

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 20 September 2018

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN VIRTUAL POWER PLANT PROJECT**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:03):** I move:

That the fifth report of the committee, entitled South Australian Virtual Power Plant Project, be noted.

It is intended that the South Australian virtual power plant will comprise a network of decentralised, small-scale renewable energy systems made up of five-kilowatt solar photovoltaic, or PV, arrays and five-kilowatt and 13 kilowatt hour Tesla Powerwall 2 lithium-ion batteries. The powerplant will be virtual because it will utilise aggregating software to synchronise separate battery units to operate simultaneously. Operating in this way, the combined units can provide electricity and stabilising services to the grid.

The \$800 million project will be delivered in three stages. Stage 1 comprises 100 systems installed on SA Housing Authority properties. Stage 2 comprises 1,000 systems installed on SA Housing Authority properties to demonstrate the aggregation platform. Stage 3 comprises 24,000 systems on government-owned—mostly Housing Authority—properties, plus 25,000 systems on private properties. Stage 1 is complete. The VPP project is supported by a \$2 million grant to finance stages 1 and 2. Pending the successful completion of stages 1 and 2, a \$30 million loan is contemplated as seed funding for stage 3.

Once fully operational, the virtual power plant will have a combined generation and energy storage capacity of 250 megawatts and 650 megawatt hours. This is 2.5 times more capacity and five times more storage than the 100 megawatt Tesla battery near Jamestown, in the state's Mid North. It is expected that the virtual power plant project will deliver the following benefits:

- the systems will provide participating South Australian Housing Authority tenants a reduced price for electricity below current market prices;
- services to the South Australian electricity grid will include system security, frequency regulation, voltage support and backup; and
- the VPP project will also support local manufacturing and installation employment.

The Public Works Committee will monitor the progress of the South Australian virtual power plant project, as required by the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, through quarterly reports from the Department for Energy and Mining.

The Public Works Committee has considered written and oral evidence provided by Tesla and the Department for Energy and Mining in relation to this project. Having regard to the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee hereby reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:06):** I also rise to support the report from the parliamentary Public Works Committee. The report examines the history of the proposal and the efficacy of the application of South Australian taxpayer funds to the South Australian virtual power plant project, which was referred to the Public Works Committee by the Department for Energy and Mining.

In 2017, the South Australian government established a renewable Renewable Technology Fund to incentivise the development of next-generation storage technology to provide systems services, such as fast frequency response and peak generation capacity. One of the submissions for

support for the Renewable Technology Fund was from Tesla for a virtual power plant, which was approved by the state government on 14 December 2017. The \$800 million South Australian virtual power plant project is intended to be delivered over three phases and commenced in January 2018.

The project was referred to the Public Works Committee on the basis that the proposed public work is to be constructed on Crown land, or a state instrumentality, and during phases 2 and 3 the total construction value is expected to exceed \$4 million. It is intended that the South Australian virtual power plant will comprise a network of decentralised small-scale renewable energy systems with each being made up of five-kilowatt solar photovoltaic arrays, and five kilowatt and 13 kilowatt hour Tesla Powerwall 2 lithium-ion batteries, in conjunction with smart meters and associated software.

The power plant will be virtual because it will utilise aggregating software to synchronise these separate battery units to operate simultaneously. It is important to note that, without this aggregating software, the combined generation and storage units become stand alone to each house on which the units are installed. So a very important part of the virtual power plant is this aggregating software that comes with the proposal.

The intention of a virtual power plant is that it assists in a number of areas. One such area is in terms of backup and resilience because it allows the improving of reliability during outages. Of course, the batteries take in the electricity provided or generated by those solar photovoltaic arrays on the rooftop and then they enhance the system resiliency by dispatching aggregated installed capacity on all these batteries from the virtual power plant.

It has been found that, in areas of increasing solar and wind penetration not only in South Australia but throughout the world, utilities are seeing the need to increase the hosting capacity of substations situated throughout their network because, on occasions, the distributed generation from these renewable sources starts to surpass the load that is required at those substations during certain times of the day. Peak generation oftentimes is in the mid-afternoon, as opposed to when peak usage is in Australia, which is often when people come home from work after 5 o'clock.

The traditional solution to cope with this calls for a significant upgrade to these substations that will allow the load to be covered, and of course they have to forecast up to 50 years in the future. It has high up-front costs and bears the risk of long-term forecast inaccuracy, especially as the electricity systems we know of today are going through a significant transition. The system itself, via these smart meters being installed, will also assist with situational intelligence because it will provide visibility of the network on a second-by-second basis across the systems. This will help improve operations of the network and forecasting of loads as well.

I might just mention the three phases of the project to give you an understanding. The first phase involved 100 systems that were installed on South Australian Housing Trust properties. The primary objective of this phase was to streamline the installation processes and to refine customer engagement. Households have retained their existing energy retailer during this period. It is also important to say that this phase of the project is complete.

Phase 2, which is what the Public Works Committee considered, involved 1,000 systems being installed on South Australian Housing Trust properties. The primary objective of this phase is to start demonstrating the aggregation platform for the system's security services and also the retailer model and then to prove the commercial viability of the virtual power plant at some form of scale. The installation of this phase 2 home energy storage system is due to take place once our report has been considered and will go through until approximately June 2019.

Phase 3, should it proceed, noting that it is conditional on the success of phase 2 and attraction of sufficient third-party investor and finance, is the most expensive phase of the project. It envisages a further rollout of up to an additional 24,000 systems on government-owned properties, mostly South Australian Housing Trust, but not exclusively, and also 25,000 systems on private properties, which would be via an opt-in approach.

Frontier Economics, when they did their study into this, suggested that there may be a saving for customers using the program of around 30 per cent. Frontier Economics also identified benefits to non-participating customers as well, via greater retail competition, as this virtual power plant effectively can become another retailer, and also general generation capacity into the network.

The state will have ongoing strategic oversight of the project through its lifespan through the membership of the virtual power plant advisory committee. To ensure that Renewal SA is not left with any unfunded maintenance liabilities as a result of this project on the South Australian Housing Trust properties, all costs associated with the operation and maintenance of the home energy system have been included in the operation and maintenance services for the duration of the 20-year program.

The project has been developed, and the trials are being managed in consultation across a range of relevant government agencies, including Housing SA, Renewal SA, the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Crown Solicitor's Office and the Office of the Industry Advocate. As I have mentioned previously, prior to phase 2 commencing this project was referred to the Public Works Committee. The committee received written and oral presentations and submissions from witnesses. In fact, the oral submissions were heard on 2 August this year. The witnesses were representatives from the Department for Energy and Mining and Tesla.

It is also worth mentioning that the 2018-19 state budget focuses on reducing the cost of energy for households and businesses and delivering on the government's energy solution. It proposes \$184 million in expenditure to ensure more clean, reliable and affordable power for South Australians. The budget delivered on our election commitment of \$100 million for the Home Battery Scheme to provide subsidies for home owners to purchase batteries, in addition to this virtual power plant. The Home Battery Scheme is a key component of the government's plan to deliver cheaper electricity to South Australian households and businesses.

The state budget committed \$50 million towards grid-scale storage, to aid with the development of new storage technologies to back up our abundant renewable energy and help stabilise South Australia's network, and also \$30 million to better manage demand and help consumers benefit from helping to reduce peak demand to lower system costs. These themes also play out in the virtual power plant.

The Public Works Committee will monitor the progress of the South Australian virtual power plant project, as required by the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, through quarterly reports from the Department for Energy and Mining.

**Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (11:16):** I also rise to talk to the fifth report of the Public Works Committee, in this the 54<sup>th</sup> parliament, entitled South Australian Virtual Power Plant Project. The project is a child of the Renewable Technology Fund. As has been alluded to by the previous speakers, the project constituted a proposal by Tesla for a virtual power plant that was approved in December 2017. The project has a net value of about \$800 million and will be delivered over three phases.

Phase 1 is essentially concerned with streamlining the installation processes, as well as refining customer engagement strategies. To that end, there are roughly 100 systems installed on South Australian Housing Trust properties. Phase 2 will crank things up somewhat by a factor of about 10 and aims to put about 1,000 systems on South Australian Housing Trust properties. The primary objective of this particular phase is to demonstrate the aggregation platform for the system security services and the retailer model.

Translated, this effectively means, as the member for Morphett has described, that without the software these are stand-alone systems on each of the properties. The inherent software in the systems enables the aggregation of the power so generated, and in particular power stored, so that they can be deployed to other homes, other properties or to the wider market. The system security services, on the other hand, are a by-product of the capacity of the systems to provide to the general network stabilisation and security efforts.

The Public Works Committee spent considerable time and effort understanding the processes and the systems to be deployed in order to achieve these objectives. The Public Works Committee was especially keen to ensure appropriate undertakings were provided regarding South Australia's long-term access to these enabling technologies. I am pleased to report that, in our view, we achieved those goals in order to deliver those objectives.

Phase 3, as has been detailed, will entail roughly a further 50,000 systems with, in all probability, half those being South Australian Housing Trust, or other government-owned properties, and a further 25,000 or so systems on private properties via an opt-in approach. The key thing is that, whilst phases 1 and 2 have a commoditised approach using common photovoltaic and power storage technologies, phase 3 may well entail alternative system configurations and/or alternative property styles. That will, in turn, be determined over the course of phase 2. Phase 2 is due to take place from September of this year through to about June of 2019. Phase 3 is scheduled to run from 2019 through 2023.

The project itself is supported by a \$2 million grant and a \$330 million loan from the renewables fund to finance the initial trial of 1,100 home energy systems—that is, phases 1 and 2 on South Australian Housing Trust properties. That will additionally provide seed funding for phase 3, which is by far the biggest part of the phase. As previously stated, some of the primary objectives are system security services as well as cost savings for low-income households, improving electricity market competition and there is also anticipated to be follow-on or spin-off, with local manufacturing and site installation jobs generated as a result.

Again, as has previously been alluded to, the VPP, once fully operational, is anticipated to have a combined generation and storage capacity of 250 megawatts and 650 megawatt hours, which translates to 2.5 times and five times respectively more storage than the battery stored up at Horndale. The estimated total cost of the project is about \$800 million. In particular, I make the point that improvement of electricity market competition will be by virtue of the contribution of the net power generated by the aggregated system back down and into the grid or the market itself.

In terms of the public value of the proposed project, which of course is one of the criteria the Public Works Committee is charged with, there will be a variety of benefits. There will be direct benefits to low-income households with, as has previously been alluded to, anticipated savings somewhere in the order of 30 per cent per home courtesy of Frontier Economics modelling. The system has scope to generate further income for use in whatever form is desired, including cross-subsidisation of other housing tenants' power costs by virtue of the aggregated power generation and collation and sale down into the grid.

There is anticipated to be reliable grid services provided. They include, in no particular order, dynamic capacity, flexible ramping, frequency regulation, voltage support, backup and resilience, and situational intelligence—things I am sure that the member Morphett, given his background, would only be only too happy to further enlighten members on, should they wish. A further benefit is the system security services being provided, which are anticipated to improve the security of the South Australian network, given the combined generation and energy storage capacity I have previously referred to in comparison to the battery itself.

