and Woolworths and drive SA shops out of business. 100 per cent of our produce goes to independent retailers. The big chains often stock fruit and vegetables from overseas.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:43): The Leader of the Opposition asks what we are doing to support industry in South Australia, and the answer to that is plenty. We have already made sure that as of 1 July this year we will be reducing their costs by returning the \$360 million that the former government took out of the economy in effectively doubling the emergency services levy by removing the remission.

Another thing we are doing to support industry in South Australia, of course, is to remove payroll tax on all small business in South Australia. As of 1 January, no small business in this state with an annual payroll of up to \$1.5 million will be paying a cent. Previously, the threshold was, I think, \$600,000 and it is now going to \$1.5 million. No government has ever done so much for small business as this government has already announced in its first 79 days—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and implemented as quickly as possible. One of the other things we are doing—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Leader of the Opposition asks a reasonable question: what are we doing? Another one of the critical things we are doing is we are addressing the skills shortage that exists in business in South Australia. Those opposite were happy to preside over this freefall in terms of the number of kids in South Australia, children in South Australia and young people in South Australia, who were taking up apprenticeships in South Australia. I'll tell you one thing that the new government is doing: we are putting more money into creating more apprenticeships and more traineeships in South Australia because—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —I know—if we provide these young people with opportunities in terms of training, they will stay in South Australia. We are going to do every single solitary thing we possibly can to make it a more attractive environment for business in this state to flourish, because we know if we do this we will grow our economy, we will grow jobs in South Australia, we

will keep young people in South Australia. Also, we will actually grow revenue in the state government coffers, and I think this is worth exploring. Often, those opposite think that, when you provide tax cuts, this is a loss of revenue to the state. Well, I say this to those opposite: revenue is a function of the rate multiplied by the volume.

They have had the handbrake on the South Australian economy for a long period of time. By reducing these rates down, by reducing the cost of doing business in South Australia, we believe on this side of the house that we will grow business confidence. People will invest in their businesses, they will grow the volume, the size of our economy, and that will create further revenue into our state coffers so that we can provide quality services to the people of South Australia. That's our equation. We took it to the people of South Australia.

There is no scary news in our budget, which is coming up in September. The reality is that every single thing we said that we were going to do we are doing. I'll tell you what happened after the 2014 election. There was no discussion about this \$360 million whack to businesses and households in South Australia, but immediately after the election, of course, the first budget comes down—horror! The reality is that we on this side will be bringing down a budget that is in the best interests of growing our economy in South Australia, delivering on all of the commitments we made.

WORLD ENVIRONMENT FAIR

Ms HABIB (Elder) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Will the minister inform the house on the success of the World Environment Fair held over the past weekend and the opportunities this presented to highlight the new government's range of practical environmental policies?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:46): I thank the member for Elder for that question. I know she is passionate about our natural environment and wants to work alongside this side of the house as we do what we can to invest in and enhance that natural environment that means so much to our state.

With yesterday being World Environment Day, on the weekend, during Saturday and Sunday, the World Environment Fair was held at the Adelaide Showground, and a hugely successful event it was. Some 10,000 people went through the gates over a couple of days. That was the second World Environment Fair which has been hosted here in South Australia at the showgrounds, the previous one being in 2017. We've had one this year and, hopefully, we are now getting a foundation in place to be able to run these events year after year.

The event is sponsored by the Department for Environment and Water and also by the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board, giving a total, I think, of around \$40,000 in contributions towards making that event viable. One of the great things about that event is you are throwing open the doors and you are showcasing what is great about South Australia's environment. You are providing people, who perhaps live in the metropolitan area and don't necessarily have access to some of the far-flung natural beauty spots of our state, the opportunity to experience some of the aspects and learn about some of the aspects of our natural environment.

It was great to see the focus on nature play and getting younger people inspired and involved in our natural environment. It was great to see many of the stalls and displays, which gave young people the opportunity to explore the scientific side of our environment. I make that point because it is so important for our young people to understand the dynamic nature, the multiple views, when it comes to our natural world and our natural science. We don't want our young people having a flat earth view like those opposite.

We need our young people to have a grasp of those competing views and be able to work through them, and that was one of the beautiful things about the World Environment Fair this week. There was a whole range of opportunities for the people attending the fair to be able to look at what the environment department is focusing on at the moment, particularly looking at national parks, our coastline, our wilderness spaces and, as I mentioned, nature play and citizen science.

There was also an opportunity for people to reflect on the practical side of our environment—what they can do themselves to protect our environment. There were talks from Ranger Stacey from

Totally Wild and Craig Reucassel from the *War on Waste*, that successful ABC show, and those things really tied into the Liberal government's views that anyone can be involved in protecting our environment, and we want to rely on that on-the-ground knowledge and understanding.

It was great to hear today, in response to the deputy leader's motion on World Environment Day, so many people from this side of the house sharing their commitment and their love of our state's natural environment—the members for Narungga, Finniss, Morphett, King, Colton, Waite and Stuart all joining me in celebrating our natural environment. I did feel very sorry for the deputy leader because it was her motion. She had stewardship of it.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: There was no-one—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated. Minister, please be seated. The minister will be seated. Point of order.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: I think he's out of control, sir.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Making references to debate before the house, sir.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is debate. I think the minister is wrapping up. Please return to the substance of the question, minister.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I just want to take this opportunity to thank members on this side of the house for their commitment to our natural environment, and I hope they will join me at the World Environment Fair in 2019.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier met with the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Martin Haese (also a successful businessman), in relation to the deregulation of shop trading hours and its impact on CBD businesses. Mr Haese said:

Should shop trading hours be further liberalised, the very livelihood of these small businesses could be put at risk. That's because the deregulation of shop trading hours will benefit larger shopping centres and take customers away from small traders on our city and suburban streets. History tells us that when you reduce the number of independent retailers, jobs are displaced, product choice evaporates, prices go up and profits are shifted interstate or offshore.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be heard in silence. Several members are on two warnings. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:51): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. In answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question, yes, I have met with the Rt Hon. the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Martin Haese. I meet with him on a very regular basis. In fact, we are looking to have a solid, grown-up, sensible relationship with the Adelaide city council. Yes, he has raised—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —not formally, but he has certainly raised the issue of shop trading hours in the media, and I believe he has probably raised them with me again but, as I have said in previous answers, we are making a decision on behalf of all South Australians. Now, can I just make the point that those opposite were the ones themselves who were violently opposed to further deregulation within the CBD. It was the—

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: the Premier is debating the question and talking about opposition policy.

The SPEAKER: Debate?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: The question was very specific. It was about Mr Haese in regard to a policy. I ask the Premier to return to the substance of the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: And if he is not heard in silence, members will be departing the chamber.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The reality is the benefit that is derived by those businesses in the CBD, which they wish to protect, is just the same benefit that we on this side of the house wish to extend to all South Australians. At the moment, the Lord Mayor is making it very clear that there is a massive benefit to businesses when they open when customers want to buy goods and services.

We want to provide exactly and precisely that same opportunity to every business. We don't think that just businesses within these areas defined by those opposite, defined by the SDA, defined by government of any persuasion, should be those who are advantaged. We want to see all businesses in this state benefit from deregulation, and that is exactly what we will do.

We have backed the Lord Mayor on plenty of other issues—for example, the car park tax. Those opposite sought to introduce a very punishing car park tax which certainly would have disadvantaged trade—

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Point of order. What is the point of order?

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier is not responsible for opposition policy, sir; bring him back to the substance of the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: One moment. The point of order is that the answer is not directly relevant to the question. When the Premier talks about other matters such as the car park tax, strictly speaking he is not talking about this policy in question, so I ask the Premier to return to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, sir, there was an explanation, but the question was: do I speak to the Lord Mayor of Adelaide? The answer to that is yes, and I am providing some detail—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to the house about the breadth of issues that I discuss with the Lord Mayor. He is a very important leader in our community, and there is a range of issues that we discuss. One of them might be shop trading hours; others would be punishing taxes that those opposite try to inflict upon businesses in the CBD. I have made it very clear that, despite hearing the issues and arguments offered by the Lord Mayor, we have formed an opinion, and that is that the benefit derived by businesses within the CBD because of the deregulated shop trading hours there should be extended to all businesses in South Australia.

We have been elected not just to look after one or two areas in South Australia but to look after the overall economy of the state. Again, I direct those opposite, if they need any evidence of the benefits to growing our economy from the deregulation of shop trading hours, they need look no further than the Australian Productivity Commission's report into this matter, which makes it very clear that there are massive benefits to be derived. That is what we are seeking. We are seeking a growing economy in South Australia. We are seeking to grow jobs. We are seeking to keep our young people in South Australia, and we will advance that case every day we are in office.

WORLDSKILLS AUSTRALIA

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Industry and Skills. Will the minister update the house on the WorldSkills Australia event held in Sydney over the weekend?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (14:56): It was a pleasure to visit the WorldSkills fair in Sydney over the weekend. From the minute I walked in the door, I could hear the drop saws, I could hear the nail guns, I could smell the timber shavings—I was at home. It was terrific to meet the talented group of young South Australians who competed in the WorldSkills Australia event. Seven of those contestants were recipients of medals. This is an outstanding achievement for South Australia.

I congratulate the following winners. Oliver Horvath won a silver medal in carpentry. It is amazing to watch the students as they are competing. They are very focused, although I did get a thumbs up from Oliver as he glanced over. I noticed he had a fan watching him as he was cutting mitres on the drop saw. Gianni Zumpo won a silver medal in wall and floor tiling, and Taylah O'Brien won a bronze medal in graphic design. I spoke with her during the lunch break. She was very nervous and concerned that what she was doing was not going to win or get her a placing. Congratulations to Taylah on her bronze medal.

Chole Anne Dyker won a bronze medal in retail bread. She is amazing. She is from Gawler South Bakery. The thing that surprised me, seeing that most bread is made from a packet, is that she had to put all the ingredients together. She had to do a rye batch, a sourdough batch and a mixed grain batch. The loaves looked terrific. If anyone wants to see how they looked, go to my Twitter site, where there is a terrific photograph of the loaves on display. Jayden Ballantyne won a bronze medal for electrical installation, Joshua Jantosh won a bronze medal in turning and Kerry Ham won a bronze medal in construction steel.

There were 10 other South Australians competing over the weekend. In welding there was Jake Spokes, and in bricklaying there was Andrew Adams. Andrew is in the fourth year of his apprenticeship, and he was competing with 12 other apprentices. He was doing some terrific work. When I spoke to him, he said he really enjoys standing back and admiring the work he has done. In joinery, there was Timothy Berry; in painting and decorating, Damian Trembath; in plumbing, Liam Waldhuter; and, in vehicle painting, Luke Alexander. Luke had a Boyzone cheer squad, and his partner was there from Adelaide cheering him on as he was competing in his competition.

In retail butchery was Corey Stone from Athelstone Meats, and it was the very first time he had left Adelaide in a plane—it was terrific—and he was trimming the fat. I was thinking that he could have done some work in Mr Lucas's office. Of course, in welding there was Dominic Tucker; in fitting, Angus Altschwager; and, in cabinet-making, Mitchell Muller. The skills event in Sydney is Australia's biggest vocational education event and an excellent competition.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): My question is to the Premier. How many times has the Premier met with representatives of South Australian Independent Retailers in relation to the deregulation of shop trading hours?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:00): Not only myself but plenty of members of our cabinet have met with members, as described by the Leader of the Opposition. We value their input, but again—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, I don't have the exact number with me today, but I can say plenty of times, and they have made their position very, very clear—very, very clear. They have made their position very clear in person and in writing. I think they have even taken out ads to tell us what their position is, and we understand what their position is and we respect their position.

But it must be a revelation to those opposite that, just because you are having a difference of opinion, just because somebody says you should be doing something, doesn't mean that you should be doing it. We have made a decision. We are happy with our decision. We considered this decision over an extended period of time. In fact, I think we announced our position in

September 2016. September 2016 was the time when we made it very clear, so it can't be any shock to anybody in South Australia what our intentions are.

Our intentions are to back the people of South Australia—not only to back the consumers in South Australia but to back businesspeople in South Australia. I note recently that Business SA has published a survey where—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: 82 per cent.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, 82 per cent of their members, 82 per cent of business members in South Australia. I know this is probably going to be news to those opposite, but that means that 18 per cent don't want it. But do you not do something because 18 per cent don't want it? The reality is, as I have said repeatedly, we will make decisions that are in the best interests of all South Australians. We do not take our instructions from the SDA. We don't take our instructions from the trade union movement. We make our decisions after consideration, taking into account the best interests of all South Australians, and I am very proud of the decision we have made.

Now what we are asking is for this parliament to consider the legislation which we will bring to the parliament and to consider it not in terms of the arguments advanced by interest groups but taking into account the entire South Australian community—businesses and consumers. In particular, I ask those members of this parliament to consider not their riding instructions from their trade union bosses or their caucus, but to consider those people who have left South Australia who believe that they don't have a place in South Australia because our economy is not strong enough, not providing that work for them in this state.

I just ask those opposite, and those in another place who will consider this legislation in the coming weeks and months, to make a decision after considering the impact that this decision can positively have on future employment opportunities in this state.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier commit to undertaking economic modelling on the impact of deregulation of shop trading hours on South Australian businesses? In Budget and Finance on Monday, Under Treasurer David Reynolds confirmed that he was not aware of any work that had been done on the economic impact of deregulation in South Australia, nor has he been asked by the government to undertake any such economic modelling.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:04): It's amazing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I don't know whether Kevin Naughton has run out of questions or what's going on over there.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will not respond to interjections. The Premier will answer the question, and he will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to answer this question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's not a revelation to know that we have not asked the Under Treasurer to conduct economic modelling. This is not something that we would ask him to do. He is a very capable person. We arrived at our decision after careful consideration, and that consideration has taken place over a long period of time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It wasn't something that we just dreamt up on the spot. It was something that we considered and it was something that we spoke to people about. We announced it in September 2016. People have had plenty of time to adjust to the fact that the new government wants to grow our economy, and that will have some implications. I'm not suggesting for one second that every single trader in South Australia will see this as a benefit to their business. I am making a decision, and this government will be making a decision on behalf of the totality.

The arguments offered by those opposite are very similar to the arguments that were put forward by people when South Australia was discussing whether or not we would deregulate shop trading hours in the sixties and seventies. By the same sort of syllogism offered by those opposite, we would have to go back to restricting hours because, by their argument, if we restricted shop trading hours even further—let's just say we only opened shopping hours on Mondays between nine and 12 and everybody had to go and buy all their products between nine and 12—that would cut out a lot of costs in business. Guess what? They would argue—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that would be a benefit to business.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It didn't work that well in Soviet Russia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It didn't work that well in some other central governments that those over there aspire to or look up to.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The reality is that the wall came down. Consumers should be given the opportunity to shop. Shopkeepers, retailers and owners of businesses should be given the opportunity to open when it suits their business. Only those on this side of the parliament want to provide that choice to our economy and to provide that growth to our economy to create those jobs for our next generation.

Grievance Debate

RICHARDSON RESERVE

Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:07): I rise today to speak about an important local issue facing the residents of Wynn Vale and Modbury Heights. The City of Tea Tree Gully is currently consulting on a proposal to sell a 3.4-hectare piece of land, called Richardson Reserve, located on the corner of The Golden Way and Grenfell Road, Wynn Vale. The council has received an unsolicited proposal from German retailer Kaufland of \$13.8 million to purchase the site and build a new supermarket.

Richardson Reserve is home to Modbury Vista Soccer Club, which currently has around 750 members and has now stopped taking members because it has outgrown its current site. The clubrooms that Vista use are also no longer fit for use, and the pitch has not been up to standard for many seasons, forcing the club to play many of its home games at the neighbouring Modbury Jets synthetic pitch, which was funded by the previous Labor government. I was very pleased to be there when the member for West Torrens opened it last year.

With the funds from the proposed sale, the council will relocate the club to another site in Golden Grove and build new synthetic pitches for Modbury Vista and other clubs, while spending the remaining funds on upgrading local open space. It was because of the incredible growth of Modbury

Vista Soccer Club and the poor state of the current playing surface that the Labor Party committed to providing the club with \$1 million for a new synthetic pitch, if re-elected.

As the newly elected member for Wright, one of my first acts was to meet with the president of Vista to encourage him to write to the new government to ask them to honour the election commitment made by the Labor Party. It was at this meeting that I learned, much to my surprise, that the Liberal candidate for the seat of Wright had called and spoken to the club president before I made the commitment on behalf of the Labor Party and said words to the effect of, 'Whatever Labor commits to you for your club, we will match.' I do not for a second question the intent of the Liberal candidate for Wright. He is a very decent person and I have a lot of respect for him. I know he would only have made this commitment with the imprimatur of Liberal Party leadership.

I wrote to the Minister for Sport in early April, informing him that the Liberal Party also committed to \$1 million for a new synthetic playing pitch for Modbury Vista Soccer Club and have confirmation that his office received that letter on 16 April. I am yet to receive a reply, but as the consultation for the proposed sale of Richardson Reserve continues, I think it is only fair to the residents of Wynn Vale and Modbury Heights that they know there is another option on the table, and that is to preserve Richardson Reserve as public land and for the new government to honour the commitment that its candidate for the seat of Wright made before the most recent state election.

Over the following two Saturdays, I will be conducting my own consultation on the proposed sale, with local ward councillor Sandy Keane, mayor Kevin Knight and federal member for Makin, Tony Zappia. I have also written to all residents in Wynn Vale and Modbury Heights with a survey asking for their feedback, and I am closely monitoring similar surveys and polls in other online forums. Once residents and stakeholders have had an opportunity to digest the proposal and provide their thoughts and feedback, it will return to council for a final decision.

I note from the many conversations I have already had with local residents that there are different opinions on this matter, and although ultimately this is a decision for council, I commit to not taking a position on the proposal myself until after I have spoken to as many local residents as possible.

The SPEAKER: Could ministers who are not talking please be seated or leave, thank you.
Deputy Premier.

DAVID TONKIN SCHOLARSHIP

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:11): It is with pleasure that I wish to inform the house today about the David Tonkin Scholarship that is awarded annually to 16 to 18 year olds, either resident, working or studying within the electorate of Bragg. The Tonkin Scholarship rewards youth achievement, aspiration and community service, in addition to honouring the memory of my esteemed predecessor, the first member for Bragg, the Hon. David Tonkin, former premier and treasurer of South Australia from 1979 to 1982. I am eternally grateful for the ongoing support in this endeavour of Mrs Prue Tonkin, who attends the Tonkin Scholarship ceremony each and every year and presents the winner with a small gift.

Dr Tonkin exemplified the best of public service. After a distinguished career as an eye surgeon, he was moved to stand for parliament to advance public health outcomes and safeguard rehabilitation programs for youth offenders. He was a fierce proponent of equal rights and opportunities, having drafted the first Australian bill to outlaw sex discrimination, and he supported fellow Liberal Murray Hill in his bid to decriminalise homosexuality. In his early life, he was raised by his mother, who was a single parent.