In terms of the cost of the project for phase 2, the virtual power plant assets will be installed and remain the property of a special purpose vehicle dubbed, for the purposes of discussion, Project Co, which will be incorporated by Tesla specifically for this project. Again, that was the subject of considerable discussion and analysis by the committee. An important point to make is that all costs associated with the operation and maintenance of the home energy systems have been included into an operation and maintenance services agreement with Tesla, which guarantees the operation and serviceability of these assets, given that the agreements in place, if phase 3 is to go ahead as planned, are anticipated to be of the duration of something in the order of 20 years.

In relation to the estimated net effect of the work and its use on public funds, it is anticipated that there will be greater retail competition. There will be greater generation competition as a result. The independent analysis tends to indicate a reduction in wholesale prices and therefore the generation of approximately \$90 million per annum in reduced wholesale charges as a result of the increase in capacity. It is anticipated that there will be, as previously described, an industry value chain, ranging from the production of some of these units as well as the jobs associated with their installation.

Insofar as management of the process is concerned, there will be a VPP advisory committee. Project management resources reporting to that committee will be provided initially by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and subsequently by the Department for Energy and Mining so as to ensure that the people of South Australia get what it is they thought they were getting. I

would draw the house's attention to the fairly standard but nonetheless pertinent point that the committee will monitor the progress of the South Australian virtual power plant project as required by the Parliamentary Committees Act.

The committee will provide a further statement to parliament in the event that subsequent information provided renders this report inaccurate or misleading. Based upon the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee reports to the parliament that it recommends the proposed work, and I endorse the report accordingly.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:26):** I rise to speak to the Public Works Committee's fifth report of the 54<sup>th</sup> parliament. The report is in regard to the South Australian virtual power plant project. This is obviously a project that is being looked at by the Public Works Committee because part of the phases of this work is around how much money is invested in the project. The issue is the potential for the project to go over \$4 million, so for obvious reasons it goes direct to the Public Works Committee, which has looked at this issue.

I think it is a great opportunity for South Australians to reduce their power costs after having the worst costs in the world inflicted on them by the previous Labor government, who, even though they make out they have green eyes for energy, invested over \$100 million in dirty diesel generators, which, if all fired up at once, would burn 80,000 litres.

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** Nearly 400.

**Mr PEDERICK:** I have been corrected: it is nearly \$400 million on dirty diesel generators that would burn 80,000 litres of diesel an hour. I remember saying to the former energy minister that he would not need just a truck to fuel these diesel generator; he would need to hire a ship to make sure that we had enough diesel on board to power these plants. That is just a reflection of what has happened with power policy by the previous Labor government.

What happens is that so many private people have had to invest tens of thousands, even hundreds of thousands, on an individual basis, depending on what they are trying to power at home. It is not hard to spend in excess of \$20,000 to have a diesel generator. In fact, I have spoken to people who have spent over \$20,000 to have a generator in place on an automatic switch so that when the power does drop out, if it does, especially in the dark days of Labor, they do have continuous power.

I have talked in here before about vital industries, such as dairies. Many of them have spent tens and tens of thousands of dollars to make sure that, when they are powering those rotary dairies that host 50 or 60 cows, they do not have to have put their cows through missing a milking and the associated issues with managing the dairy herd when they do miss a milking. I also reflect on what happened on a broader scale when hundreds of millions of dollars were lost to production. Olympic Dam had to shut down after the breakdown on 28 September 2016, when, because of the previous government's policy, one circuit-breaker dropped the whole state out. It is just outrageous that the previous government gave us the most unreliable grid but the most expensive power, and that is if you could get it.

This virtual power plant is helping follow through on our policies to save money for the good constituents of South Australia. I have 14.1 kilowatts of solar panels on my properties. I wish I had a lot more, but there is only so much roof space. The issue for South Australians is the ever-increasing price of power, as it was under the previous government. We are now trying to clean up Labor's mess with battery programs, solar panel programs and energy programs for industry and also getting that vital interconnector built through to New South Wales. The previous government was in favour of it until we decided we were going to implement it. We put that seed money in for the energy companies to look at that vital connection to the 53 per cent of green power from this state through to the coal power in the east.

A lot of people are allergic to coal-fired power stations. They talk about climate change and get emotional and that sort of thing, but I believe that we are the biggest exporter of coal in the world and that we cannot get enough ships into the east coast of Australia. If we are serious about climate,

we need to look at it on a global basis and understand that coal plants are being built every second of the day somewhere in the world. Whether that is right or wrong is a bigger policy debate.

Certainly, people have to have power—that is the issue—and they have to have stable power. We need to have a mix of base load, so there is still a place for coal. There is obviously a big place for gas, but then we see some people pushing back against the gasification of the Leigh Creek coalfield, which, sadly, had to shut down because the previous government forced the destruction of a perfectly good power station at Port Augusta. I think if they can get this gasification project up and going it will be a great project for this state.

However, you do need to have that base load and transition power also in gas to work alongside the bulk of green energy, and it is the bulk of green energy in this state. Green energy is intermittent. What we are doing on this side of the house is making sure that people can connect to the system so we can have storage. Power options are getting cheaper every day. They have been very expensive over the last few years but, as time goes on and there is more uptake, people come on board. However, we still need those other sources.

This project came about with the establishment of the Renewable Technology Fund, and that was about incentivising the deployment of next-generation storage technology to provide system services such as fast frequency response and peak generation capacity as well as broader community benefits such as affordability, which I have been talking about, and job creation. I note that Tesla was involved in the virtual power plant that was approved by the previous government back in December 2017.

This \$800 million South Australian virtual power plant project will be delivered over three phases, and that commenced in January this year. During phase 1, 100 systems were installed on South Australian Housing Trust properties. The primary objective of this phase was to streamline installation processes and refine customer engagement. Households have retained their existing energy retailer during this period. This phase of the project has been completed.

In phase 2, 1,000 systems are going onto South Australian Housing Trust properties. The primary objective of this phase is to demonstrate the aggregation platform for the system security services and retailer model and to prove commercial viability of the virtual power plant at scale. Then we roll into phase 3, which is the full rollout of up to an additional 24,000 systems on government-owned properties, mainly but not exclusively South Australian Housing Trust properties, plus 25,000 systems on private properties via an approach to opt in if you think you can manage that approach.

This was referred to the Public Works Committee, which has contemplated the proposal. They have done some consultation across the housing department, Treasury, the Crown Solicitor's Office and the Office of the Industry Advocate. They have looked at a whole range of issues around it and they have recommended that the public work go forward. I fully commend this project.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Giles, I welcome to parliament today in the gallery year 9 students from Pulteney Grammar School, who are guests of the Minister for Child Protection. We welcome you to parliament today, and I hope you enjoy your time here.

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SOUTH AUSTRALIAN VIRTUAL POWER PLANT PROJECT**

Debate resumed.

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:36):** I was not intending to speak on this issue and the good work the Public Works Committee is doing in terms of assessing the virtual power plant, but I did think it was important to stand up to heavily emphasise that this was a Labor initiative. I congratulate the Liberal government on not turning their back on that initiative. There was a contractual element, but I am sure that there are escape clauses and that the final stage, depending upon the outcome of the earlier stages, is not locked in. It is a great initiative and an exciting initiative.

I am particularly pleased about it because it is targeted at people on low incomes, especially people in Housing SA properties. It has been one of my bugbears over a long period of time when it comes to accessing the cheaper power that rooftop solar can provide that people in Housing SA properties have missed out. The contractual arrangements that someone in a Housing SA property has to enter into in order to have rooftop solar means that if they were to leave the property they would either have to dismantle the PV system and take it with them or leave it in place and get no return on that investment. These are people often on the lowest income having that impost put on them.

The virtual power plant was a way of addressing that and ensuring that people in Housing SA properties got a significant reduction in their electricity costs. I have had a long involvement in this area. Back in the mid-1990s, when I was on the Whyalla city council, I attempted to mandate through our development plan the installation of solar hot-water heaters on properties and new properties that were being built and major extensions. It was a Liberal government at the time. It had to go through the minister, and they did not like the idea of mandating solar hot-water heaters, so we missed out on that.

However, because of our initiatives, ETSA at the time—it had not been privatised yet—and Solahart offered people in Whyalla subsidies to put in solar hot-water heaters in our community. It was a worthwhile program. I was always mindful, though, of the development of PV. For a long time, PV was incredibly expensive; it is not now. It is now the cheapest form of electricity you can get if you have it on your roof. However, as I said, people in Housing SA properties missed out.

Looking at my community of Whyalla, owner-occupied dwellings would probably be at about 50 per cent penetration when it comes to PV systems, yet hardly any of those systems are on Housing SA properties in Whyalla. When you consider that nearly a quarter of the households in Whyalla are Housing SA properties, and that all those were missing out, it is not a good thing. It is fantastic to see the rollout of this program. Hopefully, it will meet all its milestones and demonstrate in the early phases its success, and we will see the battery and the solar panels go up on Housing SA properties in South Australia. It is five kilowatts of solar and a 13.5-kilowatt hour battery, so that will make a big difference.

The aggregation of these systems is incredibly important. I was speaking to one of the senior managers at BHP some time ago about the potential for the virtual power plant. One of the great things about solar is its sheer scalability, from the very small scale to the very large scale. He expressed an interest—this was not the formal position of BHP—in the project because it did lend itself to incremental increases to match the fluctuation in demand over time. He thought it was a very worthwhile initiative. In the meantime, given what is going on with Tesla overseas and its owner, hopefully he can hold things together long enough, but I am sure there would be other battery companies that would be more than eager to jump in to the space.

I have to touch on the constant refrain about our investment in the diesel peaking plant. The simple point about that diesel peaking plant is that it would very rarely be used. The only reason the investment occurred was because of what the private sector did: available capacity not coming online and households and businesses being shed from the system. We have had multiple reports now that indicate that gouging has been going on, the degree of market concentration and how that has been used in a very untoward way when it comes to consumers of electricity. In part, that is a function of privatisation.

Nobody comes to this debate with clean hands. That diesel unit was going to transition over to a gas-fired unit—a highly efficient gas-fired unit—to be used at times of need, but technology gallops on. I was in Port Augusta a few weeks ago at the Upper Spencer Gulf Global Maintenance Conference. In listening to the member for Stuart, it looked like no-one was going to ask any questions initially so I put my hand up, but then some people down the front put their hand up so I thought I would let them ask their questions.

What I was going to say to the member, after listening to his speech, was that one could almost be forgiven for thinking in this state that we now virtually have a bipartisan approach to electricity issues. We are all going to score points at particular times, but when you look at the different elements that those opposite now support, and the elements that we supported in

government and when we were putting in resources, it would be very healthy if that sort of approach were happening at a national level. The national level is causing us all sorts of problems because of that really tiny conservative rump in the Liberal Party and the National Party, which are just absolutely fixated on fossil fuels and constantly using climate change as a stalking horse to destabilise leadership in the Liberal and National coalition.

One prays for the day when sanity is going to prevail at a national level, and hopefully that will come with a change of government at a federal level.

**Mr Pederick:** That won't bring sanity.

**Mr HUGHES:** You might well find that as a government you might well be in sync with some of the initiatives in the energy field. With those few words, I commend the work that the Public Works Committee is doing. It is important work, to have that oversight, and I look forward to this project being rolled out.

If for some reason, for whatever reason, it does not ultimately stack up, I do have a costed proposal I am more than happy to share with the government. It is cost neutral when it comes to assisting Housing SA properties, and I did put it to the previous government, but this is a more sophisticated approach than the one I was advocating. I still have a cost neutral approach; if this does not work out, come and see me.

Motion carried.

#### *Motions*

### **TRANSFORMING HEALTH**

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Bedford:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into and report on the benefits, costs and impacts of Transforming Health and in particular—

- (a) the scope of policy issues that Transforming Health was designed to address (including federal healthcare funding cuts) and whether they were addressed adequately;
- (b) what other issues Transforming Health should have addressed;
- (c) the adequacy of the model of care proposed by Transforming Health, based around three tertiary hospitals and 'centres of excellence' supported by ambulance transfers;
- (d) the adequacy of consultation with clinicians and the community on Transforming Health and alternative models for consultation and engagement;
- (e) the degree to which a focus on primary health care could improve the overall effectiveness of the healthcare system;
- (f) the degree of difference between public expectations and the capacity of the healthcare system, as currently resourced, to meet them;
- (g) whether, having regard to its revenue base, the federal government is funding an appropriate share of the state's healthcare budget (and what the state should be doing to address this); and
- (h) any other relevant matter.

(Continued from 26 July 2018.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:47):** I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on motion:

Ayes .....	39
Noes .....	2
Majority.....	37

#### **AYES**

Basham, D.K.B.  
Boyer, B.I.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Brown, M.E.

Bignell, L.W.K.  
Chapman, V.A.



## AYES

Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Hildyard, K.A.
Hughes, E.J.	Knoll, S.K.	Koutsantonis, A.
Luethen, P.	Malinauskas, P.	Mullighan, S.C.
Murray, S.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Patterson, S.J.R.
Pederick, A.S.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.	Rau, J.R.
Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.J.	Teague, J.B.
Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Weatherill, J.W.
Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.	Wortley, D.

## NOES

Bedford, F.E. (teller)	Brock, G.G.
------------------------	-------------

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

*Parliamentary Committees*

**ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: EMERGENCY SERVICES LEVY 2018-19**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Duluk:

That the first report of the committee, entitled Emergency Services Levy 2018-19, be noted.

(Continued from 6 September 2018).

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (11:54):** I rise to continue my input on this motion. At the time when I sought leave, I was talking about the Alert SA app and how important it is to the community. A great example of this was a few years ago, when I was in Melbourne on dairy industry business. In the middle of a meeting, the Alert SA app alerted me to an accident at the end of our driveway on the farm. A school bus was parked to let off one of my staff member's kids in the driveway and a car drove straight into the back of the school bus. Interestingly, I knew about it before my wife, who was only 500 metres away from the accident—that is how great the Alert SA app is when it is working well.

I think it is great that we are seeing money in the budget to make sure that we get this app back up and running. It has really concerned me that we have been operating for many months now without the app in place in any shape or form. The CFS first had the mapping system in place, and then it was put into Alert SA. To have to rely on ABC radio to listen for events to be reported has made it very difficult for many people in regional areas to understand what is going on and what they need to do to manage their businesses. The other time that comes to mind for my farm was, again, back in the mid-nineties pre the CFS app, when a fire started.

Luckily, at the time I was actually outside and saw the fire start upwind of us. We had half an hour to move every mob of cattle on the farm prior to the fire arriving on our farm. Luckily, we were out there and saw it. Without that half an hour, some of our cattle would have been in the direct line of the fire and we might have had some stock losses. That extra half an hour is really important to people in the community, so I think it is great that this app is being supported. We are seeing the investment of \$2.6 million, plus ongoing funding of \$866 million, each year indexed, into the app. I think it is a credit to the Liberal government that it is investing in this space.

It is also fantastic that in the state budget we are putting into the emergency services an increase in the aerial firefighting fleet, from 18 to 26 aircraft and that we are seeing an increase of \$5 million for CFS station upgrades. We are also seeing other things, not just in the fire space but in the investment of shark-spotting drones, which both the clubs in my electorate, Port Elliot and Chiton Rocks, are seeking to be part of. We are seeing \$5,000 available for Surf Life Saving Clubs to

upgrade equipment. We are seeing the provision of new CFS and SES command centre headquarters and also \$4.2 million for an upgrade of the SA Computer-Aided Dispatch System.

All these things are an enormous benefit to our emergency personnel, both volunteer and paid. I think it is really important that we look after those individuals who are risking their lives out there to protect the lives of community members and their assets, so thank you to all of them. The amount of effort that is put in by volunteers, in particular, is a real credit to them in this space, such as the hours that people are prepared to go and do training. The expectation of CFS volunteers now is much more than jumping on the fire truck on the day the fire starts. It is very much about training, making sure that they have the adequate skills and understanding of what is needed of them and knowing how to best protect themselves during a fire.

It is not just the commitment at the time of the fire but also many hours of training and making sure that they understand the needs. It is also a great part of our Australian community that, when there is trouble elsewhere in the country, our volunteers put up their hand to go and help. Many times, we have seen South Australian firefighters and other personnel going interstate, and even on occasions overseas, to help in these situations, so it is very important with the emergency services levy that we support this space.

There are many emergency services in Finnis. We have police operating in the Goolwa and Victor Harbor police stations, we have ambulance stations also in Goolwa and Victor Harbor and we have the Victor Harbor Goolwa Sea Rescue Squadron. We also have the Victor Harbor MFS and the south coast SES, which covers the Fleurieu Peninsula, which is a very large area for them to cover during storms and other emergencies. Then there are nine CFS stations in the seat of Finnis: Victor Harbor, Goolwa, Back Valley, Lower Inman Valley, Currency Creek, Port Elliot, Middleton, Mount Compass and Waitpinga, all of which are very well supported by volunteers across the electorate. I conclude my remarks.

Motion carried.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today the former member for Hartley, the Lion of Hartley, Joe Scalzi. Welcome to parliament today, sir.

#### *Bills*

#### **STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (BUDGET MEASURES) BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 September 2018.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:01):** I am not the lead speaker, as obviously this bill has already been introduced into the house. I rise to speak to the excellent budget measures that the Marshall Liberal government has put in place in regard to our first budget. I think it is a balanced budget. We are making sure that we fund our 300 or so specific election promises. Notwithstanding that, there is a little bit of pain along the way. However, the pain could have been a lot worse if it were not for the excellent financial management of our team, including the Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas from another place, trying to sort out the wood from the trees.

I say 'the wood from the trees' because, when you have the previous treasurer, the member for West Torrens, stating that we are going to have a \$12 million surplus that turns into a \$397 million deficit in real terms, that is a sign of some of the issues that we have had to deal with coming into the first year of our first term in responsible government. I hope there are many more terms to come, because it is a far better view from this side of the chamber.

As the member for MacKillop indicated, and proven by different studies done over decades, when Liberal parties come to power at any level, whether state or federal, they have to fix up the total financial mess that previous Labor governments leave their state or country in. It is easily found.

You can see the spend of Labor governments, and then there is the financial management done on the conservative side of the house to make sure that things are pulled into line.

I am sure it is a tactic by the Labor Party to make it look like money grows on trees. They spray money out to the masses like confetti and the masses get used to having money thrown at them. But the only money that governments have is money that is raised from tax. Governments do not have their own money: it is all taxpayers' money and it should be managed appropriately. It should be managed in a fair and financially astute way.

We only have to look at what happens with different builds, whether it is the public sector versus the private sector. If we look at the build of the new RAH, the \$2.4 billion new Royal Adelaide Hospital under the previous Labor government, we will be paying for that over the next 30 years at \$1 million a day, and that is without the staff in it. It is just outrageous. When we look at what Calvary have done with their expansion—sure, it is a smaller expansion; it is probably close to around half the beds in the new RAH—it was done for about \$400 million or so.

So we have to wonder why, when there is a public dollar to be spent, it appears to just be abused. It does not just appear to be abused: it literally gets abused. The issue for us is that we always need to put the fire out, so to speak. We have to bring that solid financial management because we understand that money literally does not grow on trees. That is why we also have brought down a budget that is sensible, has an excellent financial framework and is about growing our state and growing our jobs.

Instead of just throwing money at people like confetti, we are making sure that we put the right tax framework in place so that we can give an incentive to thousands of companies, thousands of people who are small business owners who may only have one worker working for them. In my case, when I was managing and running the farm as my own business, I would employ two people at seeding time and then one at harvest. That is how it worked for me. We had a great working relationship but it was very much a small operation.

That is why we are putting in measures to support more jobs, lower costs and better services, which we are implementing for South Australians. Payroll tax is one of the issues that we are addressing, taking the exemption up to \$1.5 million before a business has to start paying payroll tax and then there is a graduated index up to \$1.7 million. That is excellent news for small to medium businesses now in South Australia because, instead of a few hundred thousand dollars, which was the limit before—I think it was about \$600,000—it gives people some relief.

Obviously people get paid different amounts, and I am not being too judgemental about that. You could perhaps have up to 25 people working for you under the new regime. That will put real money into people so that they can run their businesses, whether they are farms, small takeaway-food operations, people running coffee shops—there seems to be a lot of money made from selling coffee these days—small delicatessens, chicken shops, or light industry. There are a lot of small, light industry businesses that employ fewer than 25 people.

I want to talk about one of the success stories that will benefit from this payroll tax relief and that is Bowhill Engineering, which is doing a lot of the bridgework on the South Road works and the overpasses. It is fantastic work. I inspected it other day with the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Mr Whetstone, the member for Chaffey. In a little town with not a very big population in my electorate on the river—a beautiful spot to work—they hire pretty well all local people. I know they have people working there who are in close proximity to Bowhill. Some come out from the Murray Bridge region and around Karoonda. I know that one young lad from Lameroo is working there and doing a trade there.

It is just fantastic to see this employment opportunity so that people can work close to home and work with a company that has done such fantastic work for many years here in South Australia. One of the projects they have done is the walking bridge near the Festival Theatre. It is not the one across the Torrens recently but the far smaller one years ago. Also, we saw in recent years the clipper ship *City of Adelaide* brought over from Scotland. Bowhill Engineering was one of the engineering companies, along with a swag of others, who contributed by building the framework to hold the ship stable on the barge to bring it all those thousands of kilometres to Australia.

That is a prime example alongside many, many other companies throughout the state and the regions. Another business in my electorate is Miegel brothers, who make excellent trailers and do other light engineering work in Murray Bridge. They are well renowned for the quality of the products they make. They, too, are employing many local people. That will be a real benefit. Instead of the government spraying money out, we can have the economy built on the back of these companies which may decide to put on an extra worker—or maybe a couple more. Maybe they can put five more on and boost production and contribute to the economy both on a federal basis and a state basis. Not just that, it is pouring money back into local communities.

Other things we are doing are remedying deficiencies in the owner-driver exemption within the contractor provisions to ensure that the contract is either fully exempt because it falls within the relevant exemption or is taxable because it does not fall within the relevant exemption. With our budget measures, we are certainly continuing to allow deductions to be made to the value of motor vehicle allowances for business use, monitoring the changes made in the commonwealth government's income tax legislation.

I also want to note some issues around how we have managed stamp duty under these budget measures. We have facilitated the collection of data as part of the commonwealth government's initiatives on third-party reporting and the national register of foreign ownership of land titles. I note that the Taxation Administration Act 1996 is also amended to enable the commissioner to collect and disclose real property sales information to the commonwealth government.