As premier, he extended the scope of his original antidiscrimination legislation to include disabilities. When he came into office, land rights and negotiations for the Pitjantjatjara people had stalled and he made the decision, not universally popular in the party at the time, to continue them. He met 100 Pitjantjatjara people at Victoria Racecourse, the first time many of them had ever travelled to Adelaide.

In October 1980, on the traditional lands of the Pitjantjatjara people, premier Tonkin signed an historic agreement granting to them over 100,000 square kilometres—over 10 per cent of the state. He was the first Australian premier to grant land rights to Aboriginal people. For context, this

was 12 years before the High Court handed down the Mabo decision. As part of this agreement, mining proposals needed to be negotiated with Pitjantjatjara and Yankunytjatjara people, who would receive a share of any royalties. Their sacred sites would be respected and any disputes from them needed to go to an arbitration tribunal. We now call this land the APY lands.

His involvement and work with the South Australian Aboriginal communities went beyond the enactment of native title. As a doctor and medical specialist, he was greatly concerned with the abysmal health outcomes of the Aboriginal community. He continued to visit the lands after he retired from parliament to treat preventable eye conditions, such as glaucoma. My friend the member for Newland reminded us last week that there is still much work to be done in this area.

It will come as no surprise to members that I share Dr Tonkin's values and outlook and that I wish to foster these in the next generation of leaders. Every year, I cherish reading about the 1,001 brilliant achievements of our state's youth and why they aspire to lead a life of public service. I am also constantly uplifted by the many and varied ways in which they can contribute.

This year, I am pleased to announce the winner of this year's David Tonkin Scholarship is Zoe Chalmers of Seymour College. She has given outstanding service to her community and achieved remarkable academic results. Like Dr Tonkin, Zoe has a thirst for social justice, and she tutors newly arrived migrant and refugee children in the vagaries of English at Gilles Street Primary School. I am sure all members of this house join me to commend Zoe and others like her who welcome and assist these new Australians in finding their feet.

Zoe wishes to undertake a Bachelor of Arts at the University of Melbourne after taking a gap year—she has certainly earned it with what she has done in her own short lifetime. While the thought of losing South Australia's best and brightest to Melbourne or even London always saddens me, it is unquestionably to our benefit if they return to South Australia with fresh eyes and knowledge as to how our state can progress.

I am proud of all the achievements of our Tonkin scholars, and I keep in touch with many of them as their careers have developed. I am certain that with their academic capabilities and liberal values they will be leaders in this state and possibly in this parliament one day, too. Congratulations, Zoe.

RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:15): I rise today to talk about jobs in regional South Australia and especially the potential to grow a significant number of jobs from a new and emerging industry. Last year, the then state government delivered the Hydrogen Roadmap for South Australia. A lot of work had gone into the Hydrogen Roadmap, and since then a number of tangible commitments have been made to particular projects in regional South Australia.

When talking about hydrogen it is probably worthwhile reflecting on the front page of *The Advertiser* today, where there is yet another story about price volatility and high prices when it comes to fuel—diesel, petrol or aviation fuel. I know that out in country South Australia a lot of communities do not get the benefit from price cycles, and they do not get the benefit from real competition, so as a result we are often facing high diesel prices and high petrol prices. That has a real impact on businesses and on families and households.

One of the other, related, elements when it comes to fuel prices is another concern that is raised on a periodic basis, and that is fuel reserves here in Australia. We have 16 days of diesel in reserve, we have 21 days of petrol in reserve and we have 19 days of aviation fuel in reserve. That does not count what is in transit to Australia aboard ships, and the usual method of determining the reserves internationally does not take that into account.

So we are susceptible as a country to some real risks when it comes to the importation of petroleum products. Fortunately, though, as a country we do have massive resources, and that was part of the basis for the Hydrogen Roadmap being delivered here in South Australia. With hydrogen, you have the potential to do a whole range of things. It has industrial applications, it has thermal power station applications and it has fuel cell applications, both for mobile fuel cells and stationary fuel cells. So there are a lot of opportunities available to us as a state if we continue to pursue the Hydrogen Roadmap for South Australia.

The previous government had a 750-megawatt storage target as part of its 75 per cent renewables by 2025. Some on the other side are disparaging of that, but it is definitely the direction that we should be pursuing. While in government, we made a tangible commitment to Neoen, the big French company that is now in this state. It was to develop the world's largest wind and solar complex with battery with a hydrogen electrolyser, the electrolyser being a 50-megawatt plant. That will be, given its size, a world first.

As part of that potentially \$600 million project, to be located near Crystal Brook, we provided \$1 million to assist with a feasibility study in addition to a \$4 million grant and a \$20 million loan from the Renewable Technology Fund. We also provided assistance for a smaller \$117 million project in Port Lincoln, in the member for Flinders' electorate. There were some constraints in Port Lincoln in developing a serious, hydrogen-based industry, not the least of which is the grid.

There are only two renewable projects on the whole of Eyre Peninsula—that is, two significant utility-size projects in the form of a wind farm at Cathedral Rocks and one at Mount Millar. However, there are massive opportunities in other parts of the state. One of the targets in the Hydrogen Roadmap was to generate 4,200 jobs over a period, and a lot of those jobs would have been in regional South Australia. I would call on the Minister for Energy and Mining to commit to the work that has already been done on the Hydrogen Roadmap and to demonstrate, in the way the previous government did, a tangible commitment to going in that particular direction.

KING ELECTORATE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:20): I rise today to make special mention of people and recent achievements, and to acknowledge some key activities that I have participated in since being elected. Firstly, I would like to thank my local community of King for getting behind and supporting the various ANZAC Day dawn services and events that were held, which showed a tremendous amount of respect for those who have gone before us, who have given us our freedoms and allowed us to live securely in the communities we have today.

I attended several events. I would like to acknowledge the beautiful services within the City of Playford; specifically, the dusk opening ceremony, which is put on by many young people who do an overnight vigil. It was great that we had good weather for it this year. I also attended the One Tree Hill ANZAC Day dawn service at the beautiful One Tree Hill Institute. There were hundreds more people there this year. It is a beautiful service, where stories are told, respect is shown and we listen to the kookaburras and the roosters crowing as the service takes place.

After that, I attended the Pegasus Pony Club ANZAC Day Show, which was a much different type of service and lots of fun. I also attended the Salisbury Ferns Lifestyle Village ANZAC Day service and spent time with all the residents later on, having breakfast in the hall. I was very grateful for that invitation and look forward to attending again next year. In addition, our King office was represented at the Tea Tree Gully dawn service, which I have now attended for many years and which shows a lot of respect. It was very well attended and I thank the City of Tea Tree Gully for supporting that service.

I would also like to congratulate Mr James McKechnie of Hillbank on his outstanding achievements representing South Australia and Australia at the recent Gold Coast Commonwealth Games. James finished fifth in the 50 metres breaststroke final after an excellent performance in his heat. It is so encouraging to see local people like James representing our community in such a positive way and achieving wonderful results. I look forward to watching James' career with lots of interest in the future.

The Greenwith Primary School SAPSASA girls' cricket team also won their first cricket game recently. Well done to the coach, Mr Smith, and captain, Keighley, on co-ordinating the team. The school achieved some outstanding results at the Salisbury East athletics carnival as well. Well done to the parent volunteers, Tammy McBryde, Fiona Rasch and Tracy Hemmerling, for assisting the students and the school on the day.

Our Lady of Hope School recently commenced the first Our Lady of Hope playgroup. I am pleased to hear that this initiative has been successful and staff driven. Congratulations to the school's playgroup co-ordinators, Ali Wallace and Bernadette Gaudio, and congratulations also to our year 7 student, Laura, who provided a variety of activities for the children. Quality time between

parents and their children is essential, and it is pleasing that the Our Lady of Hope playgroup school initiative has included a variety of sessions to foster and develop these relationships.

I would also like to commend the great work of the City of Salisbury on launching the Watershed Art Prize—

Ms Bettison interjecting:

Ms LUETHEN: Yes, Ms Bettison was there as well. I thank the council for promoting local artists and providing them with the opportunity and the platform to create and display artwork. I fully support the council in its endeavours to focus the artwork on water management, conservation and creating a sustainable environment, and encourage the council to continue its work in supporting the young and emerging artists' prize.

I would also like to thank the councils in my King community for the good work they do in providing great local citizenship ceremonies. Thank you to the City of Tea Tree Gully for its citizenship ceremony, which I attended on Wednesday 11 April, and the City of Salisbury for its citizenship ceremony that I attended on 18 April. I would also like to reaffirm our Liberal government's commitment to deliver \$110 million to Modbury Hospital.

TURTUR, MR M.

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:26): On Wednesday 23 May, I was honoured to attend a Lord Mayoral reception at the Adelaide Town Hall to award Mike Turtur AO the key to the City of Adelaide. Mike Turtur is a true South Australian legend. Born and bred in Adelaide, Mike's involvement in the sport began with his first visit to a velodrome to watch his brother in a race. He instantly fell in love with cycling and determined he would one day compete for his country at the Olympic Games. With the signature Mike Turtur determination, that is exactly what he did.

In a stellar cycling career Mike went on to become both a Commonwealth Games and Olympic medallist. At the 1982 Brisbane Commonwealth Games he won two gold medals—in the men's 4,000 metre team pursuit and the men's individual pursuit—as well as a bronze medal in the 10 mile scratch race. In 1984, at the Los Angeles Olympics he won a gold medal in the men's 4,000 metre team pursuit, and in 1986 he was the flag bearer for Australia at the Edinburgh Commonwealth Games, winning another gold medal for the same event.

Yet in some ways this is where Mike's story really begins. Wanting to share his knowledge and experience, Mike went on to become the coach of the South Australian Sports Institute sport cycling program for five years. From 1993, he was manager and promoter at the Adelaide Super-Drome, headquarters of the highly successful Australian Institute of Sport's women's and men's track cycling program. In 1990, he also opened his business, Mike Turtur Cycles, with his brother Greg.

Of all his achievements, perhaps the most significant was Mike's work in establishing what is now internationally acclaimed as the Tour Down Under. There is little doubt that Mike played an integral role in working with the then Olsen state government to launch this first Tour Down Under. He was appointed to the position of race director and it is a position he has held ever since. To cap the achievement, the inaugural race was won by South Australian Stuart O'Grady.

The organisers anticipated that between 10,000 and 15,000 people would attend the first circuit; however, more than 40,000 South Australians turned up, many out of curiosity, never having seen a race before. That was perhaps symbolic of the success that was to follow. In 2007, then premier Mike Rann and then tourism minister Jane Lomax-Smith launched a campaign for the Tour Down Under to become the first race outside Europe to secure Pro Tour status from the Union Cycliste Internationale (UCI). This is the world governing body for sport cycling and overseas international competitive cycling events. Pro Tour status would guarantee all the world's top teams would participate.

This was an incredibly bold and ambitious move, and there is little doubt that the leadership of and respect in which Mike Turtur was held within the international cycling community was a significant contributor to the result. In 2008, the Tour Down Under became the first UCI Pro Tour in Australia, and the following year it became the inaugural event in the UCI world-ranking calendar. Officially, South Australia was on the world international cycling stage.

The event has also led to an increase in diversity and opportunity for female cyclists. In 2012, the event hosted a series of women's street criterium races, making it the first time female athletes participated in the event. In 2015, the annual women's race was established as part of the National Road Series, and in 2016 it was granted UCI status. Now operating as the Santos Women's Tour Down Under, the 2018 event saw elite international women's teams commence their season in Adelaide.

In January this year, Mike was made an Officer of the Order of Australia for 'distinguished services to cycling, particularly through the development and promotion of world-class cycling events, and to the community of South Australia'. This year, in its 20th year, the Tour Down Under injected \$63.7 million into the South Australian economy, creating 774 jobs. When we celebrated the 20th anniversary, Mike expressed confidence that the event will continue to grow and develop for many years to come. Mike's story is amazing and inspirational. In the words of internationally hailed voice of cycling, Phil Liggett 'Mike's sold this country to the world, and by this country, I mean South Australia.'

EYRE PENINSULA ABORIGINAL HISTORY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:30): I rise today to talk about an event I attended in the electorate of Flinders last week, during National Reconciliation Week. Reconciliation Australia this year invited all Australians to learn more about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultures and history and to share that knowledge and help us grow as a nation.

'Don't keep history a mystery: Learn. Share. Grow' they say explores history hidden just beneath the surface, ready and waiting to be uncovered and that this National Reconciliation Week, which of course was last week, we learn more about the Australian story. I was fortunate enough to be granted a pair last Wednesday night from the parliament to fly to Port Lincoln to attend a forum in Coffin Bay entitled, 'An Introduction to the Aboriginal history of Coffin Bay and Eyre Peninsula with the Nauo people and others'.

We were invited to meet and greet with Nauo Aboriginal people and to learn about the history of Coffin Bay and Eyre Peninsula from a Nauo perspective. We had the opportunity to ask questions and share personal knowledge about the shared history of a beautiful place, significant to many people, including to me. In my humble opinion, Coffin Bay is the most exquisite place in the world, but I may be biased.

The Hon. D.J. Speirs interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: I have support from the Minister for Environment here. The forum was attended by almost 100 people. There was an interesting cross-section of people from Lower Eyre Peninsula of all ages and occupations, including, I noticed, some descendants of the very earliest of European settlers on Eyre Peninsula. My congratulations go to Mr Brian Witty, who facilitated the evening. Amongst other things, he writes at the outset:

It is hoped that this is the beginning of an era of deeper knowledge, harmony and respect acknowledging Nauo History and Culture. And the organisers hope that in the not too distant future Coffin Bay residents and visitors alike will gain an appreciation of our shared history and legacy.

I attended and, after acknowledging Reconciliation Week and passing on a message from our Premier, I made the point that across Eyre Peninsula we are familiar with many people, including the Wirangu, who occupy the Far West Coast; the Kokatha, who occupied the Gawler Ranges; the Barngarla people, who inhabited EP proper; the Mirning people, who lived on the Nullarbor Plain; and the Anangu Pitjantjatjara people, who relocated to Yalata following the atomic testing in the fifties. This is all according to Tyndale's work published in the 1940s.

However, very little is known about the Nauo people. I was aware of the people. My assumption was that they lived in an area around Coffin Bay, and certainly that seems to be the centre of their activity. We were addressed by speakers such as Dr Scott Cane, a local anthropologist and archaeologist, who very ably described the connection to Central Australia that the Nauo people had through the dream lines, who through generations had formed not just trade lines but lines of language and family.

Dr Belinda Liebelt, an anthropologist and historian, was there. She is also preparing a native title submission on behalf of the Nauo people. Jody Miller represented the Nauo people as an elder, and I know Jody and have done so for some years. Brenton Weetra and Auntie Pauline were there. A key point was that Scott Cane believed that it was the first time in the state, if not nationally, that a native title group had been invited to speak to a community. It was actually established by the people of Coffin Bay.

In the time left to me, I also want to quickly recognise the work of the District Council of Elliston to acknowledge the deaths of Aboriginal people at Waterloo Bay in May 1849 through its Reconciliation Monument Wording Project. It has been recognised at the National Local Government Awards, and the project has won the Promoting Indigenous Recognition category. It was not an easy debate for the Elliston community. Ultimately, a monument has been erected acknowledging the incident with appropriate wording, and certainly it will go a long way towards healing the rifts of the past.

Dr HARVEY: I note the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Bills

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS (CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:37): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Limitations of Actions Act 1936. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:38): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am absolutely delighted to introduce the Limitation of Actions (Child Sexual Abuse) Amendment Bill 2018, which amends the Limitation of Actions Act 1936 and abolishes the limitation period for claims for compensation for victims of child sexual abuse.

This bill addresses observations made in the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, Redress and Civil Litigation Report released in September 2015. The royal commission found that the existence of a limitation period creates significant barriers for survivors of child sexual abuse and operates unreasonably to deny victims access to justice. The Limitation of Actions Act 1936 currently sets a limitation period of three years for bringing a common law action in personal injury. For a person who suffered abuse as a child, this means that an action must be commenced by his or her 21st birthday.

This important piece of legislation expands on the bill I introduced in September 2016, which was integral for victims of institutional child sexual abuse both at that time and now. The one major difference between the former private member's bill and the one I lay before you today is that this government bill takes into account all victims of child sexual abuse, not just those who have fallen victim to predatory behaviour in our government and non-government institutions.

On that note, I commend the work undertaken by the Hon. John Darley MLC of another place on a bill with the same name in 2017. As I mentioned in 2016 when introducing the former legislation, it is a credit to South Australia that we advanced inquiries in relation to institutional child sexual abuse many years ago. This began with the Mullighan inquiry, for which I wish to recognise the late former Supreme Court judge, His Honour Ted Mullighan, and more recently the Nyland royal commission, recognising the work of former Supreme Court judge, Her Honour Margaret Nyland.

From the Mullighan inquiry, we saw the creation of an ex gratia payment scheme for survivors of institutional sexual abuse while in state care to seek compensation for the abhorrent crimes committed against them. This ex gratia scheme is still in operation and, since 2009, the total of ex gratia payments made pursuant to the guidelines is about \$1.74 million. As at 4 June 2018, the Crown Solicitor's Office has received 213 applications for ex gratia compensation under the

guidelines. Offers of compensation have been made to 127 applicants, and 115 applicants have accepted their offers. Payments have been made to all applicants who have accepted their offer.

This is a government of action and progress in acknowledging the survivors of child sexual abuse. Only last week did this government announce our participation in the commonwealth's National Redress Scheme for victims of child sexual abuse. By joining the National Redress Scheme, the state government is taking responsibility for and helping to heal the pain caused by the sexual abuse of children in government and non-government institutions. This ensures that South Australia joins the majority of the country in recognising the importance of a nationally consistent approach to the devastating impact of institutional child sexual abuse.

Importantly, this scheme will go beyond what is already provided by the ex gratia scheme as non-government institutions will be able to participate and South Australia will also assume 'funder of last resort' responsibilities in appropriate cases where jointly responsible institutions are unable to pay redress due to having ceased operation. On Wednesday last week, the Catholic Church confirmed their commitment to opt into the scheme as a non-government institution. Similar announcements followed the next day from the Anglican Church, Salvation Army, Scouts Australia and the YMCA.

For survivors, this is incredibly encouraging. I place on record my appreciation for these organisations coming into the scheme and committing with the resolution they have passed. Beyond these claims made through an ex gratia or redress scheme, many survivors do, however, wish to make a civil claim through the courts. This is a right which victims have and which they should still be afforded, despite the existence of other redress or compensation schemes, if they choose to use this approach instead.

The reality is that, for many of the victims, the accused party is impecunious, is no longer in the state or is dead, so the opportunity for them to take civil action with any jot of a chance of recovery is, of course, slim. In my previous comments on this legislation, I have been critical of the level of payments made under the ex gratia scheme administered by the government. I maintain that a survivor, should they choose, ought to be able to attend court and make a civil claim against a government or non-government institution.

Here is the situation: if a child is sexually abused at a young age and goes through their teenage life and attains the age of 18 years, they have only three years from their 18th birthday to make a claim against the alleged perpetrator of that abuse, or someone who would otherwise be responsible and should have acted to protect the child in those circumstances. This is simply unacceptable. There are very good reasons that we have limitations on actions. However, in many circumstances, victims may never feel the courage or motivation to come forward against a perpetrator, let alone at the young age of 21. Significantly, a number of victims do not come forward until they know that their perpetrator has died, and they feel free enough to make that disclosure.