One measure that I am really pleased to see is expanding the current stamp duty exemption for family farm transfers to include those involving companies. Some farming businesses are quite reasonably sized—medium to large businesses, not just small to medium-sized businesses—so farmers these days have to make sure they have a succession strategy in place. Some people think that farmers set up a succession strategy to try to get around paying tax or similar things by setting up companies or a company, or they may be involved in a trust. But, no, I can tell you that, as a fifth-generation farmer, it is a real thing to get succession management right, especially when it involves farmland.

It does not matter how many acres you own, some people—and they may be related to you—think you are a millionaire. The only time money is realised from a farm, the real money, is if you sell the property. Most farmers do not want to do that unless they are retiring, or there has been a death in the family, or something else happens. That is the nub of it. It can be not just a few hundred thousand dollars in some small properties but millions of dollars of value in land, especially with the need, as has been seen over many years—and it is an old saying in farming—to get big or get out. It has happened forever. It happened when we went from basically walking behind horses through to using 70, 100 to 600 horsepower tractors, or wherever we are going to land next using drone technology, and there is a bit of drone technology being used, especially in spray operations on some properties.

It is a real issue. The management of companies is also about succession planning and looking after the land for future generations, especially when a son or daughter gets married. It is a reality that maybe up to 50 per cent of the population do not survive their first marriage, so I believe that not enough people take succession planning seriously until it is nearly too late, and sometimes it is too late to make sure those right decisions are made. With regard to stamp duty exemption for family farms to include those involving companies, I think it is a fantastic measure being put in place.

In regard to the stamp duty exemption being provided on premiums paid in relation to multi-peril crop insurance policies entered into from 1 January this year, it was a policy we took and it is a policy we are implementing. People can protect those many hundreds and thousands of dollars, and in some cases some people have spent \$1 million plus putting in a crop. You only have to see a tough and dry year like this, when, if you are lucky, you get a few millimetres of rain occasionally and you are getting through, but there is wide variance in South Australia, from some fairly handy crops through to very dry dusty paddocks. It is a tough situation for anyone to be in. Yes, multi-peril crop insurance is expensive on a per acre basis if you look at the total figure over, say, 4,000 acres, but if you have to make a claim you can get back a reasonable amount.

Other measures we are getting involved in include making South Australia a more attractive place in which to invest and do business. With regard to land tax, we are increasing the tax-free

threshold, from \$369,000 to \$450,000, and introducing a new tax bracket of \$1.2 million to \$5 million and a marginal tax rate of 2.9 per cent on land tax from 1 July 2020. This is expected to benefit—and this is a huge number—over 50,000 land tax ownerships, including around 8,000 that will no longer have a land tax liability at all, so that is another great feature of our budget measures bill.

We are working with environment protection looking at recovering the costs of environmental management issues such as soil and groundwater contamination and odour facilities, with underground petroleum storage systems required to hold an environmental authorisation. This is a very serious business. If you talk to anyone who is in the service station game, they know only too well about liabilities in regard to old fuel tanks that have been underground for a long time. Sometimes it is better just to walk away and find a greenfield site or you just dig up the old tanks and completely replace them which is another option.

In regard to local government, apart from rate capping, which I think is an excellent policy to make sure we get our rates spent appropriately and our money managed a lot better at the local government level, we are going to abolish the royalties on extractive minerals for councils where the minerals are sourced from council borrow pits and used to build and maintain local roads from 1 July 2019. This is one issue that the Local Government Association at a state level has written to us about, to the Treasurer, thanking us for removing this cost impost on councils.

There is a whole range of things that we are handling, including liquor licensing fees and rural property. We are closing the office of the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island and we are getting on with the real job of delivering responsible government with these fine budget measures for the state of South Australia.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (12:21):** I thank the member for Hammond for his comments and completing his contribution and catching me completely unawares. It is a pleasure to speak on the budget measures bill, which of course gives the parliament the opportunity to enact a number of the measures within the budget which require legislative amendment.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, sorry to interrupt, are you the lead speaker?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am the lead speaker, yes, but hopefully it is less onerous than what that usually entails, if I can put it that way. Of course, there are quite a few legislative amendments in this budget which are required in this bill. Most of them in this bill are consequent on the abolition of the Independent Gambling Authority, and the move of the operations and the requirements that various pieces of legislation had placed on that agency, and moving it primarily into the responsibility of the Commissioner for Liquor and Gambling.

I spoke yesterday at some length about one particular issue with regard to online gambling and sports betting, which is currently managed, or at least regulated, on the advice of the IGA for decision by the minister. That will now be one of the many functions, as I understand it from this bill, which is to be undertaken by the Commissioner for Liquor and Gambling in the future. There will be some detail and information that the opposition will seek when we go into the committee stage of this bill.

The number of legislative instruments that that decision by the government to wind up the IGA and move its operations into the purview of the Commissioner of Liquor and Gambling requires the Authorised Betting Operations Act, Casino Act, Gaming Machines Act, Independent Gambling Authority Act, Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act, Problem Gambling Family Protection Orders Act and so on—the lotteries act, I think, as well—to be amended.

Aside from that change, there are also changes to legislation to give effect to, for example, the abolition of the role of the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island. We on this side certainly hope that this does not signal an intent by the new government to lessen the perspective or the importance that Kangaroo Island has to play at the very least in the state's economy, if not more generally within the state's community.

A significant amount of work was undertaken by the former Labor government, under the purview of the now-abolished economic development board, which sought to identify economic and social opportunities for development on Kangaroo Island. They recommended a list of measures that could be undertaken by government, of either persuasion, to pursue those outcomes. One of those

measures was for the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island to act as a broker for people on Kangaroo Island, or even agencies on the island like the council, to better deal with the state government and mainland interests and businesses. As you can imagine, Deputy Speaker, there will be some interest in how that coordination role and that brokering role are to be undertaken.

This budget measures bill also gives effect to a range of new charges, fees and taxes imposed by this budget. While the member for Hammond talks about the change to the Land Tax Act, which will give effect to the proposed relief for land tax payers, there are also new charges, fees and taxes introduced. To his credit, he did mention the new licensing and charging regime that is going to be imposed on petrol stations in South Australia. Of course, that will have a disproportionate impact on one operator, but it will also have an impact on other operators, in particular the small and dwindling number of independent operators that we have in South Australia.

It is also noticeable that the EPA is proposing to recover the greater costs of regulation that it imposes on large industrial facilities. This is resonant in part of the old electorate of Lee before the boundary redistribution in Birkenhead and Peterhead—Adelaide Brighton Cement, for example. I trust that the EPA's extraction of higher fees from that organisation might mean that the EPA perhaps pays some closer attention to the impacts that that operation has on the communities on the lower half of the Lefevre Peninsula in particular. We also see that there is a new licence and fee regime to be imposed on the resource recovery sector, with several hundred resource recovery operations now to face a new tax or a new charge under that regime.

There is also an amendment to the Liquor Licensing Act to massively ramp up fees, particularly on hotels and also on other licensed premises. You do not have to wander too far through the CBD or into the suburbs to find a hotel or a licensed premises that is genuinely shocked and surprised that this increase in fees is taking place. Albeit the government is saying that these were recommended under the Anderson review of liquor licensing—that may be the case—I am sure that the industry would have appreciated a heads-up before the budget, and even better before the election, that the Liberal Party was intent on whacking thousands of dollars a year of extra costs on licensed premises through this new regime.

The local government sector is to be given a legislative amendment that will enable them to avoid paying royalties on the rubble they recover from council-owned land or borrow pits for the purpose primarily of road making. While that may be a boon to councils, it is less of a boon to the private operators and the private quarries that are effectively unable to compete with those councils fortunate enough to have those resources on land that they are able to take free of government tax. In the briefing from the Treasurer's office, I raised whether this was a breach of the now longstanding competition principles, which all Australian jurisdictions, including the South Australian government and councils, are required to adhere to, but apparently it is not. I look forward to understanding how it is not during the committee stage of the debate.

As the member for Hammond also mentioned, there is a new stamp duty exemption imposed in this budget which, I think other than in this bill, does not find its voice in any of the other 500 to 700 pages of the budget papers. That is the exemption for rural property transfers or farm transfers between family members which will for the first time involve companies. As I understand it, there has been a longstanding exemption for transfers between families—

**Mr Pederick:** Family members.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —family members, sorry, not families—but not family members involving companies. I am sure that the vast majority of future transactions would involve the types of landholdings that the member for Hammond refers to—that is, between members of farming families that have been longstanding here in South Australia and that are not necessarily what the public can often perceive as wealthy farmers.

I did ask whether this was the Gina to Ginia amendment so that the Rineharts are going to have a massive free kick in whatever large swathe of our state they have managed to procure now. I am sure that the public and members of this parliament would certainly prefer to support the former category of farmers, the category of farmers that the member for Hammond was alluding to, and perhaps not so much the category of farmers that I speculated might also be entitled to this

exemption. Again, I am sure we will be furnished with all the detail during the committee stage of the debate.

There are also some other changes to the Stamp Duties Act which, for want of a better term, tidy up some of the provisions consequent from the hundreds of millions of dollars a year in stamp duty relief which the former treasurer, the member for West Torrens, passed as a budget measure in one of the budgets that he handed down and which exempted commercial property transactions from stamp duty. We were the first Australian jurisdiction, and in fact I think we are still the only Australian jurisdiction, to do so. It pertains to not just real property but also plant and equipment, business goodwill, and so on, and is a huge incentive for people to come and invest in businesses here in South Australia.

My understanding is that the amendment effectively will ensure that when people are processing these land transactions with the Lands Titles Office they are not incentivised to underquote the amount they paid for those properties. In the context of stamp duty, you might think, 'Does it really matter, if they're not paying stamp duty on the purchase price?' Well, it does not matter for stamp duty, of course, because that is exempt, but it does matter for the transfer fee, which is an important source of revenue for the government. This ensures that there are requirements on purchasers, and I think also on vendors, to make sure, if necessary or if obliged to, that accurate prices are disclosed during those transactions. Also, as the member for Hammond already said, it clarifies the exemption from stamp duty on multi-peril crop insurance.

I also see that amendment is required of the Taxation Administration Act to facilitate the better transfer of information from the state government to the commonwealth government for the purposes, I am told, of their maintaining a clear perspective on the land transactions that are occurring involving foreign individuals or foreign entities so that they have a better and clearer understanding of their register of foreign ownership of land titles.

During his contribution, the member for Hammond raised the topic of Bowhill Engineering. He may remember that Bowhill Engineering were contracted by the state government transport department back in 2015 to build new steel-hulled ferries to finally replace the up to 80-year-old timber-hulled ferries that were in operation in up to three locations on the Murray. Not only did they once again deliver that project exceptionally well for taxpayers in South Australia but they also were responsible for building the steel structures at the Adelaide Showground's train station.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I am sure that as you were struggling back to your train service with arms full of show bags only in recent weeks, you would have noticed the quite extraordinary twisted structure for the overpass that Bowhill Engineering delivered at that train station. They do remarkable work. With those unusually brief comments, I conclude my contribution.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (12:36):** I rise today to speak to the budget measures bill, an omnibus bill that seeks to put into effect the budget that was handed down on 4 September. For my part—and I am sure there will be many other speakers who will speak about various other areas of the bill—I want to speak briefly about the Kangaroo Island commissioner and the fact that we are seeking to wind up the KI commissioner as part of this bill.

The Kangaroo Island commissioner was brought in post the 2014 election with a mandate to try to get economic activity happening on the island and to look at what the blocks or impediments are to seeing this beautiful island move forward. On this side of the house, and as we were then in opposition, we agreed with those sentiments, but we did not believe that the Kangaroo Island commissioner was the right way to go about it—and we still do not. It was a policy that we took to the election and, like all our policies, we are going to deliver on that.

What I want to say through my contribution is that we are not going to leave the people of Kangaroo Island high and dry. In fact, we on this side of the house would say that there are a number of structural ways we can change the way we do business and take what the KI commissioner was supposed to do to help deliver that for all of South Australia.

Wendy Campana, who was appointed as the Kangaroo Island commissioner, has been doing a fantastic job. She has certainly built strong relationships on the island and has been involved

with all major projects that are going on, or potentially will go on, on the island. The main thrust of her role was to crack some heads. The main thrust of her role was very much to help bring government departments together and to help people navigate the maze. Whether that happens through the planning approval process, through finding small business support, or through putting people together in the same room to get ideas off the ground and to get things to happen, that has been the role of the Kangaroo Island commissioner, as well as looking a little bit more broadly at some of the impediments.

The island has some unique challenges. It is a fantastic place. I was lucky enough to visit a couple of months ago, I must admit for the first time, and see firsthand what is and what is not going on on the island. What struck me was the natural beauty of the place. I had a conversation with the Minister for Environment and Water only a couple of weeks before going. He said, 'Stephan, you will be taken aback by how beautiful it is and how big it is.' People forget that this place is massive. It is basically the size of Adelaide and there are about 4,500 people who sit on it.

I must admit that my other impression of the island was the fact that the roads were a whole lot better than I expected them to be, especially the state government roads. I was seriously expecting some rundown pothole-ridden roads, and that is not what I saw. Once you get off the beaten track, I am sure that is what happens, but that is an issue when you have such a big expanse to deal with.

Heading across on the SeaLink ferry and through the subsequent discussions that I had, it was very clear to me that access to the island is the number one issue. If we are able to solve it and provide a better solution, then everything else will much more easily fall into place. It will still be difficult and there will still be challenges. There is still a cost disadvantage because of that stretch of water, but we can try to ameliorate it the best way that we can.

The infrastructure at both ends needs to be improved in various different ways. Certainly, heading down to Cape Jervis, you can see that how the infrastructure around there looks a sad indictment on the former government. I know there are some parts that the Yankalilla council owns, but the landing area is not a great gateway to Kangaroo Island, and we need to look at how we can improve that. The Liberal government have a couple of million dollars on the table to help do that, but a whole lot more work will have to be done in order for us to be able to realise that.

The SeaLink issue is one that we need to deal with. On the Penneshaw side of the stretch, we need to look at the infrastructure challenges that exist there, and there are a number. We are very keen to work through the process to get towards a solution for that, and that was certainly my message to the people I met with on the island.

What is really exciting me is that there are a huge number of opportunities on the island. There is the Kangaroo Island golf course that the Minister for Environment and Water is currently dealing with, and then we will go through the planning approval process in the normal way. It could be really exciting as a step change. Standing out there and looking at the cliffs to see where this golf course would go, it is a beautiful and stark landscape, and if the course can pass all the hurdles it would no doubt be a great addition to the island.

There are a number of tourism developments that are currently going on and slated to be undertaken around Kingscote and American River to add some depth and breadth to the tourism offer on the island. There is a very difficult issue going on at the moment in relation to Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers and Yumbah Aquaculture regarding a planning development process for a new wharf that for very obvious reasons I will not talk about any further, but I wanted to make sure that I saw firsthand what that looked like.

There are a huge number of opportunities on the island. It seems to me that there is a lot of potential activity over there that is either underway or could be underway to really help to drive vibrancy of the area. The challenges exist with electricity supply. Challenges certainly do exist when it comes to housing supply and all these issues the KI commissioner was looking at. But when I looked at the role of the Kangaroo Island commissioner and took in the fact that we have this fantastic resource in Wendy Campana, and put that to one side and looked at the structure of the role, what really got me was the fact that, if government were working as well and efficiently as it should be, the



role of the KI commissioner would become extremely unnecessary because the commissioner does not have any power to make something happen.

The power of the position was in the ability of the person to facilitate. That is not something that you need a statutory officer to be able to do. It means that we need to do more about making our government more consumer facing and more friendly as we face businesses. There is work underway at the moment around that and I look forward to being able to put those things into place.

Certainly, with the reorientation and the machinery of government changes, I think we have made it a lot clearer for businesses about whose role does what. We have had a series of ministers who I know have all visited the island, from the member for Chaffey through to minister Ridgway in the other place. The Minister for Environment and Water and the Minister for Industry and Skills have visited, as have I. I know the Premier has been across there.

We have put a lot of time and effort into the island, but this idea that we have a role that essentially is a bandaid solution instead of fixing the structural issues that existed with the former government's business engagement process, we thought was unnecessary. Instead of putting a bandaid across the issue, we need to fix the structural deficiencies, and that is exactly what we need to do. More than that, to the extent that the KI commissioner's role was a facilitative one, we actually need to provide that for all South Australia, especially for all regional South Australia. Getting rid of the Kangaroo Island commissioner is not about our taking away something from Kangaroo Island; it is about giving that to all regional and metropolitan South Australia.

Yes, there are some issues on the island. Again, that body of water between Kangaroo Island and the mainland is an issue. It creates a structural difference between how other businesses across South Australia can operate—and last week, I was in Port Lincoln in the Deputy Speaker's electorate—and an example is the cost to get grain to market from the Far West Coast, or to get produce to Adelaide from the West Coast. There were a couple of good wineries that we visited while we were there. The wines tasted pretty good, but I do not want to give too much praise because we have to keep things in perspective.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is high praise from the member for Schubert.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Getting that product would be just as difficult as, for instance, getting a bottle of wine from Kangaroo Island to Adelaide to get it into market. The issues are difficult but, in my view, they are not unique. If we can deal as best we can with this body of water, then I think we go some way to providing as much equity as we are able to provide. I do not want anyone to construe that my comments in the house today suggest support for the bridge. Frank Pangallo, in another place, certainly pulled that one out. Whilst I understand the problem he was trying to fix—that is, there is this stretch of water we need to traverse—I do not think a bridge would fix it.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** He says \$5 billion. We have been working hard behind the scenes to make sure that we have alternative processes in place so that the people on Kangaroo Island, who have been using the KI commissioner to help them, know full well what the alternatives are and that we take the lessons Wendy Campana has shared with the government, spreading those learnings right across regional South Australia and right across all South Australia.

In seeking to bring our election commitment to the fore, as part of the budget measures bill, yes, we are looking to wind up the Kangaroo Island commissioner. I reiterate that this is not about our taking away something from Kangaroo Island; it is about our fixing the fundamental issue. It is about learning the lessons and providing them to all South Australia and it is about fixing the fundamental issues that the island has, rather than just providing a person with a facilitative mandate to be able to connect the dots.

There are other worthy reforms as part of the budget measures bill, but they do sit outside my portfolio area, so I will leave it to others to comment on those. I encourage the house to support the bill. I look forward to the opposition's support. I look forward in the future to our being able to announce a better, more facilitative structured business engagement process in South Australia.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:48):** I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Budget Measures) Bill 2018 and commend the bill to the house. I would like to acknowledge the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and his contribution in respect of the Kangaroo Island commissioner and the work she has done.

Like a number of my colleagues, I have a number of reports that were prepared in respect of Kangaroo Island over the 16 years of the former government. I had occasion to welcome the then premier, Mr Rann, to Kangaroo Island, the birth place of the state, during the 175<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the state. He commissioned a report, called *Paradise Girt by Sea*. He promised that tens of millions of dollars were going to be contributed to Kangaroo Island. In the following 12 years, I think there was a walking trail built; there were some roadworks done—

**An honourable member:** An airport.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —I will come to that in a moment—a contribution in respect of the enhancement of some of the parks area, which take up about 40 per cent of the island; massively increased fees to access the parks; and, of course, infrastructure improvement was developed, largely to increase the revenue for the then state government.

It is disappointing, in some ways, that when the commissioner was appointed it was another expression of interest in and commitment to Kangaroo Island, which, unfortunately, even with the efforts of Ms Campana, have not really transpired. We did get a commitment of \$9 million in the last couple of years of the former government, matched by another \$9 million for an airstrip extension at the Kingscote Airport—the Cygnet River Airport, actually, but often known as Kingscote Airport. That was then, under the hands of the former minister for transport and infrastructure, the responsibility for the administration and project management. They allowed it to be handed over to the local council.

It went \$3 million over the funds available, and guess what? The ratepayers, largely, together with state taxpayers, are picking up the mess of that. Nevertheless, it is a beautiful redevelopment. The extension of the runway has concluded and there is a new area to facilitate some expansion. Personally, I have not thought that the biggest problem for Kangaroo Island was getting people to it. We have many more thousands a year go to Kangaroo Island, in the form of international and national tourists, than the Galapagos Islands. They have a \$20 billion tourism industry, why doesn't Kangaroo Island? Largely, because they do not stay for longer than a day, but sometimes overnight. Obviously, other infrastructure opportunities may be needed.

I do welcome the comments of the minister as to the acknowledgement of what is clearly the standout issue for people who live and work on Kangaroo Island—that is, the cost of the transport and freight and the water gap issues that have been referred to in every report that I have read of in my lifetime as the most significant and what he might be able to do in negotiating with his federal colleagues in that regard. I would hope to see some positive outcome because, clearly, the current federal member either has not tried or has not been successful in that regard, in even identifying the most significant issue.

I agree that the bridge option—whilst my father had a childhood dream of robbing a bank and building a bridge from Kangaroo Island to Adelaide, he said, to his visit his grandmother in Port Adelaide—will never come into fruition. It is a total fantasy. He, like others, who from time to time raise this as an option, clearly did not appreciate the significance of the passage being the most rough around Australia. Nevertheless, it was a terrific contribution in that regard, and we look forward to Kangaroo Island getting the real benefits of investment in it in the future.

I wish to address another important aspect of reform proposed in the bill, that is, the reference to dealing with gambling regulation in South Australia, particularly the amendments to the Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000. As we know, the commercial gambling environment in Australia has changed considerably in recent years. Over a number of years now, there has been the Independent Gambling Authority's charter in this state to provide for the regulatory framework in respect of gaming. There is the poker machine legacy of the former treasurer Mr Blevins under the leadership of Mr Arnold. Neither of them was there very long, so I suppose you cannot blame them entirely for what happened in the preceding years, the State Bank collapse and the desperation of the then Labor government to find a revenue stream to rebuild—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Wasn't it 1990?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No, just before.

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It was way back in 1982 or 1983. The establishment of poker machines brought a new, at the time, contemporary capacity for those who wished to bet at an entertainment and gambling outlet. I must say that it was not something favoured by my father, who was a member of this house. He actually opposed the introduction of poker machines. This is coming from a family who would bet on two flies crawling up a wall and had many farming arrangements with racehorses and the like.

Nevertheless, he was happy to cross the floor to support the Casino in a protected environment, in which there were no poker machines in the 1980s, but not to support poker machines. However, at the time it was and still is to some degree a significant forum in which gambling has been offered to the community. The Independent Gambling Authority was the protective basis upon which that umbrella of protection was provided.