What has been identified—and this was acutely considered in the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse—is that very often a person who is the subject of abuse as a child does not disclose or even recognise the significance of that abuse until they are well into adulthood. Sadly, what can happen, particularly in circumstances of child sexual abuse, is that the memory and recall can be suppressed, or not really dealt with or acknowledged.

A survivor should not feel pressured to deal with certain events without proper preparedness or professional assistance. There are many reasons why children keep this secret to themselves. We know that is not the right thing to happen. We know that the abuse should not occur in the first place. We know that they should feel free and comfortable to be able to tell somebody, and we know that they should have relief and protection. We know that if they are treated badly, and there is continuing pain or injury, there should be necessary treatment—whether that be medical, psychiatric or psychological—and they should be given every opportunity for that to occur.

I refer members to the discussion from the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. In recommendations 85 to 88, in its Redress and Civil Litigation Report, the commission recommended that all states and territories take immediate steps to remove the limitation period for cases arising from institutional child sexual abuse. This is the commitment the then Liberal opposition made to South Australians.

We committed to introducing legislation to remove the limitation period for victims of institutional child sexual abuse within the first 100 days in government, and this is what we are doing. The bill achieves this result but applies it to all victims of child sexual abuse, not merely to those who suffered abuse in an institutional setting, as I have mentioned previously.

I now turn to particular aspects of the bill. It inserts a new section 3A of the Limitation of Actions Act 1936, which provides that an action for damages relating to the death of or personal injury to a person resulting from child sexual abuse may be brought at any time and is not subject to any limitation period. This includes limitation periods applying to claims brought in tort, in contract, under statute and otherwise.

Although the bill permits such actions to be brought at any time, it does not limit the court's inherent, implied and statutory jurisdiction or its other powers. The court will retain the power to summarily dismiss or permanently stay proceedings where there has been an abuse of process, or where the lapse of time affects the defendant's case, such that a fair trial is not possible.

The bill also contains transitional provisions to clarify its application in cases where a limitation period on the cause of action has expired prior to the commencement of the bill. In particular, schedule 1 of the bill provides that section 3A applies to an action or a cause of action that accrued before or after the day on which section 3A comes into operation, including where the cause of action was statute barred prior to section 3A coming into operation. Further, an action may be commenced even though:

- another action has been started but not finalised before the commencement of section 3A;
- another action has started but discontinued before the commencement of section 3A;
- a judgement was previously given on the ground that a limitation period applying to the cause of action has expired; or
- an action was dismissed on the ground that a limitation period applying to the cause of action had expired.

In cases where there is a previous judgement on the action or an action has been dismissed on the ground that a limitation period has expired, the permission of the court is required before a new action may be commenced. The court may grant permission for a new action to be commenced if satisfied that it is just and reasonable to do so. In granting permission for a new action to be commenced, the court may make any order it considers to be necessary for the action to proceed or otherwise appropriate in the circumstances.

As recognised by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, it is critical that those survivors have the opportunity to come forward into adulthood and seek some redress where appropriate. Although this government is providing an option through access to the National Redress Scheme by removing the limitation of actions period, survivors who may have experienced abuse outside of an institutional context will still have an option to seek redress and compensation through the courts. This is a right that should not be denied to them. We ought to do everything possible to ensure these children have access to compensation and are not denied when a very latent disclosure comes to the fore for which they ought to have some redress.

As to other jurisdictions, New South Wales and Victoria have previously had limitations and they have passed legislation to abolish these. The governments in these large jurisdictions have listened—and they have acted. Soon after the introduction of the former private member's bill, Queensland also followed suit. Queensland, like the Liberal opposition, has obviously read the report and accepted the argument and has acted to ensure these children do not miss out when the issue is disclosed at a later date.

A matter that was concerning to me both in 2016 and now is that we often heard from the former government that they were sympathetic to the circumstances, that they understand, that they are model litigants and that they are prepared to act to protect and provide for children who have been so badly treated in these circumstances. These were hollow promises which were never followed through in supporting this important legislation.

This government, in stark contrast to the former, is implementing decisive change, and we are extremely proud to do so. We do not want to have a situation where a government delays providing justice to victims of child sexual abuse whose claims would be precluded. We want to ensure that victims do not need to beg the court to look at the matter in years to come.

It is true that there is a power under the legislation for a court to extend the time or to grant permission to be able to apply out of time. There is a process for that but, again, it is a just another hurdle—insurmountable for some—over which the applicant has to jump before their file will even be considered by the court. As I have said in this place previously, I would urge those opposite not to put their heads in the sand on this matter. A number of new members have been elected and I seek that they act on this and enable this important legislation to pass and to pass swiftly.

The Limitation of Actions (Child Sexual Abuse) Amendment Bill 2018 is an important step towards addressing decades of injustice and indifference shown to victims, both institutional and otherwise. Put simply, removing the limitation period lifts a barrier that is patently unfair. I commend the bill to members, and I table a copy of the explanation of clauses.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Cook.

JUDICIAL CONDUCT COMMISSIONER (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:54): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act 2015. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:54): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill I introduce today makes miscellaneous amendments to the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act 2015. The Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act was passed by parliament on 29 October 2015 and received royal assent on 5 November 2015. Since that date, the Governor has appointed the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, the Hon. Bruce Lander QC, as the first Judicial Conduct Commissioner, with the approval of the parliamentary Statutory Officers Committee.

The amendments contained in this bill were requested by the commissioner. They operate to clarify some important aspects of the act and improve the efficiency of the judicial complaints process. The bill allows the commissioner to investigate if further information enlivens a complaint that would otherwise have been dismissed and also allows the commissioner to summarily dismiss complaints that could be dismissed under section 17. This would occur without the need to conduct a preliminary examination or to give notice of the complaint to the judicial officer concerned or to the jurisdictional head.

It is true that, from time to time, we have frivolous and vexatious claims made not just against the judiciary but against public officers at a number of levels, and in circumstances where that has occurred, particularly repeated similar claims, this would enable the commissioner to formally dismiss the complaint, if he were satisfied that it should be summarily dismissed, without the need for the preliminary examination. This government is reducing the administrative burden placed on the commissioner.

The bill provides that the identity of the complainant need not be provided to the judge concerned or to the relevant jurisdictional head, unless the complainant consents to the disclosure or the commissioner is of the opinion that the disclosure of the complainant's identity is necessary in order to ensure that a proper response to the complaint is filed. This is essential to facilitate complaints to be made to the commissioner, especially coupled with an amendment to make it clear that any acts of victimisation from a judge towards a complainant can itself be the subject of a complaint. Lawyers should not be dissuaded from making complaints due to fears of retaliation when they next appear before that judge.

The definition of 'relevant jurisdictional head', where the person, the subject of the complaint, is themselves a jurisdictional head, has been amended to refer to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, meaning that complaints about a jurisdictional head are referred to the Chief Justice. The bill also makes several minor points of clarification, including:

1. Requiring a copy of the report of the Judicial Conduct Panel to be provided to the commissioner;
2. Providing that, where the commissioner is also the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, as is currently the case, a person employed under section 12 of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012 and directed to perform duties under the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act or a person seconded to assist the commissioner be included as a 'member of the Commissioner's staff'; and
3. Making it clear that that the commissioner has the explicit power to consider conduct that occurs prior to the commencement of the Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act.

Finally, the bill makes an amendment to address the circularity of the current section 33, which provides that a person must not, except as authorised, publish information relating to a complaint if the publication is prohibited. The section has been amended to clarify that the information cannot be published, unless authorised by the commissioner.

The provisions in this bill have the purpose of clarifying the commissioner's powers and assisting him in the discharge of his statutory duties. I thank the commissioner for bringing these matters to the government's attention and providing his explanation for the same. After consultation, I now commend the bill to members and table the explanation of clauses.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Cook.

FARM DEBT MEDIATION BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:59): Introduced a bill for an act to provide for the mediation of disputes between farmers and creditors relating to debt incurred in the conduct of farming operations, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (16:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce the Farm Debt Mediation Bill 2018. The introduction of this bill into parliament fulfils a commitment that the government made to introduce this legislation in its first 100 days.

Mediation is a structured negotiation process in which the mediator, as a neutral and independent person, assists, in this case, the farmer and the creditor in attempting to reach a mutually agreeable outcome on the present arrangements and future conduct of the financial relations between them. Currently, in South Australia a farming operation can be forcibly foreclosed without any form of negotiation. This can have a severe impact on a farmer and their family when we remember that a farm is not just a place of business; it is also the family home.

At a time when South Australia's manufacturing industry is facing challenges and falling global commodity prices are placing pressure on the mining sector, our primary industries sector is more important than ever. The agriculture industry has not only been the backbone of South Australia's economy since settlement in 1836 but will continue to be imperative to our state's future economic prosperity. Agriculture is our greatest renewable industry.

However, harsh climate conditions, damaging weather events and unpredictable commodity prices make farming a volatile industry that can leave farming families and their assets prone to

financial crisis. In recent times South Australian farmers have been hit by severe storms, hail, bushfires, flood events, frost and, of course, drought.

The government is committed to our farmers and believes that farmers, through a mandatory farm debt mediation scheme, should be given a fair opportunity to present and discuss their case with an independent mediator before they have their farm foreclosed on them. Through this mediation, there will be an opportunity to facilitate an outcome for all parties involved, but one that enables our farmers to take ownership of decisions rather than have circumstances imposed on them. Let me summarise some of the key components of the Farm Debt Mediation Bill 2018.

A creditor who proposes to take enforcement action against a farmer under a farm mortgage must, before doing so, give written notice to the farmer. A creditor must not take enforcement action until the expiry of the period of 21 days from the day that notice is given. The notice must state that, under this act, mediation between the farmer and the creditor is available. A farmer who is liable for debt (whether or not the farmer is in default) may request mediation under this act.

A farmer who is given a notice may, within 21 days from the date the notice was given, notify the creditor in a manner and form approved by the commissioner that the farmer requests mediation concerning the farm debt involved. A creditor who receives a request for mediation from a farmer may, by notice given to the farmer, agree or refuse to participate in mediation in respect of the farm debt involved. The notice of a response by a creditor to a request for mediation must be given in a manner and form approved by the commissioner.

If a creditor refuses to participate in mediation with a farmer who has made a request, and if the farmer is in default, the farmer can apply to the Small Business Commissioner for a prohibition certificate, preventing the creditor from taking enforcement action against the farmer for up to six months.

Conversely, the creditor is entitled to apply for an exemption certificate if the farmer is in default under the farm mortgage, no prohibition certificate is in force against the creditor, and (1) a satisfactory mediation has taken place; or (2) a satisfactory mediation has not taken place due to the farmer's refusal to participate; or (3) at least three months (or such longer period agreed to in writing by the creditor and farmer) have elapsed since notice was given and throughout that period the creditor made attempts to participate in mediation in good faith but satisfactory mediation has not taken place; or (4) in any other case—satisfactory mediation has taken place under an alternative dispute resolution process.

The exemption certificate allows the creditor to begin enforcement proceedings and remains in force for varying periods of time depending upon the steps previously taken under the act. If the Small Business Commissioner, who is responsible for the administration of the farm debt mediation scheme, receives notice that a creditor and a farmer have agreed to participate in mediation, the Small Business Commissioner must make arrangements to facilitate the resolution of a farm debt dispute by mediation.

This bill improves the protections in place for South Australian farmers, building on the existing voluntary South Australian Farm Finance Strategy and the Farming Industry Dispute Resolution Code under the Fair Trading Act 1987. This bill brings South Australia up to date with other states where farm debt mediation legislation has been operating successfully—in New South Wales, Victoria, and Queensland since 1994, 2011 and 2016 respectively.

A bill for farm debt mediation was first introduced into the South Australian parliament in 2015 by the Hon. David Ridgway MLC. That bill formed the basis of this legislation. The Farm Debt Mediation Bill 2018 is largely aligned with Victoria's legislative framework and New South Wales' and Queensland's legislative frameworks for farm debt mediation have also been reviewed and considered.

Victoria conducted a recent independent evaluation of the Victorian farm debt mediation scheme. That evaluation found an agreement between parties had been reached in 96 per cent of all mediations held since commencement of the scheme, well above the program's initial target of 75 per cent. The evaluation process also revealed that participation in the Victorian farm debt mediation scheme resulted in improved outcomes for many farmers, and also saved both farmer's

and creditors' time and money that may otherwise have been incurred in different debt resolution processes.

It should be noted that the federal government is committed to a nationally consistent approach to farm debt mediation, and the introduction of this bill is timely. A mandatory farm debt mediation scheme in South Australia will help relieve the emotional and mental stresses associated with a foreclosure at what is understandably an extremely difficult time, and ensure our South Australian farmers are given every opportunity to succeed. The government has consulted with key stakeholders on the design of the Farm Debt Mediation Bill 2018, including agricultural and banking industry stakeholders as well as the Small Business Commissioner.

With those words, I commend the bill to the house and look forward to further debate, and seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Object of Act

This clause sets out the object of the Act to provide for the efficient and equitable resolution of farm debt disputes by requiring creditors to provide farmers with the opportunity to have the disputes referred to mediation before the creditors are able to take possession of property or other enforcement action under farm mortgages.

4—Interpretation

This clause defines certain terms used in the measure.

5—Application of Act

This clause provides that the Act—

- (a) applies to creditors only in respect of farm debts; and
- (b) does not apply to a farmer in certain specified circumstances.

6—Enforcement action in contravention of Act void

This clause provides that enforcement action taken by a creditor otherwise than in compliance with the measure is void.

7—Relationship with other Acts

This clause sets out the interaction between the measure and other legislation.

Part 2—Availability of mediation

Division 1—Availability of mediation

8—Notice of availability of mediation to be given

This clause provides that enforcement action must not be taken unless the notice requirements set out in the provision are met.

9—Farmer may request mediation

This clause enables a farmer to request mediation.

10—Creditor may agree to or refuse mediation

The proposed section provides that a creditor who receives a request to mediate under section 9 may agree or refuse to mediate.

11—Enforcement action postponed to allow for mediation

This clause provides that if a farmer requests mediation under section 9, the creditor must not take enforcement action unless an exemption certificate is in force.

Division 2—Prohibition certificate

12—Application by farmer for issue of prohibition certificate

This clause provides that if certain conditions are met (as set out in the clause) a farmer is entitled to a prohibition certificate.

13—Issue of prohibition certificate

The clause sets out the requirement for the Commissioner to issue a prohibition certificate and provides that a creditor must not commence enforcement action against a farmer if a prohibition certificate is in force.

Division 3—Exemption certificate

14—Application by creditor for issue of exemption certificate

This clause provides that if certain conditions are met (as set out in the clause) a creditor is entitled to an exemption certificate.

15—Issue of exemption certificate

The clause sets out the requirement for the Commissioner to issue an exemption certificate and provides that the Act (other than Part 2 Division 3) does not apply to the creditor who holds the farm mortgage while the certificate is in force.

16—Creditor may satisfactorily participate in mediation without forgiving or reducing farm debt

This clause provides that a failure by a creditor to agree to reduce or forgive any debt does not, of itself, demonstrate a lack of good faith on the part of a creditor in participating in, or attempting to participate in, mediation.

17—Duration of exemption certificate

This clause sets out time limits for exemption certificates.

Division 4—General

18—When is a farmer or creditor presumed to have refused to participate in mediation?

This clause sets out the basis on which a farmer or a creditor (as the case may be) is presumed to have refused to participate in mediation.

Part 3—The Commissioner and mediation

Division 1—The Commissioner and mediators

19—Administration of Act

This clause provides that the Commissioner is responsible for the administration of the proposed Act.

20—Functions of Commissioner

This clause sets out the Commissioner's functions.

21—Functions of mediators

This clause sets out the functions of a mediator engaged by the Commissioner under clause 20.

Division 2—The mediation process

22—Commissioner must arrange mediation

The clause provides that the Commissioner must arrange mediation if notified under clause 10(4) that the parties have agreed to take part in mediation.

23—Conduct of mediation

The clause sets out the manner in which mediation must be conducted.

24—Confidentiality

The proposed section makes it an offence to disclose information obtained in the course of mediation under the Act, or in the administration of the Act, except in specified circumstances.

25—Mediation fees

The proposed section provides for the payment of mediation fees by each of the parties to a mediation.

Part 4—General

26—Agreement reached by parties at mediation

This clause provides that a creditor must ensure that any binding agreement relating to the farm debt made between the creditor and the farmer that is entered into during or at the conclusion of mediation is reflected in any contract, deed, mortgage or other instrument executed as a result of that binding agreement.

27—Contracting out prohibited

The proposed section provides that a provision of an agreement or other instrument that attempts to 'contract out' from the operation of the Act or attempts to have a farmer (as debtor or guarantor) or a guarantor indemnify a creditor for any loss or liability arising under the Act is void.

28—Waiver of rights void

The proposed section provides that a waiver of rights under this Act is void.

29—Notices by mortgagee

This clause provides that if land is subject to a farm mortgage and another Act requires the mortgagee to give notice to the mortgagor before exercising in relation to the land a power or right conferred by the other Act or by the farm mortgage nothing in this Act derogates from the requirement to give the notice under the other Act.

30—Service

This clause sets out the manner in which the service of a notice or document may occur.

31—Offences by bodies corporate

This clause provides that if a body corporate is guilty of an offence against this Act (other than an offence against the regulations), each director of the body corporate is guilty of an offence and liable to the same penalty as is prescribed for the principal offence if the prosecution proves certain specified matters.

32—Regulations

This clause facilitates the making of regulations by the Governor for the purposes of the Act.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

1—Transitional provision

This clause states that the Act applies to farm debt (whether or not incurred before or after the commencement of section 8) in respect of which no enforcement action was taken before the commencement of that section.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Cook.

CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (16:08): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Correctional Services Act 1982. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (16:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

At the last state election, the government committed to a zero tolerance policy in relation to drugs in prisons and pledged to introduce legislation to support this policy in its first 100 days. Stopping drugs entering our prisons remains a priority for this government to protect both employees and prisoners.

All correctional jurisdictions are challenged by prisoner drug use and attempts to introduce drugs into prisons. The number of prisoners detained in South Australia for drug-related offending is significant. The Department for Correctional Services has dedicated resources to ensuring it has sophisticated infrastructure, technology and systems in place to prevent attempts to introduce drugs. In the financial year to date, 2017-18, there have been over 5,000 drug tests and nearly 100,000 searches conducted in South Australian prisons to detect contraband and illicit drugs.

This bill will assist DCS to block potential avenues for drug incursion and increase the safety, security and integrity of the prison system. The Correctional Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2018 (the bill) provides for amendments to be made to the Correctional Services Act 1982 (the

act) to provide the power to prohibit members of outlaw motorcycle gangs and organised crime groups from visiting prisons and institute workplace testing of prison officers, staff and contractors for alcohol and illegal drugs.