The new government's initiative is to take into account the matters raised by a report of Mr Tim Anderson QC prepared in 2016. It was not released by the former government, but we have recently released it, with some redactions to deal with some commercially sensitive matters. Nevertheless, the recommendations clearly were that the regulatory regimes were complex and needed to have a significant streamlining. His recommendation was that there be the replacement of the authority with a board and that a large amount of the regulatory regime be transferred to the commissioner in respect of commercial gambling.

The proposed legislation will repeal the legislation that established the Independent Gambling Authority. There will be a replacement of the Independent Gambling Authority Act 1995 with the Gambling Administration Act 1995. Since the establishment of the authority, there have been quite significant changes in relation to options available for gambling outside gaming machines, Casino operations, on-table gambling and horseracing in various codes.

There has clearly been a decline, though, in the demand for traditional gaming machines in licensed gaming venues in favour of the increased use of online gambling applications that are easily accessible via the internet, smart phones and tablets. Of course, there is 24/7 availability, which produces a significant challenge in relation to future regulation. We have a situation where, coupled with regular advertising and incentive offers, the normalisation of online gambling is putting young and vulnerable people at significant risk of harm. As I have previously said, the biggest risk to problem gambling is online. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

*Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **CHAMBER MEDIA ACCESS**

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the Premier, I can advise the house that I have been approached by both the Leader of the Opposition's office and also the Premier's office with a request to take photos, not videos, today, and I have allowed that request. Members, please be advised that there may be photographers taking photos in and around question time.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir: standing order 70. The Deputy Premier announced on public radio last night that all members visiting the public gallery would need to seek your permission to enter the parliament.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No, that is not what you said. I have here—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I will listen to the point of order by the member for West Torrens.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** No, I have the point of order. Member for West Torrens, if I could make it crystal clear what I will do. It has been made aware to me that there were comments made on radio last night. What I have requested—

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** Or your colleague.

**The SPEAKER:** Excuse me, member for Light, I am dealing with this situation, if that is okay. In respect of the member for West Torrens' point of order, I have requested a transcript of what was said. I intend to make a statement on the matters that were raised yesterday. I am pretty clear that, once that statement is made, the concerns of the member for West Torrens and any other member will be addressed. I am happy to take that on notice, get the transcript. I do not want to mislead the member for West Torrens, especially given his recent zeal for matters of privilege, which is entirely his right to do. I want to get the facts. I will come back to the house. I will make a statement, and we will go from there.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** And you will correct the member for Bragg.

**The SPEAKER:** Well, I will come back to the house. The Premier has the call.

*Condolence*

**GILES, MR B.L.**

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:01):** I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of Mr Bryant Lionel Giles, former member of the House of Assembly, and places on record its appreciation of his meritorious service, and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Bryant Giles was a member of this house for the term of the Liberal and Country League government of Steele Hall between 1968 and 1970. Although his parliamentary service was relatively brief, he was an active participant in the work of a reformist government. He was elected at the March 1968 election in the seat of Gumeracha. His election was notable because he succeeded in that seat the man who remains the longest serving leader in any commonwealth parliament, Sir Thomas Playford.

In his maiden speech, Mr Giles noted that, during the more than 26 years Sir Thomas had been premier, 1,992 acts of this parliament had been passed, something he called, and I quote:

...a staggering performance when one considers the time consumed in thought and research concerning each individual Act.

Indeed, it was. The election of Mr Giles was notable for another reason as well. He was only 39 when he first sat in this house, then considered a relatively young age to be entering parliament. As a book about South Australian politicians during this period noted, Mr Giles was 'a young local orchardist' at the time of his election. It also recorded that in winning the right to succeed Sir Thomas as the local member, Mr Giles had 'canvassed all LCL members in the district and in a "friendly campaign" ran out ahead of six competitors'.

No doubt, his victory in this big field of candidates was due in no small measure to his active community work. At the time, he was a member of the council of the adult education branch of the Onkaparinga district and the Onkaparinga Area School Committee and chairman of the Lenswood branch of the agricultural bureau. He was also well known locally for his work as an orchardist and his participation in local and state industry organisations, including the South Australian Fruitgrowers' and Market Gardeners Association and the Royal Agricultural and Horticultural Society.

In his maiden speech, he spoke proudly about the industry in which he was an active and successful producer. He referred to the fact that up to 1.5 million bushels of apples were grown each year in the seat that he had been elected to represent. He spoke at the same time about some serious problems that the industry faced, including low prices in export markets and the need to find ways to secure more domestic sales. Mr Giles was obviously well known, too, and supported by his local community. He won almost 70 per cent of the two-party preferred vote in securing the seat of Gumeracha.

In his two years in this house, he continued to speak up strongly to the interests of primary producers right across the state. His son, Phillip, has said that during his time in parliament his father

regarded his most important contribution as working behind the scenes to help secure and ensure that G.H. Michell company retained its headquarters in South Australia, rather than moving interstate. Many subsequent employees of this great South Australian family company, including me, therefore have Mr Giles to thank for helping to ensure that the Michell company remained based in South Australia.

As well as primary production, Mr Giles took a deep interest in education, health and emergency services issues and the importance of water conservation. On water, he told this house in one speech that 'this is not only Gumeracha's problem; it is South Australia's problem, and it extends to the whole of Australia too'. It was this concern that made him a strong supporter of the campaign by the Hall government to have a dam built at Dartmouth to provide South Australia with a more assured long-term supply of water from the Murray. This was one of many important measures taken during this period of government in which Mr Giles was a diligent member and a hard worker on behalf of his community.

In the extensive redistribution of House of Assembly seats before the 1970 election, however, the seat of Gumeracha disappeared, with its voters reallocated to four other electorates. Mr Giles was not a candidate at that election. However, long after leaving parliament he retained an active interest in politics and in primary production. During the latter part of his life he lived in the South-East, farming sheep and cattle and being a proud exhibitor of cattle at shows right around Australia.

On behalf of all members of this government, I express appreciation to Mr Giles for his service to this parliament, his electors and our party, and I express our genuine condolences at his passing to his family and friends.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** I rise to support the motion and welcome the family of the late Bryant Giles. The parliamentary service of Mr Giles coincided with one of the most dynamic periods of state politics and, of course, the end of the Playford era. It is also a key chapter in the history of the Liberal and Country League and its charter to represent the rural sector of South Australia.

Mr Giles, an orchardist and farmer, made it clear in his maiden speech that the House of Assembly should distinguish between country and city. City seats should have twice as many people as a country seat, he said, on the basis that the contribution of agriculture, along with its problems, deserved appropriate recognition. That proposition has defined the South Australian parliament for decades.

Premier Tom Playford had long recognised the state's reliance on regional agriculture. He supported the extra-weighted representation that country voters had but, as Premier, he was also minister for industrial development. His pursuit of car manufacturing changed the economy and therefore the parliament. The timing was not good for Bryant Giles.

As the Premier has mentioned, Mr Giles was elected in 1968 in the seat of Gumeracha, and that had been held for 30 years by Sir Thomas Playford. He knew the Playford family well and several other Adelaide Hills families that played significant roles in politics past and present. News reports from the time showed that there were seven candidates for preselection for Gumeracha in 1968. In sporting parlance, it was certainly a class field. A former mayor of East Torrens was in the running—Bill Bishop, the grandfather of a then 12-year-old Julie Bishop, who of course would go on to become Australian foreign affairs minister. Another contender in that ballot was G.W. Evans of Heathfield. The Evans family, of course, have made a very significant contribution to this house.

When Mr Giles entered parliament succeeding Playford, South Australia's economy had been rebuilt around tariff-protected industry that sat alongside traditional rural industries. He applied his agriculture knowledge in his service on the parliamentary committee for land settlement. However, his leader and premier was Steele Hall, who was set on introducing a new system of electoral boundaries, changing the weighting applied to country seats. The seat of Gumeracha was abolished in 1969, and it folded into Kavel and then later Morialta.

The election came earlier than expected when Independent MP Tom Stott and premier Steele Hall split over the dam water storage issue in 1970. Stott withdrew his balance of power

support on the night of 30 April, and in 1970 the writs were issued for an election in May. Bryant Giles was stranded. He did not stand for re-election and returned to his passions of orchards and grazing. He later moved to the South-East, where he was a very active community contributor. He maintained his support for what has now become the Liberal Party after the merger. As I mentioned earlier, his parliamentary service came at a watershed time in South Australian history.

There is a small irony in his last day in parliament, dominated by the issue of River Murray dams and the then crippling drought. He questioned one of his own colleagues on why works had not been done to solve the flooding issues at the Oakbank Area School. It should also be remembered that he often championed the need for a solution to trucks losing control down what is now the South Eastern Freeway. Escape roads and run-offs were a welcome idea, he said, as well as moves for emergency braking systems to become compulsory.

There is a story from 1940 I would like to share with you that goes to the values, principles and work ethic that spanned Mr Bryant's life and that of his community. It is recorded in the 3 October 1940 edition of *The News* and is headlined 'Boy's Effort'. It reads:

Twelve-year-old Bryant Giles, of Norton's Summit, recently saved up his pocket money, bought a billy goat for five shillings and sixpence, broke it in, harnessed it to a cart, and started using this outfit to collect waste paper for the Fighting Forces Comforts Fund.

Bryant, who is being helped by his brother Howard and his friend Wallace, travels several miles every Saturday morning through hilly country to collect paper, which is needed for the Boy Scouts' waste paper campaign. The boys have collected nearly six hundred-weight of paper.

Six hundredweight of paper in today's measure is 304 kilograms. It would appear that ingenuity, commitment and a touch of political skill were evident in the early days of Bryant Giles' life because not only was the paper collection an honourable pursuit but the president of the local unit of the Fighting Forces Comforts Fund was, of course, Mr Tom Playford. I acknowledge Bryant Giles' service and express our condolences and extend them to the family.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:12):** I, too, rise today to offer my condolences to the family and friends of Mr Bryant Giles and echo the words of the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier. Mr Giles was the member for Gumeracha, an area now covered by the state electorates of Morialta, Kavel and Heysen, from 2 March 1968 until 29 May 1970. He is remembered as a proud and dedicated local member of parliament who passionately believed in the importance of the value of hard work and service to the community.

The apple and cherry orchards that were a large part of the landscape in the 1960s still form a significant part of our local industries. Mr Giles was a passionate advocate for the needs of orchardists in terms of market share, fair market price and biological control of pests. The fruit that is produced in the Adelaide Hills was and continues to be the best quality you will find anywhere in Australia.

Mr Giles was a firm believer in the importance of volunteering and the value this adds to our communities. Summertime in the Adelaide Hills is, of course, bushfire season, and he was particularly grateful to, and recognised in the parliament, the volunteer firefighters who saved lives, homes and properties from deadly bushfires. Since that time, there have been some personnel changes, but there are still some people who were then and still are in some of those brigades. The volunteer firefighters are an absolutely critical part of our Hills communities and remain so.

Being an advocate for Hills primary producers in the parliament saw him also make important contributions in relation to the healthcare and educational needs of the local area and also express some significant words about tourism opportunities in the Adelaide Hills.

Reading his maiden speech in recent days, I was quite taken also with Mr Giles' reflections on the benefits of cycling, perhaps ahead of his time and still potentially causing some controversy in those Hills communities for whom cycling is not as popular, or at least cyclists are not always as popular as they are in some other areas of our city. He understood deeply the value of being out in nature, the peace and tranquillity that the Adelaide Hills offer.

He was proud of the natural beauty of the area he represented. He spoke in that maiden speech of the Liberal priorities, of progress and growth and worked hard during his time in this place to bring about lower costs to encourage industries to South Australia. His maiden speech concluded

with a quote that I thought I would repeat, with the indulgence of the house, in the hope that we may all reflect on it:

I trust that we here will be able to work together for the advancement of South Australia. I do not believe that backbiting and personal attack will achieve much. Let us get on with the job of reinstating South Australia in its rightful place on the ladder of success.

They were good words then, and they remain valid 50 years later. Mr Giles was a proactive and diligent servant of his community, and we are grateful for that service.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:16):** I rise to address the condolence motion and to add to the record. Mr Bryant Giles came to this place on the retirement of Sir Thomas Playford. Playford was a colossus, as the Premier and the opposition leader have remarked. It is hard to imagine the task of filling Playford's seat, but that was the task that Mr Giles faced. Mr Giles was a popular and fair-minded orchardist. He had imbued in him from early days the volunteer spirit and ethic, which remains in the Hills and which we value to this day.

Neal Blewett and Dean Jaensch reflect in their text *Playford to Dunstan* that preselection contests in 1967 were all completed by June of that year. They write—and I add to the Premier's remarks:

In the four seats from which LCL members were retiring—Gumeracha, Rocky River, Burra and Eyre—there were keen contests. In Playford's old seat of Gumeracha...B Giles got off to an early start, canvassed all LCL members in the district and in a 'friendly campaign' ran out ahead of six competitors, although only after distribution of some preferences.

He did not face that risk at the subsequent election: he was popular and his success assured. The text continues:

A less friendly fight was waged in the sprawling electorate of Eyre...

Mr Giles was deeply respected in his community. He was sought out for his counsel and friendship. His name frequently came forward when committee work was required. I bring up some but far from all of his service. My intention is to record it.

Mr Giles served as vice chairman of the royal agricultural society horticultural and floricultural section. He served on the Onkaparinga adult education council and the Onkaparinga Area School Committee and was, for a time, chairman of the Lenswood Primary School committee. He was chairman of the Lenswood branch of the Agricultural Bureau and also a member of the apple and pear section of the South Australian fruitgrowers' and market gardeners' association.

He was an excellent orchardist, and he had learnt politics and also fruit growing from the best. Our party, then the Liberal and Country League, relied on Mr Giles heavily. He served as president of the Gumeracha district committee. He was a member of the state council organising committee. His branches sent Mr Giles as delegate to the LCL state council, to the southern Legislative Council committee and to the Angas divisional committee. He was also president of the Lenswood branch of the LCL for some time.

Our members had picked broad shoulders on which to cast substantial responsibilities, but fate can be a difficult thing, and changes in electoral boundaries, of course, played their role in Mr Giles' political future. Blewett and Jaensch, to whom I referred earlier, detail the close of Mr Giles' political career in this way:

It was, indeed, the absolute reduction of country seats, and the great transformation of many districts that occasioned difficulties for members and aspirants alike. It was not surprising that there were some 'tense ballots'...

Those ballots, of course, were for Liberal preselection. The text continues:

John Freebairn, MP for old Light, whose constituency was dramatically re-drawn, lost out in preselection to the Mayor of Gawler, largest town in the new district of Light. B.L. Giles, whose constituency of Gumeracha was mostly absorbed by the new seat of Kavel, was defeated in the preselection for that seat.

Some will know that the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy AO, ultimately deputy premier, succeeded in that preselection and became the member for Kavel following the 1970 state election. He always spoke very kindly of Mr Giles and I was eager to hear those remarks.

Political life and death can come quickly. Perhaps this is a lesson for all of us. Mr Giles' service was elegant and brief. He was a principled man. There are still many people in Kavel who remember him and remember his service. We feel his loss. We acknowledge his family.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

*Sitting suspended from 14:22 to 14:31.*

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme—Actuarial Valuation Report 30 June 2017

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

National Environment Protection Council—Annual Report 2016-17

*Parliamentary Committees*

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:33):** I bring up the sixth report of the committee, entitled Pennington School R-7 Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:34):** I bring up the fourth report of the committee, entitled Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (Investigation Powers) Amendment Bill 2018.

Report received.

*Question Time*

**SA WATER**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35):** My question is to the Premier. Why is the government extracting an additional \$250 million from government businesses, including more than \$120 million from SA Water over the next three years?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:36):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. As he would be more than aware, we had a difficult task to deal with on coming to government. The previous government had made it very clear that we were heading towards a surplus. In fact, we found advice had been prepared by Treasury officials, which was available in January, only weeks after the Mid-Year Budget Review was faithfully handed to the people of South Australia, which showed that we were headed towards a deficit at that point approaching \$200 million.

We have now seen the state budget. The state budget provided for a return over the forward estimates—in fact, in the first year—to being a balanced budget and into surplus. That is exactly and precisely what we want to deliver for the people of South Australia—balanced budgets, living within our means but at the same time achieving our ambition to get this state on track: more jobs, lower costs and better services.

With regard to the issue of water pricing and any distribution from the SA Water Corporation, we know that those opposite had been essentially raiding and, in fact, fixing the amount of money that was distributed from SA Water to prop up their absolutely hopeless budgets. What we know for a fact is that over the last 10 years the previous government posted seven deficit budgets. In fact, in the budgets that they did conjure up a surplus, it was only after flogging off a whole pile of state government assets.



*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** When we talk about flogging off assets by those opposite—the winding up of the Motor Accident Commission, the selling off of the Lands Titles Office, the forests, our assets that existed with regard to SA Lotteries—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens, leader, Deputy Premier, member for Lee!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —it was all designed to do one thing only, and that was to deal with the issue the previous government had for a long period of time, which was their inability to bring the budget back into balance. Rather than take some of the tough decisions that have been necessary in our first budget, they instead chose to do everything that they could to disguise the real situation that existed for a very long period of time.

I would like to just talk about this for a short period of time, which is the issue regarding water pricing and, in fact, the distribution of money from SA Water to prop up the balance of the previous government's budget.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** What we know from evidence that has been provided by two former directors and the chief executive of ESCOSA is that it was very suspicious activity from the government in setting the regulated asset base. We see the member for Lee smiling over there because he's got his fingerprints all over this.

*The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** He's smiling, he's smirking because he thinks he got away with something. What we know is that when asked—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —he sent evidence, would you believe, but we understand that he sent evidence or requests to ESCOSA to see what the impact upon the distribution to the state government would be if there was a 5 per cent, 10 per cent, 15 per cent or 20 per cent increase in the regulated asset base. I don't know about you, but I don't think that's the determination of what the regulated asset base should be. It should be based upon what the actual asset base should be, and that's precisely what our water price inquiry will get to the bottom of.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I call the following members to order: the Deputy Premier, the Minister for Primary Industries, the member for Kaurana—and I warn him a first time, the member for Lee, the member for West Torrens—and I warn him a first time, the member for Playford and the leader. The leader has the call.

#### SA WATER

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40):** A supplementary question, Mr Speaker: then does the Premier accept that without these funds his government would be delivering budget deficits in both 2018-19 but also 2019-20?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:40):** I know that the Leader of the Opposition—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —has been in this—

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier will be seated. Premier, please be seated for one moment. The member for West Torrens, that is not an excuse to interject, and you are warned for a second time. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you very much, sir. As you would be aware, and as all of us suffering in this parliament would be aware, the Leader of the Opposition has now been in this esteemed role, this important role, for six months but he still doesn't understand what a hypothetical situation is. He still continues to ask questions in this position—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Please do not provoke the opposition, Premier!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** 'If this didn't exist, what would be the situation?'

*The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Well, that's sort of the definition of 'hypothetical'. The reality is we have—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —this learner-plate Leader of the Opposition, batting away over there trying to drum up some enthusiasm from his troops. The reality is he is destroyed by the fact that the new government delivered exactly and precisely what we said we would deliver in the lead-up to the election. We said that we would put the people of South Australia first.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We said we would do everything we possibly could to create more jobs, lower costs and better services, and that is exactly what we did, and we got in. As I referred to in my previous answer—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, leader, and member for Lee!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As I referred to in my previous answer, we were left a dirty big gaping black hole by those opposite who had the opportunity—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to come clean with the people of South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** But did they come clean with the people of South Australia? No way. They kept it all hidden. But don't worry, we're not complaining about it and, most importantly, we are not using it—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —as an excuse—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I'm struggling to hear the Premier.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to move away from important commitments that we made for the people of South Australia. We have delivered on every single one of the commitments that we made in the lead-up to the election. That kills; it kills those opposite.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** But we are guided, not by their bleating, not by their incompetence that we are left to clean up, but by the wills and aspiration of the people of South Australia. We had an election. The people of South Australia voted for our strong plan for real change. If you like, the election is an opportunity to vote in a new government and cast a vote of confidence in one party or another to guide the future prosperity of our state.

I am very proud and I am very privileged to be leading a party which did receive that vote of confidence from the people of South Australia, unlike those opposite, who after 16 years had a resounding vote of no confidence in their failed policies and their mismanagement of the budget here in South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, unfortunately I have to intervene. There were several interjections during the Premier's answer. I call to order the deputy leader, I warn for a first time the member for Lee, I also call to order and warn the member for Reynell, and I call to order and warn the Minister for Primary Industries.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the leader, I welcome to parliament today several students from years 11 and 12 from St Francis de Sales College in Mount Barker, guests of the member for Kavel. I acknowledge the Lion of Hartley, former member for Hartley Joe Scalzi, who is in the gallery today.

**Mr Picton:** Bring him back.

**The SPEAKER:** 'Bring him back,' says the member for Kaurana.

#### *Question Time*

#### **SA WATER**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44):** My question is to the Premier. How will extracting more than \$120 million in additional dividends from SA Water over three years help to reduce water prices?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44):** As I outlined to the people of South Australia in the lead-up to the election, and then immediately after the election followed through with, we are conducting at the moment a water price inquiry in South Australia.

**Mr Malinauskas:** After you have raided SA Water.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We appointed somebody to this important task as quickly as we possibly could, and we have done that because we wanted to get on and discover whether the previous government had in fact been cooking the books, because it was more than one director who said that the regulated asset base provided by Treasury to ESCOSA was essentially \$2 billion overvalued. There was an inflated asset value of more than \$2 billion.

If this turns out to be true—and we will wait to find out from the water pricing inquiry, which is currently underway—essentially, what we know therefore is that the previous government was doing all it could to insert another tax, another hit to the hip pocket of every single South Australian individual, family, household and small business in this state.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** By contrast, what we want to do is to reduce that burden on individuals, families, households and businesses in South Australia. That's why we are committed to the water pricing inquiry. That's why we are committed to removing all payroll tax for small businesses with an annual payroll of up to \$1.5 million, which will come into effect on 1 January next year. That's why we are committed to a massive reduction in land tax in South Australia from mid-2020. That's why we have already passed through to people \$360 million worth of cuts in emergency services levies—

**Mr Malinauskas:** And to pay for it you're raiding SA Water and jacking up Housing Trust rents.

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —right through until the end of this forward estimates. The Leader of the Opposition, of course, is concerned and he makes the point that this is going to hit people's pockets. Obviously he has a slightly smaller office than he had before, but there might be somebody who can give you a briefing because what you need to understand, sir, is that a water price determination has already been made. This does not in any way, shape or form affect water pricing in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** And this is the problem for the Australian Labor Party. This is the person they decided to have as their leader—somebody who doesn't know how water pricing in South Australia—

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order by the member for West Torrens for debate.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It's clearly debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I respectfully—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Is the member for Waite interjecting? I call him to order. Will the Premier please come back to the substance of the question. I think you were finishing up. He has concluded his answer. Before I call the member for Lee, I warn him for a first time. The member for Lee.