Prisons have traditionally been prime locations for members of OMCGs and organised crime groups to recruit new members. These same groups also attempt to continue their criminal activities and associations whilst in custody. This includes seeking to profit from the introduction and distribution of contraband to prisoners and to protect their criminal interests and enterprises through witness manipulation and intimidation. Drugs and associated contraband that make it into the prison system are also considered a valuable currency. As such, it is vital that the influence of organised crime groups such as OMCG is impeded and the conduit for trafficking of drugs into prisons is obstructed.

As at 15 April 2018, a total of 162 prisoners known to be associated with outlaw motorcycle gangs are detained in South Australian prisons, and this financial year to date 126 individuals have been banned from visiting prisons. In its current form, the Correctional Services Act 1982 provides no power to prevent members of organised crime groups from entering prisons and associating with prisoners. This bill will introduce an amendment that specifically recognises criminal organisations as defined in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935.

This will enable the department to work closely with South Australia Police to limit the power and control of organised crime groups and sever links between prisoners and their associates. Despite the strong intent of this amendment, the bill does include a discretionary measure available to the DCS chief executive to approve visits in exceptional circumstances only, ensuring that necessary family and community connections are not completely disengaged.

The bill also proposes new provisions that provide for workplace drug and alcohol testing of staff, officers and employees. The term 'officer or employee' includes all persons employed directly by the department and those who are designated as an officer of the department—for example, G4S staff who operate the privately run Mount Gambier Prison. The bill also allows for the testing of contractors. This ensures that the bill includes staff employed by other government departments and any persons working at a correctional facility, such as tradespeople undertaking maintenance or building works at a prison site. This is because we do not want anyone in our prisons under the influence of drugs or alcohol.

Introducing drug and alcohol testing of staff strengthens the government's and the department's stance against the scourge of drugs and sets a high standard of professionalism, integrity and transparency. The provisions, which mirror SAPOL's approach to staff testing, enable both random and targeted testing in a range of situations, including following a critical incident; if there is reasonable suspicion of recent drug or alcohol consumption; and as part of a testing program to ensure the integrity of those who are employed in designated departmental positions.

It is anticipated that the testing will focus on common drugs of concern as determined through consultation with SAPOL and SA Pathology. If the bill is passed, it is proposed that the department will undertake a process to appoint a contractor to administer an independent testing program which includes providing breathalysers and drug testing equipment and undertaking the testing, analysis and reporting functions.

The key objective of this bill is to deliver important reform that supports the government's war on drugs and delivers enhanced safety and security in South Australia's prisons. The bill will also serve to advance collaboration with other law enforcement and justice agencies in the interests of community safety.

I commend the bill to members. I also seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Correctional Services Act 1982*

4—Amendment of long title

The long title of the Act is amended to refer the fact that the Act will provide for drug and alcohol testing of correctional services officers and employees and other persons.

5—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

Certain definitions are inserted into the Act for the purposes of the measure.

6—Insertion of section 6

New section 6 is inserted:

6—Criminal intelligence

This section sets out a scheme for the protection from disclosure of information that is classified by the Commissioner of Police as criminal intelligence for the purposes of granting an approval under section 34(4)(e) of the Act or making an order under section 85A(1)(b) of the Act.

7—Amendment of section 34—Prisoners' rights to have visitors

Section 34 is amended to provide that a person who the CE believes on reasonable grounds is a member of a criminal organisation, or associates with, or has associated with, a member of a criminal organisation, may not visit a prisoner without the approval of the CE.

8—Insertion of Part 7A

New Part 7A is inserted:

Part 7A—Drug and alcohol testing scheme

81S—Interpretation

The scheme provides for drug and alcohol testing of officers and employees of the Department. The scheme is substantially similar to the scheme in the *Police Act 1998*.

One key difference is that the CE is able to require drug and alcohol testing of an officer or employee on the ground that the CE considers that the officer or employee should undergo such testing.

Also, provision is made to allow the CE to require a person who enters a correctional institution to undergo drug and alcohol testing, subject to the person's consent.

81T—Drug and alcohol testing of officers and employees

81U—Drug and alcohol testing of applicants to Department

81V—Drug and alcohol testing of other persons

81W—Procedures for drug and alcohol testing

81X—Biological samples, test results etc not to be used for other purposes

9—Amendment of section 83—CE may make rules

This amendment is consequential.

10—Amendment of section 85A—Exclusion of persons from correctional institution

The power of the CE to exclude persons from correctional institutions is extended to apply to a person who is a member of a criminal organisation, or associates with, or has associated with, a member of a criminal organisation.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Cook.

DISABILITY INCLUSION BILL*Second Reading*

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (16:16): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

In bringing the bill to this house, I note that it has come to us from the other place and it has come to us from the other place in a format that we find acceptable. We thank the crossbench for its support. What I would like to do is to tease out some of the main purposes of this bill, but what I would also like to do is to highlight for the attention of the house some of the debate, especially during committee, that was had in the other place, because it seems very clear to me that the opposition has been fast and loose with some of its amendments, whether or not the community actually supports some of the amendments that the Labor Party was seeking to put.

Potentially, I want to put on record the opportunity for the member for Hurtle Vale to be able to clarify some of the remarks made by her colleague the Hon. Clare Scriven in the other place in relation to the supposed support that the Labor Party believes that the NGO sector has provided in relation to its amendments, but I will do that in due course.

What we are essentially introducing into this house, and has been passed by the Legislative Council, is a Disability Inclusion Bill. It is a bill that will stimulate state authorities to make better provision for South Australians living with a disability. This is an extremely important bill to help further change the culture and improve the lives of people living with a disability and for state government to become an exemplar, to become a leader, in how it makes services and decisions to ensure that there is a greater level of accessibility and understanding of the needs of persons living with a disability.

There is a common misconception in the community that the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) is going to provide everything that a person with a disability needs. In fact, only last night I was informed that only 10 per cent of those living with a disability will actually be covered by the NDIS. So, while the NDIS is a fantastic solution for those potentially at the more severe end of the scale to be able to be covered, there is a whole body of work that needs to be done to help improve the lives of those who are not only inside that cohort but very especially those outside of that cohort. That is why the Disability Inclusion Bill is important.

When the NDIS problems are sorted and every one who is eligible is on the scheme, it will give people with disability access to the supports and therapies they need. South Australia has been one of the lead jurisdictions in relation to implementation of the NDIS, along with New South Wales, and we are seeing significant teething issues. As a member of a state government that has put \$723 million of state government money on the table, handed over to the federal government, we will certainly be watching with interest to ensure that the needs of those who live with a disability and are engaged in the NDIS have their issues dealt with, and ensure that the scheme works for them.

However, the NDIS will not make the local bus stop accessible for people with physical disabilities, or the local health service responsive to the needs of people with intellectual disabilities, or the corrections system able to make accommodation for people with a brain injury or a psychosocial disability. This is the work that the state government needs to do, and this is the work that the Disability Inclusion Bill seeks to help mandate, to ensure that the state government does its bit in helping us move forward in making our society more inclusive and better able to be there for all people.

This bill seeks to make sure that all government departments, statutory authorities and local councils make provisions for people with disabilities who use their services. More broadly, this is a legitimate role of government. Government is supposed to be there for all people in a way that other parts of our society potentially are not. The government is here to provide services to all people. When we have been discussing other parts of the Liberal Party's legislative agenda, we see that we are attempting to be here for the broadest possible cross-section of the community. The Disability Inclusion Bill also helps us to be able to move further along that path.

This bill is about people of all ages with disability; it is not restricted to those under 65, like the NDIS. The bill also covers all of the older South Australians who acquire disability later in life. This is a large issue, given that South Australia has an ageing population. We have a more aged population than much of the rest of the country and, therefore, this is a bill that will help to address those needs in a way that the NDIS has not and will not.

It is extremely important, especially in regional South Australia, where we understand that the age profile is even older compared with much of metropolitan South Australia. Again, a bill like

this is extremely important, especially for regional councils to be encouraged to open their eyes and look at what things they can do.

Over 20 per cent of the population has a disability, and this varies from the very mild to the most acute and severe cases. Again, governments of all tiers and all levels need to be doing everything they can to be as inclusive as possible. This bill requires all state authorities to prepare a disability access and inclusion plan every four years and to report progress on their plan every year. This is the central mechanism by which this bill seeks to make the way that government deals with people who are living with a disability proactive.

This is the integral part of the bill. It is about cultural change. It is about trying to make departments look at ways to say yes to being proactive and finding ways that they can improve how they do things. In fact, some of the amendments that have been put on the table by other parties have sought to turn what is supposed to be a positive cultural change into a punitive system which undermines the very reason that we want to go down this path in the first place. Instead of trying to beat somebody over the head and tell them what they have to do, we should provide a pathway and encourage them to look at what they can do.

What is most interesting about this is that these disability access and inclusion plans will force statutory authorities, government departments and local councils to look at what are the quick wins and the easy things we can accommodate. It is not always about tackling the most difficult parts or the most expensive parts of us moving down this reform process; it can be about finding those easy, quick wins.

Because departments or authorities have never asked themselves if they can do things a different way, the conversation within statutory authorities, departments and councils will be started by the provision of these disability access and inclusion plans. This will allow us to actually deliver those quick wins and help to start a cultural change that is positive and positively reinforcing, one that is virtuous as opposed to one that is adversarial and punitive. One would suggest that adversarial and punitive is, perhaps, the modus operandi of a former 16-year administration.

The bill makes provision for regulations for a worker screening regime, a community visitor scheme and other NDIS transition matters. In relation to the worker screening regime, this is extremely important; in fact, it is the reason why we need to get the bill through this house as soon as possible. As one of the lead jurisdictions that is looking to transition its services to the NDIS by 1 July, under a federal system, we need to ensure that new regulations are put in place for worker screening.

This will ensure that people with a disability are not taken advantage of, that they are essentially provided with the same protections that we provide to children and other vulnerable classes, and ensure that people living with a disability are not abused or mistreated as a result of less stringent government checks. This part of it is important, and it is why we as a new government have sought to ensure that this bill is a huge priority and that it passes this place well in enough time for the 1 July transitional start date.

I note that in the other house the Minister for Human Services, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, a fantastic hardworking colleague of ours who has a deep and abiding interest and passion for this area, tabled a number of amendments in light of discussions she had with members of parliament and former members of parliament, specifically former member the Hon. Kelly Vincent MLC.

Essentially, amendments were agreed to in the other house to improve the wording of various clauses in line with amendments proposed last year by the Hon. Kelly Vincent and also to add functions and powers to the chief executive by use of the words 'monitoring the compliance of state authorities and making recommendations about compliance to the minister'. This is about adding accountability to state authorities.

At this point, it would be remiss of me not to say, for those in the house who are interested, that this goes further than the previous bill that was put on the table during the last session of the South Australian parliament. What I find most interesting is that a bill was put to parliament last year that was not progressed through all stages of the South Australian parliament so that it could become

law, necessitating our bringing this back with some haste. In fact, the measures that we seek to improve and impose here, which the Legislative Council has agreed to, help to strengthen that.

This approach is very much in line with trying to create positive reinforcement, a positive, virtuous cultural change that will make our society and our government departments more inclusive. We want the bill to encourage state authorities in the goal of improving access and inclusion. To go further risks developing a mindset of compliance, with agencies meeting the requirements set but not changing their culture regarding the philosophy and practice of disability inclusion.

It is for this reason that we plan for the regulations to allow state authorities until at least the end of 2019 to draw up their first access and inclusion plan after consultation with people with disabilities and the involvement and training of their employees. This is one of those ventures where the journey taken is as important, or more important, than the destination. This is about cultural change that will endure, not about filling in the required paperwork.

The Labor Party has put some amendments in the other place in relation to a proposed disability advocate, which would create a new statutory officer with responsibilities that would potentially overlap with the roles of other statutory bodies such as the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner, the Public Advocate, the Commissioner for Children and Young People and the Equal Opportunity Commissioner. There has been no analysis or consultation proposal to create this new statutory office of the disability advocate.

If there is to be a disability advocate, it does not need to be a separate statutory officer. For instance, this is a role that would fit very well within the function of the Office of the Public Advocate. Again, I think this is one of those times when the new government has a very different rule about creating increased bureaucracy as opposed to using current structures to achieve the same end, potentially with less red tape. The disability advocate, as originally announced, was only going to advocate on behalf of NDIS participants. There was discussion in the public sphere during the election campaign around an NDIS disability advocate.

This is something that both parties agreed to. What is interesting is that we committed to agree to a Labor Party proposal, yet, upon coming to government, it seems that this was more of a last-minute idea rather than something entrenched in the way they want to do things. The reason we know that is that there was no budget attached and, if there is no money for this position, then does this position really exist?

We have committed that we will implement this and that we will, in having an NDIS-focused disability advocate, help those people who need to transition to the NDIS and ensure it is done as smoothly as possible and that participants achieve good outcomes in planning and service delivery. At this point, I would like to discuss some of the committee stage in the other place, which did actually tease out the fact that there are potentially a few problems with just coming up with an idea without proper consultation.

Things cost money, and we need to ensure that in this constrained budget environment we use it to do the most good. I quote from *Hansard* in the Legislative Council, where our dear colleague the Hon. Michelle Lensink was questioned by the mover of the disability advocate amendments, the Hon. Clare Scriven.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, can I interrupt for a moment. I am just letting you know that you should not really reflect verbatim on debates in the other place. You can talk in general terms about the debate but, rather than quote, just generalise your comments.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I will speak in generalisations. It was suggested in the other place, generally, that the Labor Party had consulted with a broad number of organisations. I am given to understand that these organisations include the Brain Injury Network of South Australia, Uniting Communities, Barkuma, Anglicare, Disability Living, Minda Incorporated, Autism SA, Purple Orange, Novita, SCOSA, Orana, Bedford and Inclusive Sport.

It goes on to say, and the Labor Party and their representatives have gone on to say, that these are people who support the disability advocate proposal. I invite members opposite in their second reading contributions to potentially clarify those remarks and suggest to this house whether

or not they stand by those remarks, or whether or not there needs to be a little bit of backtracking to understand what consultation really looks like.

It is fair to say that when you send out an email that is not consultation. Consultation is when the correspondence comes back the other way and then you listen to what people have to say. A layman's understanding of consultation would be a two-way conversation, rather than just a one-way conversation. The second part of the two-way conversation is that when you get the response back the idea is that those people say, 'Yes, we agree with your proposal.' That is where members opposite could suggest that they otherwise have that support.

The Labor Party have put on the record that all those organisations have been consulted and support this proposal, and it is in *Hansard*. It would behove members of the Labor Party in the lower house to use their second reading contributions to clarify which organisations they believe actually support this proposal or whether this was just an email that went out. Also, when you propose ideas such as this, it is normally reasonable to figure out how much things are going to cost. Again, this is where the new government has done some quick work to understand that about \$600,000 per annum is what it would cost to institute an office of the disability advocate.

Interestingly, it seems that members of the Labor Party have not heard those figures before, potentially because they did not do any work to understand what the cost would have been. Again, I think that is a little bit slack. In this constrained environment, we need to make sure that, having handed over \$723 million to the federal government, our money is used where it can do the most good.

That is why the original intent of the Disability Inclusion Bill is so important—because it utilises existing agencies and existing departments to find ways that we make advances and gains in a way that is not punitive, in a way that does not require a big stick and in a way that helps change the culture of how we include people in South Australia. It is why we will continue to oppose—as did the entire crossbench—those who seek to advance this uncoded, very poorly thought out and very lackadaisical proposal.

In summing up, I commend this bill to the house. I look forward to its speedy travel through the house so that we can ensure that on 1 July we have the necessary and appropriate measures in place to further transition to the NDIS and also ensure that we get on with the work of helping South Australian municipal instrumentalities to get on with the good work we would like them to do.

In relation to councils, and I suppose this is where the bill sits in a broader framework, it is all well and good for state governments to impose new requirements upon themselves in the development of disability access and inclusion plans, but to do so on behalf of local government may seem to some to be more red tape. What we have said, and what we will be doing, is that we will work with local government to help provide them with all the support they need to have this conversation to ensure that it is not just a bureaucratic exercise.

It is about having a conversation with their communities and doing everything we can to make sure that this proposal is not about cost, red tape and bureaucracy but about changing culture. We look forward to working with local government in that broader context, especially as we seek to help them become more efficient in the way they provide services to their local community. With those words, I commend the bill to the house and look forward to its speedy passage through this place. I table a copy of the explanation of clauses.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:35): I rise to speak on the Disability Inclusion Bill 2018 and welcome and acknowledge its introduction in another place in our parliament and the support of members there for it to progress here today.

The bill is part of the government's recognition of and respect for the needs and aspirations of those who have a disability and those who care for them. Clearly, the assumption of responsibility to assist in this regard is by government, as it should be, and the families who live with a member with a disability and, of course, understand everything from the fear and concern for their child, if born with a disability, to the daunting task of providing for the care and cost of that child and the exhaustion in respect of the relentless support required frequently way past the age of majority of that child.

The responsibility that rests with so many of our families in South Australia has been huge, and some, of course, have done it with little other support. Let me express the circumstances of one family. Every one of us, I am sure, has people within their families, within their friendship groups and within their constituency, for whom every day this is a challenge, but let me mention the Everett family.

Perc and Betty Everett have now both passed. Perc was a returned veteran and provided service to us. Betty, his wife, was born with physical disabilities. They married and all their married life they lived in Seaton in a trust home. They had two daughters: Colleen, who grew up, married, had three children of her own but, sadly, shortly thereafter died of cancer; and their second daughter, Suzanne, who was born with an intellectual disability and during her working life worked via Bedford Industries. She is now my age and in the care of Orana, who provide for her residential care and support.

Betty and my grandmother met and stayed friends. They had known each other from Port Adelaide days, and her brother is buried next to my grandmother's father at West Terrace Cemetery. Let's move forward another 40 years or so. Suzanne is living in care; I am her legal guardian. Each of the three grandchildren has the opportunity to have occupancy of their grandmother's home, and one resides there. Each of those children has some challenges in respect of their own capacities, but I am proud to say that each is working either in employment in their workplace and/or has the care of children and themselves and that each is doing as well as they can.

The real heroes of these types of families are not always just Orana or Bedford Industries and the people who provide services for them, or the scant contribution that I make in relation to assistance to this family, but people like Cynthia Caruso, who lives in the same street as Betty and Perc Everett did. They were friends, and she has kept an eye on these children and grandchildren and will continue to do so, notwithstanding that she has an extensive family of her own to care for with her own contribution in that regard. She is a decent South Australian to make that contribution.

All of us need to appreciate in this house the need for us to ensure that, as best we can, we provide for those who have a disability, whether that is from birth, or through a circumstance that has been inflicted on them, usually by some adverse event in their life, or sickness. I am proud to say that the bill promotes the rights and inclusion of people living with disability in South Australia. South Australia and New South Wales have been the trial states under the scheme, which was really the brainchild of the Australian Productivity Commission many years ago.

I remember meeting with a member of the Productivity Commission who himself had adult children with severe disabilities, in consideration of what should be taken into account. I raised with them at the time my concern that there was no reference to, or provision for, the housing needs of those living with a disability. Clearly, that was going to be a very expensive extra addition to what I think was estimated at the time would be about a \$60 billion a year exercise in providing the level of other services, let alone housing services.

Nevertheless, this bill establishes now a high-level framework to ensure that a coordinated and consistent planning approach is taken across state and local government that provides for greater equality and access to services and facilities. As members know, the NDIS, after New South Wales and South Australia, is now being rolled out across the country. It is to be administered by the National Disability Insurance Agency.

The scheme itself is a new way of providing support for Australians. The commonwealth government should be commended for their leadership in this area, but, as has been outlined by the lead speaker, it is not without complication, especially in the expected time within which this will be undertaken and implemented. Ultimately, it will provide about 460,000 Australians under the age of 65 years with a permanent and significant disability the reasonable and necessary support they need to live as best they can in their lifetime.

As an insurance scheme, the NDIS takes a lifetime approach, investing in people with disability early to improve their outcomes later in life. The NDIS gives all Australians peace of mind that they will be able to get the support they need when they need it most. It is to support people with disability to build skills and capability so that they can participate in the community and gain employment where able. This bill, following the implementation of the NDIS, will fill the gap where

the Disability Services Act 1993 becomes redundant. That act was previously required to regulate services and provide funding mechanisms but, through the NDIS, this will no longer be needed.

One of the key components of the bill is requiring the state government to develop a state disability inclusion plan, which will be reviewed once every four years and requires annual reports in its operation. The bill also requires all state departments, statutory authorities and local councils to develop disability access inclusion plans. The plans must align with the six outcomes of the National Disability Strategy (NDS) and adhere to those guidelines and regulations.

Whilst many departments and a few local councils already have a plan, the bill prescribes that agencies produce an annual report from which a statewide summary will be presented to the minister. Plans can be updated at any time and must, at the very least, be reviewed and a report submitted once every four years.

Essentially, this is about a new way of providing a service for those who need it, deserve it and want it. It is not all about sentencing, but I want to draw members' attention to the fact that from time to time people do exploit circumstances where they are required to set certain standards for those who are vulnerable as a result of having a disability, so the bill will provide a number of penalties for those who do the wrong thing.

I think most members would appreciate that people who work in the disability area usually have a level of human compassion that is beyond the realm of most of us. They are people who are dedicated to providing the best they can for those in need in this area, but from time to time some employers, service providers and others do the wrong thing. Firstly, this bill will provide a continuation that any person working with a person living with a disability, who does not hold a current screening check, will face a maximum fine of \$20,000 for a first or second offence and \$50,000 or imprisonment for one year for a third or subsequent offence.

This is a powerful provision and ensures that only those people appropriate to be working with those with disabilities have the appropriate power to do so. It is important to note here also that there is a huge skills shortage—and other speakers, I am sure, will refer to this—in relation to where some of the services are to be provided and, speaking geographically in South Australia, in some of our regional areas. We do not want people to walk away from an opportunity to work in this area and to be upskilled to be able to do that, but please be alert to the obligations in relation to working with vulnerable persons legislation.

Furthermore, any person who has been deemed to be a prohibited person who is found working with a person living with a disability will face a maximum of a \$50,000 fine or one year imprisonment. An employer who employs or continues to employ a prohibited person will face a maximum penalty—that is for a natural person—of a \$50,000 fine or one year imprisonment or, for a body corporate, a maximum of a \$120,000 fine.

I would hope these offences will never need to be prosecuted, but I suspect they may from time to time. I ask members to be aware of them and ensure that they support those who are providing services to abide by them and to certainly insist that there be compliance in relation to the hopefully rare occasions that these provisions will be required.

As the Hon. Michelle Lensink MLC, the proponent and essentially sponsor of this bill, has outlined in another place, the bill seeks to clarify South Australia's role in supporting people with a disability. It sets the state government's future direction, focused on rights and inclusion, in line with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the National Disability Strategy.

It has been a pleasure to see this bill reinvigorated from 2017. There is more to living a fulfilling life than simply being able to access disability services and support. The bill, with this parliament, will confirm that people with disability also have the right to be included in all aspects of the community on an equal basis to other citizens. The disability inclusion plan will help to achieve this.

Inclusion covers ordinary things that might otherwise be taken for granted, like driving, going shopping, working, attending concerts or any other activity. This bill will give a very clear focus. It places at the forefront of the parliament that embracing inclusion and removing barriers is the key.

This means that where previously broader community access and mainstream services and opportunities were not available, through this legislation dedicated planning and action are occurring to ensure attitudinal and physical barriers are being broken down.

In relation to the consultation on the bill, which as has been pointed out was scant, there was a consultation which initially occurred through the YourSAy site in 2017. I have identified previously my concern about simply placing something on a site and expecting that people out there in the real world are sitting around waiting to be consulted on matters and have any idea what is actually happening with it. But in any event, 67 people, at least, through the community meetings came to hear more information about the bill, asked questions and provided feedback, and the Disability Policy Unit received 19 written submissions from stakeholders.

Having read those submissions, I note that it is great to see varying comments from a broad range of groups, including councils, departments, disability service groups and otherwise. I note particularly the submission of the Multiple Sclerosis Society of SA & NT, which concluded their submission with the following information:

- When the most recent data indicates that nearly 20% of the population lives with some form of disability, it is a social and economic imperative that government at all levels demonstrate and 'road test' ways to support inclusive and accessible communities and workplaces;
- Diversity in the workforce makes good business sense;
- Access to sustainable employment is critical to people living with disabilities and to facilitate this, some changes to the recruitment processes may be necessary;
- Reflecting the composition of its community is a reasonable and even desirable requirement of government and can normalise the participation of people with disabilities in the workforce and therefore cultural shift in the way that people with disabilities are seen (and heard) in the general community.

The Office of the Public Advocate, which is part of the Attorney-General's Department, plays a huge role in the lives of people living with disadvantage, and it has also commented on the bill. The office particularly noted in its submission:

We welcome the recognition of the need to improve inclusion of people with disability in all areas of life rather than just in respect of specialist disability services. The National Disability Insurance Scheme will cover reasonable and necessary supports for people with a permanent disability. The object is broad enough to recognise the need to improve inclusion of people with disability in the domains of education, transport, health and employment among other things.

They also consider that the role of the state in this bill is vitally important by stating:

We consider this to be a very important object of the bill during transition to the NDIS where there needs to be clear delineation of roles of the state government with respect to support for persons with disabilities. This will assist in avoiding gaps in support, particularly for people with high and complex needs or vulnerabilities such as young people with disability leaving the care system.

Finally on the submissions, I note that the Local Government Authority expressed concerns regarding adequate resources to produce the disability access and inclusion plan. In response to this DCSI has stated that it will provide templates and additional resources to local councils to assist in accessing the Disability Policy Unit for knowledge and information. Providing such support to these groups is integral to ensure the plans properly come to fruition and cover all aspects, as required by the legislation.

Broadly, as detailed in the engagement summary report, the feedback has largely been positive. People can be nervous about a new scheme and we want to make sure they are supported through the introduction and establishment of this scheme. Aligning the bill with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the National Disability Strategy was widely acknowledged. Essentially, the great aspect of this bill is to have a set of rights-based principles which elevate issues faced by people with disabilities to state legislation.

I want to thank David Caudrey for making himself available to my office and to other members of the government to provide a comprehensive briefing on this bill. David has also detailed that further work will be undertaken regionally. This is important, given the service provision that will be occurring in regions for NDIS, ensuring regional state authorities are properly briefed on their requirements under the act.

I acknowledge the significant work of representatives—like you, sir—who have the responsibility of trying to identify where there are gaps in service provision in regional areas and where the general community and families and friends will be called upon, as they have been in the past, to continue to provide support.

Finally, I note the amendments that were attempted in the Legislative Council and filed by the Hon. Clare Scriven MLC. The amendments are surprising given that this bill is an exact mirror image of the 2017 Labor bill but for the date at the top. I accept that she is a new member and that she might want to put her stamp on something, but it does seem a little curious that that should have been raised. Nevertheless, I commend the bill and welcome its receipt in this house, and I look forward to seeing its passage. It will be a joyous occasion.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (16:53): I would like to make a contribution to the second reading of the Disability Inclusion Bill on behalf of the opposition in this place. The opposition, when in government, ensured that South Australia was one of the first states to sign up to the National Disability Insurance Scheme. This is something our state can be very proud of.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale, are you the lead speaker?

Ms COOK: Sorry, I am; I indicate that I am the lead speaker. Thank you for the reminder. Through the NDIS, the amount spent on the disability sector in South Australia is expected to double, with funding to the sector to equate to around \$1.5 billion every year. Of this, South Australia is expected to commit some \$723 million every year.

I understand that, through this transition, it is expected that the number of people with disability in our community who will access support is expected to double; that is 32,000 South Australians receiving support once the NDIS is fully rolled out. What a great achievement this will be for some of our state's most vulnerable people. It includes some 9,000 people who will receive support through the NDIS for the very first time.

The NDIS equates to better care, choice, control and participation in everyday life for people living with a disability. It is focused on ensuring that every community member can participate in every aspect of everyday life and in our economy. As we transition, we recognise that South Australian legislation must also be updated, and that is why we are today considering the Disability Inclusion Bill 2018. The bill better articulates and better clarifies this state's ongoing role in providing support and assistance for people with disability as we transition to the commonwealth NDIS.

The bill before us broadly focuses on rights and inclusion for people with a disability. This in line with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the National Disability Strategy. The bill legislates to ensure the issues faced by people living with disability in South Australia are integrated into policy and programs that impact them. The bill has a strong focus on disability inclusion planning.

The requirement that a state disability inclusion plan be developed every four years is an important element to this piece of legislation. The requirement that state government departments, statutory bodies and local councils are required to develop and implement their own disability access and inclusion plans every four years is a welcome element of the bill.

The opposition recognises that disability access and inclusion plans are essential to achieving key policy priorities for people with disability in South Australia. These plans will seek to address the barriers and specify the action required to ensure that people with disability can contribute to and participate more fully in their communities. It is important that there is provision to make regulations for a community visitor scheme, particularly in light of the review into how such a scheme may be impacted at a federal level under the NDIS. We support the inclusion of part 7 for the establishment of a scheme for a community visitor or visitors should the need arise.

The opposition moved two separate amendments to this bill in the other place. The first amendment sought to establish an independent disability advocate to safeguard the rights of people with a disability and ensure South Australians get the support they are entitled to. The second amendment sought to increase the number of state government employees with a disability, currently sitting at around 1.4 per cent of the state public sector workforce that identifies having a disability.

This amendment sought to have the government commit to increase the proportion of state public sector employees with a disability to just 3 per cent.

We know that in South Australia more than one in five people, which is around 350,000, or 21 per cent, report having a disability. We know that financial security and employment have been identified as key policy priorities by people with disability in South Australia, so it is imperative that meaningful employment opportunities that provide security for people with disability are available in the South Australian public sector.

The two amendments reinforce the opposition's vision for policy around disability that promotes inclusiveness, capacity building and the opportunity for people with disability to access meaningful employment to support their future. It is unfortunate that the amendments have not been supported.

It comes at a time when the disability community finds itself concerned about the impact of the implementation of the NDIS in a time frame that is currently uncertain and at a time when we are making them now wait for a much-needed advocate. In preparing the amendments, I consulted with the sector and consumers in the disability community. As a result, we were keen to see the support for the calls for an advocate to assist in giving the people in the disability community a voice.

As many in this place would know, the Hon. Kelly Vincent is a strong supporter of the position of disability advocate, and her advice was keenly sought and followed throughout the drafting of the amendments to the government bill. When the human services minister introduced the Disability Inclusion Bill 2018 last month, we seized that opportunity as a way to try to maximise the benefit of that bill early in this term.

We also remember that the Liberal Party in opposition committed to the position of advocate prior to the state election. Throughout the speech yesterday, and following the indication of the crossbench of its support for the principle of an advocate, we look forward to working with the crossbench and with the government to deliver an advocate in as timely a space as possible. I hope to see the support of the crossbench and the government as we work towards a bipartisan solution in this space.

The previous minister for disabilities, now the shadow minister for other portfolios, consulted widely prior to the 17 March election with many non-government organisations and consumers about not just the position of advocate but also the policies for the disability community moving forward. Also, along with the position of advocate as a commitment moving into the election, we had a commitment of the target of a 3 per cent Public Service level for employees with a disability. Both these things are vitally important and we are completely committed to them.

Of course, we are disappointed that we are not yet ready to pass those amendments, but we are comfortable with the outcome, and we look forward to working with the government and with the crossbench in a way to get this as soon as possible. I am not sure at this stage, obviously, how long we will be waiting for that and for the NDIS to be fully rolled out. It is incumbent on the government to be clear to the sector and to the broader community just exactly how it plans to establish the disability advocate and the time line for doing this.

We understand that the Minister for Human Services in the other place has actually done a budget bid for this, so we look forward to seeing the details. We must also remember that, coming to the end of June, many state-funded services are now coming to a close. There is uncertainty moving forward as to how these services will be delivered with the fact that the NDIS full rollout is not happening on 1 July. We call on the government to provide some assurance that people in need will not be ignored and that they will not be left without the much-needed supports and services they require.

I thank the house for enabling me to put these remarks on the record, and I indicate that the Labor opposition will support the passage of this bill.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (17:03): I rise today also to speak on the Disability Inclusion Bill. I was very, very proud to introduce this legislation last year on behalf of our former Labor government and, whilst I was very disappointed that we were not able to progress it before the parliament was prorogued, I am very pleased that it is being dealt with now.

In that regard, I want to note and thank a couple of people for their efforts in the original drafting of the bill, and particularly in that regard I want to thank David Caudrey and also Natalie Wade to whom much of the drafting of the previous bill and, indeed, this bill can be attributed. I am very pleased that this bill is being dealt with now, and I thank and pay tribute to the efforts of the Hon. Michelle Lensink in the other place and also the member for Hurtle Vale and members of the crossbench in that regard.

The National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) is the biggest reform since Medicare. It represents huge opportunity, but it is also complex and comes with some challenges, as does any reform of this size. As other members have mentioned, as a former state government we invested an unprecedented \$723 million into the rollout of the scheme. South Australia was proudly one of the first states to sign up to the scheme as we, the previous Labor government, saw how an individual, person-centred approach had the potential to improve the lives of those living with disability and their families, enabling them to choose the supports and services that would mean they could actively and equally participate in every aspect of community life, employment and the economy.

As the previous minister for disabilities, I saw how the NDIS had begun to change many people's lives for the better as they have choice and control over the services and supports they receive and are helped to achieve their goals and aspirations. However, I also saw the challenges being faced by some people with disability and the sector as we grapple with such a huge change in the way disability services are delivered.

After talking with community members, and bringing together stakeholders to talk honestly and openly about their experiences with the NDIS, I went to Canberra to advocate for South Australians with disability, their families and service providers, and I told the federal minister what is needed to make this rollout effective and efficient. Our party made sure that people with disability and the sector had a voice on what was important to them and what would ensure a successful transition to the NDIS.

One issue that our former South Australian government secured a win on, with and for people with disability, was a commitment to moving back to face-to-face planning. We found that many people were wrongly having their NDIS assessments conducted over the telephone, a practice that simply does not work when you are planning for the future with and for someone with complex needs. To respond to these needs, it is crucial that their planning meetings occur with them in their home so that they are properly heard and that there is a deep understanding developed of them, their environment and what they articulate is needed to improve their day-to-day life.

A big change that comes with the NDIS is that the state government, which has always been responsible for disability services and has directly funded these services, moved this responsibility to the federal government as the NDIS rolls out across our state. It is a transition process that, as a state, we must continually advocate to be well funded and well resourced so that no-one falls through the cracks. In this regard, it is absolutely crucial that we pay particular attention to how transition to the NDIS progresses for those in our community experiencing mental health issues.

South Australians with mental illness must have continuity of service. They must have care and service that are flexible and that recognise changes in their mental health at any given time. They must not be abandoned by this government. Gaps in funding and service must be filled. State Labor took to the election a mental health service guarantee to ensure that any South Australian ineligible for the NDIS or ineligible for all their services under the NDIS would continue to receive their current service.

The Liberal government must step up and make the same guarantee before we see some of our most vulnerable South Australians who need support missing out and before we see jobs lost in the mental health sector and workers who are incredibly compassionate and experienced at supporting and empowering people with mental illness move away from this work and from the many trusted relationships they have with those whom they currently support.

As we move away from providing all services through our state system, the Disability Services Act 1993, which outlines the current role of the state government in the provision of disability services, will not be needed once transition to the NDIS has been completed. This Disability Inclusion Bill represents a shift away from legislation focused on the delivery of services to a framework that

outlines the state's role in supporting and empowering people with disability beyond transition. Fundamentally, and rightly, it focuses on how all South Australians should be included in our community and in our economy.

The bill represents a call to action to state government departments, local councils and statutory authorities to focus on inclusion, requiring them to develop disability access and inclusion plans every four years. These plans will ensure there is a focus on making services and programs accessible to everyone. This will cover building plans, events, how consultation processes are run and so much more.

Everything these organisations do needs to be as accessible and as inclusive as possible if we are to be a state that ensures every community member can fully participate. I very much look forward on the passing of this bill to seeing councils across our state working with our community to develop those plans and bring those plans to life.

It is hoped that by leading the way in accessibility and inclusivity, the private sector will follow suit. We want all members of our community to be able to fully participate and have the opportunity to reach their full potential. One initiative of our previous government that focused on inclusion and accessibility was funding for Changing Places facilities, including Marveloos, portable toilets that met Changing Places specifications.

Some people have to plan their day around when and how they can access a toilet. Spending a day out is not always an option for all South Australians because of the lack of appropriate toilet and changing facilities being available. The Marveloo has been developed as a portable accessible restroom that meets Changing Places specifications. Changing Places toilets and the Marveloos enable people with disability to participate in society with more independence and dignity. By making Marveloos available for festivals and community events, more South Australians will be able to enjoy all that our state has to offer.

People with disabilities should never be left behind. They need to be empowered to have the adjustments they identify that they need to be able to access and enjoy our state on an equal basis with others. I hope that those opposite continue with this plan for Changing Places facilities and Marveloos, and I dearly hope that the disability access and inclusion plans that result from this bill will include such initiatives.

The bill also rightly ensures that people who volunteer or work with people with disability are appropriately screened. It is the responsibility of us all to ensure that anyone who is more vulnerable for any reason is protected and never put in harm's way. I am pleased to commend the bill to the house, and I thank all who have worked on its progress.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (17:12): I rise to support the Disability Inclusion Bill 2018, and I commend the Minister for Human Services and the Attorney-General for advancing this bill. The bill is the fulfilment of a pre-election commitment to reintroduce this legislation within the first 100 days. We are delivering real change, as promised, getting on with the job and work of helping all South Australians and service providers. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to laws to bring about tangible measures that recognise and enshrine rights and responsibilities for people with a disability. The bill demonstrates that we care deeply about all members of the South Australian community.

The Disability Inclusion Bill aims to promote human rights and improve inclusion in the community for South Australians with a disability. It is an important piece of legislation in the context of significant change taking place in the disability sector at the present time. The National Disability Insurance Scheme is transforming the way disability support is funded and delivered across Australia. The NDIS presents a major reform and heralds a new era in provision of services and support for people with a disability, with the emphasis on individual choice and control. South Australia was one of the first jurisdictions to sign up to the NDIS, and will also be one of the first jurisdictions to reach full scheme implementation.

In the context of these major reforms, the Disability Inclusion Bill seeks to clarify South Australia's role in supporting people with a disability. The bill sets the state government's future direction, focused on rights and inclusion, in line with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the National Disability Strategy.

The bill is so important to our South Australian community because people with a disability have the same human rights as other members of the community, and the state and the community have a responsibility to ensure that people with disabilities can fully exercise their rights so that every person has every chance of reaching their full potential and feeling included.

As a community representative and as a new Liberal state government, we are committed to assist people with disabilities to achieve their full potential as equal citizens. We will promote improved access to mainstream supports and services, provide for the screening of persons who want to work and volunteer with people with a disability and prohibit those who pose an unacceptable risk to people with a disability from working or volunteering with them. We will remove barriers to full participation in our community.

Our commitment is for every member to realise and feel included. We believe government should work to remove barriers to equal opportunities wherever they present themselves. We believe South Australia needs sustainable and innovative solutions to provide better outcomes for vulnerable members in our community. I am dedicated to listening to and helping people in my electorate, and I have had people raise many issues related to disabilities. I want to acknowledge some of these examples to highlight challenges in my electorate for which I will advocate for real change in the future.

Let me share some of the challenges raised. A King resident asked for this government to investigate the wait times for disability parking permits when discharged from hospital. My resident asked if there could be consideration of temporary permits. This gentleman said it took over two weeks to issue a disability permit, which held up his recovery and held him up from getting back to work. He could not make and get to appointments until he had his permit. He raised this issue with me so that I could explore how to improve this process for others in the future. I am so proud of the caring community I live in where many people look out for others.

Many King residents raised with me the need for more support for children with disabilities in classrooms so that every child has every chance of reaching their full potential. One such discussion was with a mother who had spent a year advocating for her primary school-age child to be put in special education. She shared with me that her child's first year of primary school was a nightmare because the school staff accused her daughter of being violent and so she was sent home on a regular basis. Then she told me that the past two years, when her daughter was in a special ed. class with a small supported class of four to six, had made significant and important differences to her and her daughter had thrived and was happy, and this is where she needed to be to get the education suited to her developmental needs.

Then, last year, this mother was informed by the previous Labor-led education department that her daughter no longer met the criteria for the special class and that she would have to return to mainstream. Now, a couple of terms later into this year, her child is not coping, has reverted to some of the previous disruptive behaviours and has now been suspended from school. This change has impacted their family life, the classroom, her developmental experience, and also has disrupted the experience of learning for her peers in a new mainstream class. This is heartbreaking for the mother and a huge step backwards for her daughter's confidence and her ongoing development.

A number of parents told me that they believe the education department has a duty of care to provide children with a suitable education that meets their developmental needs, and I heard many stories of where this has not been happening under the leadership of the previous government. I will investigate every one of these challenges on behalf of my constituents and thank them for bringing their stories to me and letting me learn from their experience and their situation so I can become more aware of the importance of the support services they need. I am so proud to be part of a government that is listening and acting across all 47 electorates in South Australia.

Other issues raised by King residents who are participants in the NDIS included the speed of decision-making in the new process, helping people obtain what services best suit them, finding the right providers for services and identifying who can help people navigate the new system. On this, parents who had more than one child with a disability said that they were able to access much better support for the second child, as they had learnt lessons the hard way about the services available, and about budgets and how to navigate the system in the process of helping their first

child. This often meant that they also learnt what their first child missed out on during these important developmental years.

Another issue that was raised with me, on which I sought help, was about delays and gaps in funding. This is difficult for families, who are committed to and can see the benefits of existing support, to deal with. When this delay in money comes about, it can also be difficult for the service providers, especially if they have built up relationships with the family. These issues will help us build better support in the future, now that we know about them.

Lastly, a concern raised by a King resident was the difficulty and cost of accessing appropriate rental housing if the housing has to cater for specific needs of individuals with disabilities. I note all of these issues raised and will certainly be looking to ensure that there are solutions in the future and better services. I encourage community groups and individuals to continue to provide me with examples of lived experiences so that I can best advocate for and represent their needs.

I commend the member for Reynell for her previous comments in regard to the Changing Places facilities, which I also advocated for as a councillor for the City of Tea Tree Gully. As outlined in my maiden speech, I will be a very persistent advocate for the safety of South Australians. I am so pleased that one of the key components of the bill, part 6, is the establishment of an updated disability screening scheme, which will apply to service providers operating under the NDIS as per the national Quality and Safeguarding Framework.

The details of what this entails will be outlined in the regulations, which will be dependent on the commonwealth and the NDIA. However, our state government has indicated that they will not accept any standard below that prescribed for people working with children. Under the bill, any person working with a person living with disability who does not hold a current screening check will face a maximum fine of \$20,000 for first or second offences and \$50,000 or one year imprisonment for third or subsequent offences.

Furthermore, any person who has been deemed to be a prohibited person—part 6, section 21—and who is found working with a person living with a disability will face a maximum fine of \$50,000 or one year imprisonment. An employer who employs or continues to employ a prohibited person will face a \$50,000 fine or one year imprisonment, or a maximum \$120,000 fine. I am so proud to be part of this caring Liberal government, which is steadfast in making change to protect the most vulnerable people in our community, especially children.

In summary, it is expected that the number of people receiving disability support in South Australia will grow from around 17,000 to more than 32,000 people. Funding for disability support will grow from \$760 million to \$1.5 billion and the state government will contribute \$723 million annually. The disability workforce will also double from 6,000 to 12,000 FTEs. This presents a lot of opportunity for better support for South Australians, for new and diverse businesses and for more jobs for South Australians.

We are a caring government that wishes to enable people with a disability to access their community services and achieve better education, service provision and employment opportunities. It is vital that those people with a disability, not just advisory groups, are involved from the very beginning. It is great that we have seen so much involvement to date in disability inclusion and access plans and I will advocate for this to continue.

The Disability Inclusion Bill 2018 promotes the rights and inclusion of all people of all ages living with a disability in South Australia. I commend the bill to members and commend the Hon. Ms Lensink, the Minister for Human Services, for the work she has done to prepare this bill and to advocate on behalf of all South Australians.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (17:24): I rise today to indicate my support for the Disability Inclusion Bill 2018. Fundamentally, this important bill aims to promote human rights and improve inclusion in the community for South Australians with a disability. This is my first time speaking on the issue of disability in this chamber and I note, for obvious reasons, the importance of this issue to me. I hope that I can take a couple of moments to make some high-level comments with regard to disability generally.

Disability—and I want to put on record my personal aversion to the word, although my aversion may well be due to connotation, rather than the word itself—is an issue that is often misunderstood, a word frequently misconstrued and a descriptor for a group of people as diverse in ability as we are in our view on how best to address the issue.

I would like to acknowledge that in the past others in this house and in the other place have talked with reference to my adherence to, and embodiment of, the social model of disability, a model that acknowledges that it is often society that creates barriers for people with a disability succeeding, not disability itself. While I am happy to confirm that this model to a large degree accurately outlines my views on disability generally, I acknowledge that there are other models, models that others support just as passionately.

In regard to the overall picture of disability, I want to make one point. I am sure that I will contribute in a much greater fashion to this high-level debate into the future, but it is very clear to me that in general people with a disability want to be treated no differently from anybody else in society. We simply want to be presented with an equal opportunity to others and are happy to work hard to take advantage of those opportunities presented.

It must also be noted that it is very difficult to accurately determine the true level of disability, both in terms of broad stats or within agencies, sporting clubs or other community groups. Not all disabilities are visible. Not all disabilities are known and not every person with a disability seeks to classify themselves as having such.

I also wish to acknowledge the contribution made to this debate by a previous member of the other place, Kelly Vincent. While I have not spent a large amount of time with Kelly, I respect the work that she has undertaken, and I respect the work that she continues to undertake and the contribution that I am certain she will make to the future of our state.

I want to mention the history of disability services in South Australia. Prior to the introduction of the NDIS, services were provided by DCSI and its predecessors under the Disability Services Act 1993. I was lucky enough to be one of those people who received a range of those services. In fact, I was provided with a number of arms under the limbs scheme—words I am sure probably have not been said in this house before. I am very, very thankful for the opportunity that I was given to receive such things.

Many other people I grew up with who obviously had a disability were provided with other similar supports, whether it be mobility limbs, prosthetic supports or any other services. Delivery of those services, as a state, in general I think was very positive over a long period of time, although, as I am sure everybody is aware, disability is not something that is black and white. Every disability is different. Every person with a disability is different and the needs of every person with a disability are different. Not everybody receiving those services from service providers had the same level of positive experiences perhaps that I had. This was fundamentally one of the key drivers behind the introduction of the NDIS here in Australia.

The introduction of the NDIS was obviously a very clear and substantial change to the approach of disability service provision in Australia and within state jurisdictions. It was fundamentally about empowering people with a disability to give them the right to choose their own supports and services that they sought and saw best to be delivered to help them achieve their own goals in society.

The change that came into place is not unsubstantial both in terms of the service provision aspect and for people with a disability. There were also the added complexities of dealing with heavy unexpected demand in terms of the number of people seeking to access the NDIS and also the substantial change to service providers in terms of their model and business plan.

In terms of the significant change for people with a disability, it was very clear, as I said, that everybody with a disability is different. Everybody, in terms of the services and supports they need, is generally very different, and it is very hard to build a system to accurately and positively help every person with a disability without first asking what that person themselves as an individual wishes to access and wishes support for.

That fundamental change cannot be underestimated in terms of what it means to people with a disability and the positivity those people turned towards when the change was introduced. The level of expectation of people with a disability was of course quite high when the change was introduced. The ability to choose one's services and one's provider, and what one wished to have access to, was a substantial change from the previous arrangements and certainly heightened expectations and, I am sure, in some way drove the increase in demand. That is not necessarily a negative, but it is something that government obviously needs to respond to in an appropriate way.

The transition for service providers has also been quite difficult in relation to the substantial shift in funding arrangements. Previously, most service providers submitted to government a request for block funding that was done on an annual or biannual basis. They were given an amount of money and then they provided those services to the people with a disability who accessed those services. Fundamentally, from a business structure or back office perspective, it is quite simple that a single block funding grant involves only one invoice, only one instance of processing of an invoice and only one application.

The shift in the NDIS to then having so many people individually coming to and invoicing a service provider, and the considerable change in how service providers have to report their service delivery—on a one-on-one basis, the per-unit cost for their service provision—is a substantial change that I think was underestimated by many within the industry. It is certainly something that I think the previous state government did not act quickly enough on. I believe that more could have been done, as there was in other states, with respect to preparing service delivery organisations for the change, which was coming for a long time here in South Australia, noting that we were one of the first states to sign up to the NDIS and will be one of the first states to see a full rollout of the NDIS as well.

Having said that, however, I do believe that the move to the NDIS is a substantially positive change for people with a disability in South Australia, I believe that it is a substantially positive change for people with a disability in Australia more generally and I believe that the issues, particularly from the service providers' perspective, will be worked out in the entirety of time. I hope that we maintain a good level of competition across service provision in South Australia; that is incredibly important.

The basis of the NDIS is a good strong market where people are able to source the services they require, as I have said—the supports and services that help them best achieve their goals in life. Having a truly strong market of service providers in South Australia is incredibly important, and I think this state government—and this applies to other state governments around Australia in terms of their states—will need to make sure that we are vigilant about and supportive of keeping a truly strong market of service providers in our state.

Turning to the bill, the Disability Inclusion Bill, this change is obviously on the back of the substantial change, given the introduction of the NDIS here in South Australia. It is significant, and the disability sector has not seen change to this extent for some time; in fact, I do not think there has ever been a more substantial change in the disability service provision and disability sector in South Australia. Being in this transition, there are certain things that must be taken into account now that the previously state-administered service provision is being shifted and will from now on be delivered by the commonwealth government.

Obviously, with the creation of the NDIS and the NDIA to cover that service provision and that area, and being the first jurisdiction to sign up and the first jurisdiction to see full implementation, we are one of the first jurisdictions that has to consider the ramifications of what that means from a legislative perspective in terms of removing legislation that provided funding for the delivery of services here in South Australia as well as seeking to understand what we need to do in terms of changing legislation around other areas of disability in our state.

That is exactly what this bill does: it clarifies the role that South Australia has moving forward in supporting people with a disability. This clarity is something that is very important and something that people with a disability in South Australia have wanted for a very long time as well. As I have said, the responsibility and the transition have brought on this change in legislation, and people with a disability, from a broader perspective—as I am sure we all support—have a right to be included in all other aspects of the community on an equal basis, not just in regard to service provision by any means.

Inclusion covers ordinary things that may otherwise be taken for granted, and we acknowledge that these are things like the public transport network, attendance at community events, and mainstream services that otherwise, without significant planning, would not be accessible to people with a disability. I note that these factors that prevent inclusion and prevent opportunity are not always just physical.

Many of the barriers presented are often attitudinal and easily preventable as well. The member for Schubert spoke earlier about the real intent of this bill, citing that what we are really trying to achieve here is positive cultural change, a change in the mindset of what people with disability contribute to our society and how we can best make sure they are able to contribute into the future. That is what we are really trying to achieve here.

In terms of what the bill achieves from a more practical standpoint, it will require that a state disability inclusion plan be delivered every four years. State government departments, statutory authorities and local councils will need to develop and implement disability access and inclusion plans (DAIPs), which will sit under the overarching framework included in the state disability inclusion plan. The access and inclusion plans will be there to address and identify barriers, as I have mentioned, specifically to ensure that people with a disability can equally contribute and participate more fully in their communities.

There is a need to involve families of people with a disability, their carers, advocates and peak bodies in the planning of these plans—I hate to say the words 'planning of these plans', but I am sure everyone understands exactly what is involved—the pertinent thing being that inclusion, in terms of going out and talking and engaging with people, is incredibly important in these areas. As I said in my opening remarks, every person with a disability is different and the view of every person with a disability on how to address the issue is also quite divergent, so the more we include people in our engagement around these issues the better.

Another substantial thing that this legislation does is shift the legislative basis for worker screenings to this new bill, the Disability Inclusion Bill, away from the Disability Services Act 1993, where it previously sat. The disability sector and many other sectors have to deal with this issue of pre-screening people working in these arrangements. Although it is not common, it does often happen that people take advantage of the vulnerable. We saw examples of that under the previous government, and it is certainly something that we are not looking to repeat anytime soon.

We are very keen to ensure these arrangements keep happening, and keep happening as quickly as possible in terms of making sure that they are adequate, that the screenings are conducted in a timely manner and that, where possible, we try to mirror the working with children check scheme to ensure that all vulnerable people and those working with vulnerable people are subject to the same safeguarding framework and national quality scheme. The bill also puts forward an opportunity for the Community Visitor Scheme, something that I think is also very important. The ability to make sure that our organisations and the places that look after people with a disability are appropriately checked at times is also something that needs to happen.

Lastly and most importantly, in many ways the bill enables the drafting of general regulations to fill the gaps that emerge as the implementation of the NDIS continues. Something we must also note is that the true extent, the true impact and the true change that the NDIS has and will have in the future for people with a disability, service providers and organisations still has a level of the unknown in terms of what it means for our service providers and for people with a disability more generally.

The transition and the introduction, as we know and as have been said, have been so substantial that what we once knew as the landscape is now very complex and difficult to understand at times and very difficult to navigate, which is why I certainly welcome this government's actions to introduce the NDIS participant advocate. The complex nature of the NDIS system has certainly leant to the creation of this advocate to assist where possible those who are struggling to appropriately access the NDIS scheme. At the end of the day, one thing that I think every person in this house is committed to is ensuring that people with disability access those services that will help them in the future. We certainly do not want process to get in the way of that access by any stretch of the imagination.

Lastly, I want to thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink for introducing this bill to the other place. I believe the haste in which we have had to move this through to ensure the screening provisions are appropriately managed is disappointing, but certainly I think everybody welcomes what this bill seeks to achieve. The reasons why it is there are needed.

I will say again: every person with a disability is different, and every person with a disability deserves to be treated with respect and as an equal. For these reasons, I wholeheartedly support the bill and commend it to the house.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (17:43): May I say at the outset that I am humbled and honoured to follow in my remarks in support of this bill the member for Colton, who is a member of this house and a member of our South Australian community of great distinction and achievement. He exemplifies much that all of us would endeavour to do in our lifetime. I have listened carefully to the remarks of the member for Colton as I have followed the remarks of other members of this place.

In making my remarks in support of the bill, I want chiefly to highlight the change that is in the process of taking place within our national and state legislative environments. As is clear and understood, the introduction of the NDIS is a major change in terms of the funding and delivery of services to people with disabilities across our country. South Australia proudly signed up early to the new structure. That is something that in South Australia we can be proud of in this place, and we continue to follow the process of transition. It is a major implementation process. It is not without its difficulties, but transitioning we are, and that is very much about the delivery and funding side of service provision.

The NDIS tells us that the process is well underway. We are told that, for quarter 3 of 2017-18, the South Australian statistics as at 31 March indicate that 16,221 people from South Australia are taking up NDIS services and 8,823 people in South Australia are receiving support for the first time. There is growth in the order of 10 per cent in the number of participants through this quarter. So there is a transition still very much underway, but there are a significant number of people now receiving services via the NDIS.

The NDIS further tells us that 179 children between the ages of zero and six are receiving support through early childhood early intervention. In dollar terms, an amount of \$834 million has been committed to participant supports to date. In illustrating the delivery and funding side that the NDIS is now in the process of picking up, the NDIS emphasises further that, so far as young people are concerned—that is, children aged from zero to 14—a large majority of families and carers of participants in that age range are feeling confident or very confident supporting their child's development. That is encouraging.

Similarly, the NDIS tells us that a large majority of participants have rated their satisfaction with the planning processes as being good or very good. I will come back in my remarks to the experience of some of my constituents, in particular, in the perhaps fraught circumstance of the care of people with a disability in the older age ranges, but it is encouraging to note that the NDIS is reporting those encouraging figures in relation to children aged zero to 14. That is the funding and delivery side in which we are experiencing a transition under the new NDIS arrangements.

The bill before the house this evening, in facilitating the transition from and leading to the repeal of the Disability Services Act 1993, is very much an opportunity for the state to move from being the primary funder of these services to being the source and driver of systems and structures that will foster a culture of both inclusivity and possibility for all South Australians. That is very much what this legislation is all about, that is, the long-term vision we all share to bring about an inclusive society and one in which our culture is driven not solely around processes of funding and delivery but, rather, around being able to ensure that we all have full and complete access to being the best that we can be in all our day-to-day endeavours.

While highlighting that aspect of this change, I observe that this is something that we in South Australia have a long and proud history of doing in so many areas. We in South Australia are proud of having fostered a culture of openness and inclusivity over the course of the better part of the last century. South Australia has so often led the way in terms of increasing liberalisation, increasing recognition of diversity, and looking for ways to further and foster our culture of promoting and looking for inclusivity, understanding and possibility for all people across our society.

This is the sort of shift and the sort of legislation that in South Australia we might say comes naturally to us. In willingly handing over the funding and delivery side to the commonwealth, I look forward, in this place, to increasingly participating in this space with a view to the ongoing fostering of a leading culture of inclusivity across the board.

We make this change at this time in circumstances where we now have an opportunity to set in place structures for public bodies to think about in a structured way, and to publish and review and be accountable for the ways in which they go about ensuring that people, including people with disabilities, are able fully to live their lives, including doing all the things that many of us take very much for granted but which for some people cannot be so easily taken for granted due to their personal circumstances.

Those things include many of the activities that have been adverted to by others already, such as the day-to-day transport arrangements, catching buses, attending events, going to shops or sport, getting out and about socialising, participating in educational activities, and so on. It is about access to broader community activities and services across the board and it sometimes requires a level of dedicated and proactive activity by public authorities in order to ensure that inclusion is enhanced and that barriers, where they exist, either naturally or by omission or by the failure to proactively act, can be removed.

Quite appropriately, the bill before the house provides primarily for the preparation and publication of plans, chief amongst those being the state disability inclusion plan, which will be the overarching and guiding document for state disability inclusion activities. The bill also provides a requirement for each of the state government departments, each statutory authority and each of the local councils to develop and implement a disability access and inclusion plan every four years. For those who are affected by or engaged with any and each of those bodies, a list of the bodies will be prescribed and then will be found in regulations once the legislation is passed.

The state disability inclusion plan will be the overarching framework and the disability access and inclusion plans will provide those agencies with an opportunity to detail the particular ways in which they will go about improving access to their services and programs. I emphasise that this is about endeavouring, in an organised way, to bring about a culture of steady improvement. It is to be contrasted with elements in the approach that we see in the amendments moved by the opposition.

Importantly, and I do not raise this to score points in this regard, I want to particularly emphasise that what we are about is ensuring that everybody in this state is able to get on board with the incremental improvement of culture in this state. The amendments that have been proposed by the opposition—

Mr MULLIGHAN: Point of order: I am loath to rise on a point of order, particularly when the member for Heysen is speaking, given he is such a good contributor to this chamber, but he does debate amendments that are not yet being considered by the house. When he continues his remarks after the dinner break, I ask him to confine his remarks to the bill. He will have an opportunity to debate the amendments when they are before us.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Lee. The member for Heysen will contain his remarks to the intent of the bill.

Mr TEAGUE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. In the short time remaining, rather than reflect upon the amendments as such, I want to emphasise, immediately before the break, that this is about a positive and incremental change to culture. It ought not be about penalties and compliance. I will continue by remarks after the break.

Sitting suspended from 17:59 to 19:30.

Mr TEAGUE: This legislation is very much about the development and the furthering of a culture of inclusivity, and that is the kind of thing that we here in South Australia have a long and proud heritage of doing extraordinarily well. So, to the extent that the transfer and restructure of the delivery and funding side has been transferred to the commonwealth, which presents this opportunity for us as a state government to shift the focus to culture, that opportunity is before us and that is what the legislation is addressing.

I have indicated that the primary purpose of the legislation is to provide for the plans. The legislation also does a number of supplementary things, including providing for a national Quality and Safeguarding Framework, that is, to provide a means to ensure that the delivery process of the NDIS is rolled out as effectively as it possibly can be. I referred to and adverted to some of the statistics that have been provided to us by the NDIS, particularly in relation to the delivery and the high level of satisfaction that has been reported by those in receipt of NDIS services for children in the zero to 14 age range.

I wish to refer to some of the particularly difficult circumstances that are faced by families who are struggling to provide the very best of care to an adult—a grown son or daughter cared for by parents—and the particular challenges that are associated with that. There are families throughout the state who are in that very situation, and the tremendous dedication shown by parents to continue to provide a framework for adult children in particular is something that I have been very much aware of in the course of travelling throughout my electorate.

What has been raised with me is something that I hope we might all be conscious of in this transition: that families and parents have worked very hard, and often over decades, to reinforce and to build the competency, confidence and capacity of those in their care within the family scenario. They have had provision by the state under the old scheme and they are now being required to transition into the NDIS environment. It is reported to me that that often involves having to reconstruct or revisit from scratch the circumstances that that particular person may face in order to justify the benefits that may flow.

As others have referred to, I think it is very important that the NDIS assessment process is done in a very thorough way, personally and very much with an awareness of the particular circumstances of not just the person with a disability in receipt of those services but also the broader family context and those who are endeavouring to do all they can to maximise the opportunities that an adult in their care faces.

In concluding my remarks, I again wish to draw attention to the stark contrast between what this legislation is setting out to do in requiring public bodies to set out, in a formal way, a framework for how they are going to go about maximising opportunities for all of us in our society. It is not legislation focused on compliance and penalty. We should never approach this space driven by an overriding sense of compliance and penalty. Rather, we should look to create an environment and a culture within this state that maximise opportunities across the board for all of us to live full lives. With those words, I commend the bill to the house.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (19:35): I also rise to speak in support of the Disability Inclusion Bill, which comes from the other place and was introduced by the Minister for Human Services. Hopefully, with the support of this house—which we have heard members from both sides speak of—we will seek to introduce a bill that will promote the full inclusion of people with a disability in the community. Furthermore, the bill aims to:

- assist people with disability to achieve their full potential as equal citizens;
- promote improved access to mainstream supports and services by people with disability;
- provide for the screening of persons who want to work or volunteer with people with disability;
- prohibit those who pose an unacceptable risk to people with disability from working or volunteering with them;
- provide for a community visitor scheme; and
- provide for responsibilities of the state, during and following the transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

This Disability Inclusion Bill has a whole-of-government approach. This means everyone in state government and includes things like public transport, education, justice, health care, housing, community events and public spaces, all of which are elements the state government touches on and is seeking to address in this bill. The Disability Inclusion Bill aims to strengthen the current

requirements for ensuring services and facilities are accessible and responsive to people with disability.

This new focus is driven by the National Disability Strategy as well as Australia's international obligations to those suffering from a disability, which are included in, but not limited to, the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) is transforming the way that disability support is funded and delivered across Australia. We are currently in a period of transition from the state administrative system to a national scheme delivered by the commonwealth government.

The NDIS represents a major reform and heralds a new era in the provision of services and supports for people with disability, with an emphasis on individual choice and control. As others have touched on, South Australia was one of the first jurisdictions to sign up to the NDIS and will also be one of the first jurisdictions to reach full scheme implementation by mid year.

With the rollout of the NDIS in South Australia, it is expected that people receiving disability support will grow from around 17,000 to more than 32,000 people, that funding for disability support will grow from \$760 million to \$1.5 billion and that the disability workforce will double, from 6,000 to 12,000 full-time equivalents. Referring back to the latest NDIS quarterly report as at 31 March, it further reinforces that there has been growth in this area over and above those 32,000 people.

In South Australia now, 8,800 people are receiving support for the first time, and 16,000 people are benefiting from the NDIS. I will refer back to these figures a bit later and touch on them further. The final part before I proceed is that \$834 million has been committed to participate in support to date. So funding is coming, and you can see that this transition is occurring, hence the reason why we need to address it so urgently. It has come back as the Marshall Liberal team's plan for the first 100 days.

The emphasis on individual choice and control presents challenges for participants who live with a disability. Some of these challenges include how to obtain what they need in their own plan. They need to find the right providers and also identify who can help them navigate the system. I have had some experience with these transitional programs from my time on council in terms of aged care. Originally, the aged-care provision was done through the Home and Community Care program, which was a block funding program. This moved to the Commonwealth Home Support Programme.

This is the same sort of methodology that gives the individual choice. However, sometimes for certain segments of the community, this choice presents challenges. These participants in the program need to be guided and helped through this program so that they can transition, because it is confronting sometimes to actually try to identify who can help you navigate the system and also to find those right providers.

While it is a challenge for the participants, it is also a challenge for the providers. At present, in this sector in South Australia there are close to 1,500 registered NDIS providers, with approximately one-third being sole traders. They are also facing challenges with the introduction of the NDIS insofar as there is no more block funding. As providers of the service, they now are competing effectively against other providers for the people with disability to use their services, because they are now operating in a commercial market.

It is also true that there is low pricing that has been set by the NDIA, so they are constrained a bit by the price they charge. This presents challenges from the staffing point of view, as to how they staff it, but also with the increase in providers I touched on before, looking at growing from 17,000 up to 32,000, more staff will need to come online. I think I spoke before about the figure of 6,000 FTE moving up to 12,000.

Again, touching on the NDIS quarterly report up to 31 March, in terms of the providers there has been growth from 1,500, which I referred to previously, to a newer figure of 1,695—so close to 1,700 providers, an 11 per cent increase. These providers are providing a good service, and 93 per cent of the families or carers of children, especially, aged between zero and 14 feel confident or very confident supporting their child's development. Also, 77 per cent of those families or carers of participants aged between zero and 14 feel that the NDIS has improved their ability to help them

and their child develop and learn. It is important that the transition occurs smoothly because the benefits are certainly there.

The bill seeks to address that. It does so by considering and putting in place a wideranging set of principles to be observed in not only the operation of this act but also the administration and enforcement of that. I would just like to highlight some of those that were addressed. It is by no means all, but they are some that really do resonate.

People with disability have the same fundamental human rights and responsibilities and the same right to autonomy as other members of the community. That speaks to the inclusion that this bill seeks to encourage. People with disability have the right to participate in and contribute to social development and economic life and should be supported to develop and enhance their ability to do so. People with disability have the right to live free from neglect, abuse and exploitation. At the same time as introducing this bill, the government is also introducing other bills to protect children and vulnerable adults, so this bill works in unison with that.

Another point is that the crucial role of families, carers and other significant persons in the lives of people with disability, and the importance of preserving relationships with families, carers and other significant persons is to be acknowledged and also respected. The Attorney-General spoke about some of the sacrifices that families and carers make. They are very compassionate and dedicated people, who are providing support in sometimes quite demanding and exhaustive circumstances. I would also like to acknowledge the crucial role that families play in assisting people with disability.

Introducing this bill will achieve an inclusive society as the long-term vision, but it will also require consistent efforts. The bill aims to support this by ensuring that appropriate planning takes place in a coordinated manner, both across the state and also with other agencies, including local governments. In fact, one of the key components of the bill is requiring that the state government develops a state disability inclusion plan, which will be developed every four years.

This requirement will provide this state's disability inclusion plan with the overarching framework that other agencies can base theirs upon because, while there is also a requirement for state governments to introduce this plan, it is also a requirement for state government departments, statutory authorities and local councils to develop and implement what is known as a disability access and inclusion plan every four years. These plans must align with the six outcomes of the National Disability Strategy. They will detail how agencies will improve access to their services and programs and specify the action required to ensure that people with disability can participate more fully in their communities.

As the member for Schubert stated, in a way these plans are meant to be proactive. They are not trying to be based on compliance but, rather, to implement a cultural change to improve and make positive change that is enduring, and to make agencies look at their current plans to see if it can be done a different way to hopefully see some quick wins as well now that this becomes part of their focus in terms of how they go about things.

Another key component of the bill is the establishment of an updated disability screening scheme, which will apply to service providers. Where possible, the bill mirrors the new working with children check scheme that is being established through the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016. The idea here is to maintain a standard that is, at the very least, equivalent to that which is prescribed for people working with children so that they are protected. We have seen that the Liberal government is focused on the protection of children in other legislative bills we have discussed so far this week.

Under this bill, any person working with a person living with a disability who does not hold a current screening check will face a maximum fine of \$20,000 for the first or second offence and a \$50,000 fine or imprisonment for one year for a third and subsequent offence. Furthermore, any person who has been deemed to be a prohibited person, who is found working with a person living with a disability, will face a maximum \$50,000 fine or one year imprisonment. An employer who employs, or continues to employ, a prohibited person will also face a maximum \$50,000 fine or one year imprisonment for a natural person, or should it be a body corporate, a maximum \$120,000 fine.

Hopefully, this level of enforcement is not required and it will ensure that people working with disabilities are appropriate to deal in that field, but it is also there for the protection of others. As the member for Heysen stated, it is not about compliance and penalty. It is actually trying to enact a cultural change to organisations to provide inclusion for all people.

At the same time, this bill also includes the ability to make regulations for a community visitor scheme. As I have discussed previously, at the moment we are transitioning to the NDIS and currently there is a South Australian disability Community Visitor Scheme that operates under the Disability Services Act 1993. This scheme will continue to operate during the transition to the NDIS.

In summary, I conclude by saying that the Disability Inclusion Bill aims to improve inclusion in the community for South Australians with disability. It is an important piece of legislation in the context of significant change that is currently taking place in the disability sector. I commend this bill to the house.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (19:50): I rise to address the Disability Inclusion Bill. The bill has six principal objectives. The first is to promote the full inclusion in the community of people with disabilities. The second is to assist people with a disability to achieve their full potential as equal citizens with equal rights. The third is to promote improved access to mainstream supports and services by people with disability. The fourth is to provide for the screening of persons who want to work or volunteer with people with a disability and to prohibit those who pose an unacceptable risk to people with disability from working or volunteering with them.

There is also the objective to provide for a community visitor scheme. I also mention the objective to provide for and to outline the responsibilities of the state during and following the transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme, which, as you know, Mr Speaker, is underway. There are certain other purposes which I will not reflect on now but which are also important and can, of course, be gleaned from the text of the bill. As the minister has made clear in the other place, the bill seeks to clarify South Australia's role in supporting people with a disability and sets out our future direction.

That direction is clearly focused on the rights and needs of disabled South Australians and on Australia's international obligations in that respect. One of the essential components of the bill is an obligation cast on the state government to develop a state disability inclusion plan. Importantly, the bill also casts an obligation on state government departments and councils to develop disability access and inclusion plans. I observe that several departments and some councils have adopted disability access and inclusion plans already and we recognise the work these departments and councils have performed. It may be necessary for those plans to be revised to ensure they are consistent with the legislation now before us.

The bill also contemplates the establishment of an updated disability screening scheme. It is intended that the scheme will apply to service providers operating under the National Disability Insurance Scheme. I observe that there are certain offences in the bill. I do not wish to dwell on them as there has already been sufficient commentary provided in this house as to the nature of those offences. Certain other offences apply to prohibited persons, and I refer to part 6 and clause 21 of the bill in that respect.

The bill also has a provision for the establishment of a community visitor scheme, as I mentioned. I have in mind part 7 of the bill. In my first remarks in this place, I reflected that I am committed to being an advocate for the rights and needs of disabled people. As you know, my stepmother has multiple sclerosis. It is a hard disease. She uses a wheelchair and from time to time she loses her sight. You will know, Mr Speaker, that multiple sclerosis is a disease which, in part, attacks the nervous system. I also reflect on the fact that my uncle is a disability care coordinator. I am familiar with some of his work. It is significant and important work.

I will briefly address certain local disability concerns raised with me. The township of Mount Barker, and other townships in the Hills and Fleurieu growth corridors, are growing rapidly. In my electorate, the growth is a direct consequence of the previous government's decision to rezone large areas of farming land for a housing development. It was a shameful decision made despite the objections of my community.

Those objections were very clearly expressed to the government of the day. In Kavel, we are dealing with the consequences of that decision. One consequence is the pressure placed on parking in the main streets of many towns. I mention Mount Barker in particular. Similar pressures are faced by the residents of Nairne, Woodside and of course Hahndorf, which comes under particular and unique pressure from tourist traffic.

I acknowledge that the local council, the Mount Barker District Council, has been working to improve disability parking. The availability of disabled parking in the township was raised with me by Mr John Cornaggia, the past president of the Blind Sporting Council of South Australia, who lives within Kavel, and who I met when I was doorknocking during the course of the most recent state election campaign.

John's family discovered that he had glaucoma when he was four. When doctors operated on his right eye it haemorrhaged, and he suffered blindness in that eye. At the age of 16, John was successful in obtaining his driver's licence in consequence of the sight which he continued to enjoy in his left eye. He drove predominantly on the farm. Later, I understand, John's eyesight in the eye that remained deteriorated further and he was informed by a leading eye specialist that nothing more could be done to restore his sight.

I thank John for his advocacy and for raising the matter of disabled parking with me. It was a pleasure to meet and speak with him. His life is an extraordinary one, and he has given substantial service to those with disabilities in our state and in Kavel. He deserves better recognition than speaking on this bill on this occasion naturally allows. However, his story, as I have briefly shared it with you, is one example that motivates me to be a strong representative for the rights and needs of those with a disability who live in our communities.

I commend the minister in the other place and the Attorney-General in the house for advancing this legislation. I commend the bill to the house and hope that it will pass speedily.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (19:56): I am very pleased to rise today in support of the Disability Inclusion Bill. I also would like, as many others have, to commend the Minister for Human Services in the other place for her efforts and advocacy in this very important area.

Ultimately, what this bill seeks to do is to promote the rights and improve inclusion of those in our community with a disability. In everything that we do here in this place it is important to ensure that everyone in our community is included and that people are not left behind. It is about equality of opportunity and empowering people to reach their full potential. What people decide to do with an opportunity is a matter for them, but it is essential that we do everything we can whenever we can to ensure that those opportunities exist. This is indeed the essence of what this bill does.

This is all happening in the context of a great deal of change occurring in the disability sector at the moment, as the model for providing support is being fundamentally altered. This shift is leading to a transition from a state-administered system to a national scheme, the National Disability Insurance Scheme, which is being delivered by the federal government. The national scheme brings about a significant change in that funding is provided to the individual through a care package to then be used to purchase services from a selection of providers, personalising that support and providing much greater choice and much greater control over the support that is provided to individuals and, ultimately, over their own lives.

Crucially, this change is also coming about with a dramatic increase in the total quantum and also the range of disability services that is available. It is expected that the number of people in South Australia receiving disability support will grow from around 17,000 to 32,000. Funding for disability support will grow from \$760 million to \$1.5 billion, \$723 million of which will be contributed by the state government. The disability workforce will double, from 6,000 to 12,000 full-time equivalents.

While there have been some teething issues in rolling out such a large program, it is undoubtedly a fact that it is very positive that we are seeing greater resources and support for people in our community. However, this bill recognises that there is more to leading a fulfilling life than having access to disability services, that is, by ensuring that measures are taken right across multiple tiers of government to ensure that people living with a disability are included in all aspects of our society.

The bill promotes the rights and inclusion of people living with a disability in South Australia. It establishes a high-level framework, ensuring that a coordinated and consistent planning approach is taken across state and local governments to provide for greater access to services and facilities. A key component of the bill requires the state government to develop a state disability inclusion plan that would be reviewed once every four years and require annual reports on its operation. The bill also requires all state departments, statutory authorities and local councils to develop disability access and inclusion plans. These plans must align with the six outcomes of the National Disability Strategy and adhere to those guidelines and regulations.

While a number of councils already produce such plans, the bill requires that agencies produce an annual report that will be collated to produce a statewide summary to be presented to the minister. Such plans can be updated at any time, but at a minimum they must be reviewed every four years. Another key component of the bill is the establishment of an updated disability screening scheme, which will apply to service providers operating under the NDIS as per the NDIS national Quality and Safeguarding Framework.

The details of what this entails will be outlined in the regulations that will be dependent on the commonwealth and the National Disability Insurance Agency. However, the state government has indicated that it will not accept any standard below that which is prescribed for people working with children. Under the bill, any person who does not hold a current screening check will face a maximum fine of \$20,000 for the first offence and \$50,000 or imprisonment for one year for third or subsequent offences.

Furthermore, any person who has been deemed to be a prohibited person and who is found working with a person living with a disability will face a maximum \$50,000 fine or one year imprisonment. An employer who employs or continues to employ a prohibited person will face a maximum fine of \$50,000 or one year of imprisonment for a natural person or a maximum of a \$120,000 fine for a body corporate.

Whilst we would hope that such penalties would never be needed, it is important to send the signal and make the point that only those people who are appropriate should provide services to people who may be vulnerable in our community. The bill also has a provision for the establishment of a community visitors scheme, which is in part driven by the NDIS Quality and Safeguarding Framework. It will also provide for regulations to be made in relation to the transitioning to the NDIS. A review of the act must be undertaken and a report tabled after the third and before the fourth anniversary of the act.

The NDIS is an issue that has certainly come up frequently amongst constituents and providers, who vary in concern over understanding how the process works and various other issues relating to that—essentially, getting used to what is a fundamental change in how such services are funded and provided. I also hear the very positive and hopeful thoughts of people who are involved in these areas and who can see the enormous potential of this scheme once it is fully rolled out and some of the kinks have been straightened out.

Of course, a number of people in my electorate care for a member of their family who is living with a disability, and a number of them have spoken to me about various issues, particularly local issues. One of the key things this bill really goes to is that part of the ordinary thinking of decision-makers is to ensure that people with a disability are included in that thinking. Some of the issues raised are over things that would not immediately come to mind for many of us. They can include things like access at bus stops, the positioning of pedestrian access, even crossings on some local roads; in fact, even traffic light sequencing at particular intersections has been raised as an issue that can affect some people.

There are other issues beyond these which should be addressed in the future but which will not necessarily be addressed at this point. Earlier, the Attorney-General raised an issue about housing, and this has been raised with me as well. I do hope that it is on the agenda into the future. It is often from families who are concerned about security of housing for family members, particularly for their children when the parents are no longer with us.

I have also heard a lot of very positive stories about some of the innovation that has gone on in this area. A particular example raised with me recently was of a local couple who have a grandson

who has low-functioning autism. He was one of the first people in the state to have an autism assistance dog. Essentially, if a young child is walking down the street with their family and they have a dog that is trained in very much the same way as a guide dog would be for someone who is vision impaired, the child is tethered to the dog and the dog, if it is concerned that the child is perhaps straying off the footpath, will just plonk itself on the ground like an anchor and literally stop the child from straying.

This was such an innovative application that the International Guide Dog Federation magazine *Visionary*, in one of its editions—I think towards the end of 2016—actually had a picture of this gentleman's grandson with the dog on its front cover. That was a wonderful thing, and he was incredibly proud of his grandson's being part of that.

This is all part of what this bill is ultimately seeking to do: as many others have said, it is to drive that broader cultural change so that when we are making decisions across the state it is automatic to think about how the decisions will impact on people who live with a disability to ensure that ultimately everyone is included and everyone has an equal opportunity to succeed and live a long and fulfilling life in whatever manner they wish. I am very pleased to commend this bill to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (20:08): I rise to speak to the Disability Inclusion Bill 2018. I note we have had quite a few speakers from this side of the house as well as from the other side, and there seems to be quite a consensus to get this legislation through in good time, and for good reason—because we need to do whatever we can to support people living with a disability.

The National Disability Insurance Scheme is currently being rolled out. Under the scheme the state government will no longer directly fund disability services. Instead, these services will be administered by the National Disability Insurance Agency, which will work directly with eligible participants to establish personalised plans based on their needs and goals, giving them choice and control over their own lives. Following the full implementation of the NDIS, the Disability Services Act 1993, which was designed to regulate services and provide funding mechanisms, will become redundant.

The Disability Inclusion Bill promotes the rights and inclusion of people living with a disability in South Australia. The bill establishes a high-level framework to ensure that a coordinated and consistent planning approach is taken across both state and local government and provides for greater equality and access to services and facilities. One of the key components of the bill is the requirement for the state government to develop a state disability inclusion plan, which will be reviewed once every four years and will require annual reports on its operation.

It also requires all state departments, statutory authorities and local councils to develop disability access and inclusion plans (DAIP). The disability access and inclusion plans must align with the six outcomes of the National Disability Strategy and adhere to those guidelines and regulations. Whilst many departments and a few local councils already have a DAIP, the bill prescribes that agencies produce an annual report from which a statewide summary will be presented to the minister. The plans can be updated at any time but must, at the very least, be reviewed and a report submitted once every four years.

The other key component of the bill is the establishment of an updated disability screening scheme, which will apply to service providers operating under the NDIS as per the national Quality and Safeguarding Framework. The details of what this entails will be outlined in the regulations, which will be dependent on the commonwealth and the NDIA. However, the state government has indicated that it will not accept any standard below what is prescribed for people working with children, which is obviously very serious.

Under the bill, any person working with a person living with a disability who does not hold a current screening check will face a maximum fine of \$20,000 for the first or second offence and \$50,000 or imprisonment for one year for third or subsequent offences. Furthermore, any person who has been deemed to be a prohibited person who is found working with a person living with a disability will face a maximum of \$50,000 or one year's imprisonment. An employer who employs or continues to employ a prohibited person, as a natural person, will face a maximum of a \$50,000 fine or one year's imprisonment or, as a body corporate, a maximum of a \$120,000 fine.

The bill also has a provision for the establishment of a community visitor scheme, which is in part driven by the national Quality and Safeguarding Framework. The bill also provides for regulations to be made in relation to the transitioning to the NDIS. A review of the act must be undertaken and a report tabled after the third and before the fourth anniversary of the commencement of the act.

The Disability Inclusion Bill undertook an engagement process via YourSAy, with 67 people attending the public meetings and 19 written submissions being made. All people were supportive of the broad principles of the bill. The Local Government Association expressed concerns regarding adequate resources to produce the DAIPs. In response, DCSI have stated that they will provide templates and additional resources to local councils to assist, and they will give access to the disability policy unit for knowledge and information. Council areas, for example rural areas or small councils, will also be able to produce a joint DAIP with permission from the minister.

Certainly, we on this side of the house are supporting the legislation. We note support from the opposition, but we note that there were some amendments attempted in the other place, tabled by the Hon. Clare Scriven. The proposed amendments sought to create a disability advocate—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Point of order: there are no amendments before this house, and it was ruled earlier that discussion is not allowed on that.

The SPEAKER: On what, sorry? The point of order was for—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Amendments that were defeated in the upper house.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for reference to debate in another place. Could the member please return to the second reading substance.

Mr FEDERICK: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In a general way, some people propose that there be a disability advocate and that the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment be required to take such steps as may be reasonably practicable to ensure that at least 3 per cent of the persons employed in the Public Service are people with a disability. A commitment was made by others to establish a disability advocate role, which was valued at \$200,000, the idea of which was, in a general sense, to assist people living with a disability and their families to transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme. There was a general idea of another \$400,000 for community advocacy support.

On this side of the house, we support the bill as it is because it aims to promote the absolute human rights and improve the inclusion in the community for South Australians who live with a disability. There is significant change taking place right now, which we see right across the country, whether in the local government sector, state governments and, obviously, at the federal level where they are directing the scheme. Obviously, it filters down through the other two levels of government. In the main, it seems to be getting pretty good results across the way. Like anything, it can have its teething problems but, from what I understand, it opens up avenues for some people who may not have been able to access funding before.

I note that, initially, the federal government were going to increase the Medicare levy, but they realised they did not have to because they had built up enough surpluses in the Turnbull Liberal government to fund the scheme. I commend them for their budgetary measures and controls. The National Disability Insurance Scheme is absolutely transforming the way disability support is funded and delivered across Australia. As I was saying, it is in a period of transition from what has been a state-based system to a national scheme delivered by the commonwealth government. The NDIS represents major reform, and it heralds a new era in the provision of services and supports for people living with a disability.

The emphasis—and this is very serious—is on individual choice and control, so that people can have those individualised contracts, and carers, or the people themselves, can manage the money in the appropriate way for whatever services the person living with a disability may need. I think it will give the right outcome, and that is certainly the aim of it for everyone living with a disability.

We were one of the first jurisdictions to sign up to the NDIS, and we will also be one of the first jurisdictions to reach full implementation with the scheme from mid next year. In the context of these major reforms, the Disability Inclusion Bill seeks to clarify South Australia's role in supporting

people with a disability. It sets out the state government's future direction, which for very good reasons is focused on rights and inclusion in line with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) and the National Disability Strategy.

As stated before, at the state level previously the state government was responsible for funding providers to deliver services to people with a disability. In 1993, the Disability Services Act was created for that very purpose. It is therefore a service-oriented act, established to administer funding and regulate the state disability services sector. While services are in transition, the South Australian government is progressively handing over responsibility for disability services and support to the commonwealth government and the National Disability Insurance Agency.

Once the transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme is fully realised, the Disability Services Act 1993 will not be required because the state government will no longer directly fund the services. Instead, the NDIA will work with eligible individuals to create a personal budget, as I indicated before, to pay for their chosen services and supports. That could involve gym sessions, physiotherapy and a whole range of other supports that may be needed on an individual basis.

We know that there is more to living a fulfilling life than simply being able to access disability services and supports. People living with a disability also have a right to be included in all other aspects of the community on an equal basis with other citizens. Inclusion covers ordinary things that a lot of people will take for granted, things as simple as using public transport, attending community events, getting out to do a bit of shopping, having a social day out at the football, or participating in educational activities or specific training, for instance.

The scheme also means broader access to community and mainstream services and opportunities that without dedicated planning and action are not always easily available to people with disability, due to various factors like attitudinal and physical barriers. This is what the Disability Inclusion Bill is all about. It is enhancing inclusion and removing these barriers. They are the focus of this legislation.

As part of the NDIS, these challenges were recognised, and this was Australia's response to the ratification of the UNCRPD. The state government will have a role in the future in implementing the aims of the NDIS and the UNCRPD once the NDIS is fully rolled out. The principles and vision of these landmark documents set the policy foundation for the Disability Inclusion Bill. The bill is underpinned by a range of rights-based principles that reflect the tone of the UNCRPD and the NDIS.

These principles are based on a recognition that, whilst people with disability have the same fundamental human rights as others, they often feel undervalued as citizens and experience difficulty finding a place in the wider community. That is why this bill, with these principles, will give visibility to the issues faced by people with a disability. The overall purpose of the bill is to ensure that these issues are considered and the views of people with disability are incorporated into policies and programs that affect them.

Also, the legislation is there to articulate a range of rights specific to certain groups who, it is generally accepted, face additional challenges and vulnerabilities. This includes women with disability, children with disability, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people with disability, and culturally and linguistically diverse people with disability. These principles will be brought to life through disability inclusion planning, another key feature of the bill.

Obviously, the long-term vision is that we achieve an inclusive society, and it will take some consistent effort over time to achieve that goal. The legislation, through this bill, supports this by ensuring that appropriate planning takes place in a coordinated manner across both state and local government. This planning will then underpin a more inclusive community, which provides a quality of access to mainstream services and facilities for people with disability in line with the six outcome areas of the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

Every four years, a state disability inclusion plan will be developed under the bill and, as I mentioned before, there is the requirement for state government departments, statutory authorities and local councils to develop and implement a disability access and inclusion plan. The statutory authorities required to do this will be prescribed through regulations at a later stage once the legislation has passed both houses, and this will obviously be done in consultation with affected organisations.

The state disability inclusion plan will be the overarching framework, and it will set the state government's disability inclusion agenda and provide guidance to agencies for developing disability access and inclusion plans. There is a lot of work to do. I wish the bill a speedy passage through this place so that we can get the work done on the ground to make life a whole lot better for people living with disability and let them have the inclusive rights that they deserve.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (20:29): I rise to conclude the second reading stage of this bill and thank all speakers on both sides for their contributions. This is gladly one of those times when this parliament can, to the largest degree, work together towards a very sensible outcome. We look forward to putting in place the bill as it stood last year with some minor amendments around improving the power of chief executives and not progressing other amendments which might get in the way of the culture change that this bill seeks to enact.

We look forward to those provisions being put in place, especially around the checks to ensure that people who work with people with a disability have the appropriate clearances and that we can safeguard them against being abused or mistreated by those who have a criminal history. I also look forward to the Disability Services Act becoming redundant sometime in the medium-term future and I look forward to repealing a piece of legislation, perhaps something we should try to do a little more of from time to time. With those words, I thank everybody and look forward to the speedy passage of this bill.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (20:31): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ELECTORAL (PRISONER VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 June 2018.)

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (20:32): I rise to speak today to the Electoral (Prisoner Voting) Amendment Bill 2018. Through this bill, the Marshall government fulfils an election commitment to prevent prisoners who are serving a term of three years' imprisonment or longer from voting in state elections. Committing an offence that attracts a prison term of three years or longer is so serious that the consequences ought to go beyond imprisonment to forfeiting their voting rights for the duration of their sentence.

These changes bring South Australia in line with every other jurisdiction in Australia with the exception of the ACT. South Australia is currently the only state that does not impose restrictions upon prisoners' voting and it is appropriate that we fall into line with other jurisdictions. The bill provides that any prisoner, including a person on home detention, who is serving a sentence for three years or longer is ineligible to vote at state elections but it does not change the enrolment status of those prisoners. Importantly, the bill will not apply to people who are detained under the mental impairment provisions of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Once they are released from prison, they will be able to vote again.

My electorate is home to the Cadell Training Centre. The centre is a low-security prison farm accommodating male low-security prisoners. The Cadell Training Centre was opened in 1960 as a training facility for prisoners to learn vocational skills, which may not be available within other prisons, and focuses on the rehabilitation of prisoners and preparing them to take their place in the community upon release.

I have visited Cadell a number of times and it really is a credit to that community that they accept the Cadell Training Centre in its entirety. There are a number of service sectors there. Not

only does the Cadell Training Centre provide great services to the local township but it also provides services to the wider communities, whether it be through growing fruit, growing eggs or milking cows. One of the great services that it provides to the local community and beyond is the Meals on Wheels preparation of food. It presents food packages to the volunteers who go into Cadell to pick them up and then distribute them far and wide.

It shows that the Cadell Training Centre is more than just a detention centre. It is a sector that provides a service, sadly, by those who have done the wrong thing and who have been brought into that detention centre. It shows that these prisoners have been brought into society for the greater good. The training centre, undertaking that great community work program, is utilising the labour within the system.

As I have said, the Cadell Training Centre supports many non-profit projects in the local community. Not only Meals on Wheels but the Cadell Country Fire Service is staffed by custodian staff, members of the public and prisoners. Over the years, the prisoners have assisted with many great community projects. For example, the Cadell Training Centre work group assisted with building the Hart Lagoon boardwalk at Ramco. These are just examples of the good outcomes that can come from people who have been through a tough time, committed sins and are now giving back to the community.

Prisoners also assisted growers in the clean-up after damaging hailstorms hit the Riverland, particularly in November 2016. I remember that the Cadell prisoners went out after a fruit fly outbreak and were cleaning up fruit off the ground that had fallen from trees. When we had this outbreak, they had to pick up fruit that contained potential larvae and potential fruit fly strike. The prisoners did a great job. They went out into the community and undertook work that maintained a reputation, particularly in the Riverland, of upholding that fruit fly free status.

It is important to note that the prison also has a focus on dairy production and packaging. As I have said, prisoners tend to citrus and olives as part of the program designed to reintegrate them into the community in the months leading up to their release. I am sure everyone here understands that when prisoners commit crimes and are put into these prisons, they have to be rehabilitated. There is an opportunity for them to be rehabilitated but it is also about the way we bring them back into society.

Cadell has some excellent programs. While they have these excellent programs, we have to understand that these people have committed the sins that have put them into this facility and that they have to actually be rehabilitated in order to come back into society. It is also my understanding that the centre has started selling bulk milk to distributor Fallons, a famous Riverland milk brand, and started packaging and processing its own milk in 1998. I think that is an outstanding effort for what these inmates have done at Cadell.

I visited Cadell, and in the lead-up to the election I called in to the Cadell Training Centre and said to the wardens that I would like to hand out how-to-vote cards. They were a little concerned that this would not be able to happen, so upon speaking to supervisors it was realised that I could not hand out how-to-vote cards within the prison.

This is something that the Marshall Liberal government has installed—that we would like to introduce the disallowance of inmates to receive how-to-vote cards. It is important to understand that, while in prison, they have certain rights taken away. It is also important to note that those rights have been taken away for a very good reason. In today's society, many people would understand that, in the national picture, South Australia needs to fall into line, and that is exactly what this government is doing: it is calling for the right to vote to be taken away from those prisoners.

I do not think that is an unfair or unreasonable ask, but this commitment to South Australia by the Marshall Liberal government has been done in good faith, and it has also been done for the reason that committing the atrocities that some have, to rehabilitate them, to take away some of the rights from these people, gives them an understanding of what it means not only to disobey the rules, disobey the law or break the law, but that it is also very important to understand that they have to comply. This is just another understanding that, by not complying, they have broken their obligations in today's society.

My contribution is much about people understanding that people who break the law and go into prison will pay the consequences, and one of those consequences will be that they lose their voting rights once they are in custody for a considerable offence. If they are there for more than three years, they lose their right to vote.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Cook.

At 20:43 the house adjourned until Thursday 7 June 2018 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***AUSTRALIAN HOUSING AND URBAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE**

In reply to **Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (17 May 2018).

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

AHURI is a national organisation funded by all federal and state jurisdictions dedicated exclusively to housing, homelessness and urban research.

AHURI's research partners include the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia.

The former South Australian Labor government made contributions in excess of \$600,000 to AHURI over the past five years.

While South Australian Treasurer, the member for West Torrens wrote to the commonwealth Treasurer advising that a South Australian government contribution of \$124,519.80 would be made to AHURI for 2017-18.

The current South Australian government is seeking to maximise the advantage of being a funder for AHURI by commissioning some specific research. Accordingly, it is expected that AHURI will be engaged within the first 100 days as outlined in our election commitment.

The procurement of services such as those proposed to be undertaken by AHURI is subject to policies and guidelines including those issued by the State Procurement Board.

Homelessness and housing is an extremely important and complex area of social policy and I'm disappointed by the member's attacks on an organisation whose work has previously enjoyed bipartisan support.

AUSTRALIAN HOUSING AND URBAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (17 May 2018).

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

AHURI is a national organisation funded by all federal and state jurisdictions which is dedicated exclusively to housing, homelessness and urban research.

AHURI's research partners include the University of Adelaide and the University of South Australia.

Homelessness and housing is an extremely important and complex area of social policy and I'm looking forward to my government delivering on this commitment to help provide better services to South Australians who are doing it tough.