*Members interjecting:*

#### **MINISTER FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:47):** They haven't even heard the question yet, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Why did the minister manage to meet with the Grapevine council in Texas before meeting with the mayors of Whyalla, Port Pirie and Port Augusta?

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is on two warnings and continues to interject. The Minister for Primary Industries has the call.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:48):** Yes, while I was in Texas I met with the community groups—the RDA's equivalent—with the City of Grapevine. The reason I met with them was to look at how we were going to better develop our regions here in South Australia. You may smirk, old chicken lips—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —but let me tell you something—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —I have made requests to meet with all the mayors in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** The three mayors of the Upper Spencer Gulf group were unable to meet. I have given them the opportunity, just like I have every mayor an opportunity, to meet, as has the Minister for Local Government. We are out in the regions meeting with mayors. We are out in the regions meeting with all the regional people—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —groups. The reason, unbeknown for that stupid question, is: ask yourself why.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens I again acknowledge is on two warnings and continues to interject; if he does it again, he will be departing the chamber.

#### **MINISTER FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:49):** My question is actually a supplementary question. Did the minister think touring Texas in a \$1,600-a-day limousine was more important than meeting regional mayors in South Australia?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: that question was frivolous, contained argument and has breached 97.

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to allow the question in this instance, but I acknowledge it is on the edge. Minister, would you like to have a go?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:50):** Thank you, sir, and, yes, I will give the information to the house in terms of that meeting that both my Chief of Staff and I had when we were in Dallas, Texas. We met with the Australian trade commissioner from Australia to Texas, the Hon. Peter McGauran. When we arrived—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —we got to Dallas, we were picked up by the Hon. Peter McGauran as the trade commissioner to Australia. It was the SUV—

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurana is warned for a second and final time.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —that he picked us up in. He picked us up at 8.30 that morning and dropped us off at 6.30 that night. It is the car that he regularly uses. He took us to meetings.

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is warned for a second and final time.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Obviously, the member for Lee—

**The SPEAKER:** Please do not respond to interjections, minister.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —has no idea how trade negotiations work. This vehicle is a vehicle that the trade commissioner uses on a basis when he visits Dallas. It was under invitation that we travelled with the Hon. Peter McGauran. Austrade billed the state government for that car.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order and warned for a first time. The member for Reynell is warned for a second and final time. The member for Elder will be heard in absolute silence.

### LIQUOR LICENSING LAWS

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:51):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General update the house on what measures are being taken to prevent under 18 year olds and barred patrons from gaining access to licensed venues?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:51):** I thank the member for her question and her valuable work as a minister in respect to dealing with the scourge of domestic violence. As part of the review of South Australia's liquor licensing laws, Mr Tim Anderson QC made 129 recommendations. With respect to the liquor licensing barring system, he recommended the introduction of a web-based notification system or portal for licensees, SAPOL and CBS to collectively manage this issue. South Australia is proposing that this system be in the form of an over-18 and barring notification app.

Such technology is already in use in the Sydney King's Cross entertainment precinct. Mr Anderson found that it enabled greater detection of fake identifications and was a better method of identifying those who were attempting to breach barring orders. As part of this app's development, South Australia has sought funding from the commonwealth under the Small Business Regulatory Reform Agreement, which was signed by Treasurer Rob Lucas in April this year. The deliverables for this project will soon be established between us and the commonwealth.

It is the intention that the app will allow patrons to sign up to the mySA GOV account to scan their digital licence for the purpose of confirming their age and whether they are the subject of a barring order. It would also allow for the scanning of physical driver's licences. This initiative will lower costs and simplify the processes for business by reducing the cost of lodging barring notifications. Clearly, it will also result in a reduction in underage drinking in venues.

In addition, stage 2 of the Anderson reforms will be coming into effect next Monday. Stage 2 introduces a new offence in relation to the sale and delivery of liquor to minors through direct sales transactions as well as an increase in penalties for some offences. The Liquor and Gambling Commissioner will also have the power to direct a designated person to undertake specific training.

I wish to place on record my appreciation to Mr Tim Anderson for the work that he undertook in preparing the recommendations for the then former government and to the former attorney-general for bringing to the parliament—belatedly, but nevertheless, brought to the parliament—some of those reforms. These are the result of some of those initiatives, and we welcome them.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right!

### MINISTER FOR PRIMARY INDUSTRIES AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:54):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Why did the minister find the time to visit the Napa Valley before meeting with the mayors of Whyalla, Port Pirie and Port Augusta, and did he use the services of a limousine?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left will cease using props immediately.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** It's a bit rich when you are wearing a guernsey, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** It's not a prop. And, Member for West Torrens, per the past practice—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I'm not going to kick you out yet. Per the past practice of the house, you know what the practice has been in the week of the grand final, especially when Norwood are in the grand final. Thank you for immediately putting those props down. If I see them again, I will be ejecting members. The Minister for Primary Industries has the call. He will be heard in silence. Give him a fair hearing.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:55):** Actually, why is it that you are asking these important questions?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Mr Speaker, What I would say—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** This is a very important question, but I do feel sorry for the shadow minister not getting a guernsey to ask a question. What I would like to say is that, through my travels in the US, I visited the Napa Valley, and I looked at ways that South Australia could grow the wine industry, particularly exports into the US. Since 2002, the South Australian wine industry and nationally the wine industry has been growing, but South Australia's trade into the US has dropped by 30 per cent, since the previous government was in power. What is really, really important to know—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —is that we continue to look—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I'm not drinking Argentinian malbec, but what I am going to say—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I'm backing our industries as Minister for Regional Development. This government will back our economy—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will be seated. Member for West Torrens, you can leave for half an hour under 137A, please.

*The honourable member for West Torrens having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The SPEAKER:** We will recommence once the member has left. Minister.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Thank you, sir. This government, unlike the previous government, is going to grow our exports. We are going to go to our markets and understand what we need to do to grow our economy, particularly our wine economy. We know that—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** You are breaking my heart, Tim, my achy-breaky heart.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, was that you? You can leave for half an hour, thank you.

*The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:*

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I could do. Yes, I could do. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Thank you, sir. As I said, it is an important question and, on this side of the chamber, the government are acting maturely to try to grow our exports, to grow our—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Waite is warned.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Those opposite can laugh all they want, but it was under their watch that we lost that 30 per cent trade figure into the US. It's important if we are going to get back to what was once a 7.9 per cent export figure nationally that we represented in 2002, when you were in power. Last year it was 3.9 per cent.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** The opposition were in power. Last year, 3.9 per cent—South Australia represented the national exports. Shame. So this mature government on this side are going to grow our exports.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Not only are we going to grow our exports but we are going to reopen trade offices that you closed.

**Mr PICTON:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: the minister keeps referring and criticising your behaviour.

**The SPEAKER:** Questions must be made through the Chair. Yes, that is correct. Is the minister almost done?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Yes, sir. What I will say is that we will grow our trade numbers, we will open trade offices, we will grow the economy because we understand what the South Australian economy needs.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kavel.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I will come back to you. The member for Kavel has the call.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister update the house on the government's commitment to emergency services in Mount Barker?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:59):** I thank the member for the question, and what an important question it is. I know the member for Kavel has been working very hard on this in his local region. In fact, he has calluses on his knuckles because he is knocking on my door that often, coming to see me about making things happen in his local community. In particular, he is persistently knocking my door down—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —to get things happening in the Mount Barker region. Last week, I had the pleasure—

**The SPEAKER:** Has the member for Enfield lost his page?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** No, he's asleep, Mr Speaker. He's asleep.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** The boofheads in the back row are asleep. It's a shame, Mr Speaker. They need to listen to this.

**The SPEAKER:** Please get on with it.



**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** They need to listen to this.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, sorry. I withdraw that comment.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** Point of order: it is inappropriate to reflect on a member—

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I withdraw that comment.

**The Hon. J.R. RAU:** —and to suggest that he was asleep, particularly when I was looking up the word 'quadruped' to help me ascertain what he was saying about the member for Kavel.

**The SPEAKER:** Will the minister withdraw the comment about sleep? I will withdraw the comment about the bookmark.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Yes, I will withdraw the comment, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Let's get on with important things, like the great work the member for Kavel is doing. In fact, I was up in his local area visiting the Mount Barker CFS with the member for Kavel last week. We went to the local brigade where we caught up with some members, including CFS Assistant Chief Officer, Daniel Austin, and senior MFS firefighters, including MFS Acting Chief Officer—

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Reynell is warned for a second and final time, as she was yesterday.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —Paul Fletcher, and MFS Assistant Chief Officer in charge of Regional Operations, Phil Kilsby, to discuss the Marshall government's plan to boost support for emergency services in the Mount Barker community. You should have seen the people come to laud the member for Kavel. Everywhere we went through the street, they were stopping and patting him on the back, applauding the great work he had been doing, and this is a great example. I am particularly pleased—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —to inform the house—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left and right!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —that we were in Mount Barker to highlight the establishment of the new—

*Mr Cowdrey interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton is called to order.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —MFS presence in the town. I know those on the other side don't care about the region of Mount Barker, but the member for Kavel certainly does. He is passionate about his community. With a population in the region of around 35,000, and the number continuing to grow, this much-needed additional emergency services support will be reassuring to those who live and work in the local area.

As set out in the budget, the MFS will receive \$3.9 million over three years to deliver a retained MFS service in the Mount Barker district. The funding will commence from July next year and the preparation work and training has already started. More than 20 MFS retained firefighters will be recruited and placed on call in the region to respond to emergencies when needed. This additional emergency services capability will provide great support for the CFS brigades in the region, which service the Mount Barker, Littlehampton, Nairne, Oakbank, Balhannah, Woodside and Hahndorf communities.

What a great job those local CFS brigades do too. They have outstanding volunteers and we are looking to always grow the volunteers within the CFS. These towns are growing with communities where the risk of structural fires increase with expansion and further urbanisation within Mount Gambier, but the MFS presence will not diminish the importance—

**Mr Picton:** Mount Gambier?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I should have said Mount Barker; I apologise. The MFS presence will not diminish the importance of the CFS—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —where the greatest threat to our growing Hills towns remains bushfire. I have mentioned the volunteers already that do the outstanding job there. This initiative will provide a two-pronged attack to guard against fire and continue to grow the CFS presence and the new MFS presence to assist with the built-up residential, commercial and industrial areas.

While those on the other side laugh, I want to truly commend the member for Kavel for the hard work he does and the advocacy he does for his community. I know that all of us on this side have him in our offices all the time, championing for the people of his region. He really is an outstanding local member, as there are so many on this side of the house, that tirelessly—tirelessly—work for their community, have campaigned incredibly hard and are delivering great results with a Marshall Liberal government.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Giles has been patiently waiting.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** Waiting for 186 days.

**Mr HUGHES:** Well, your budget was a starting gun.

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

**Mr HUGHES:** It is an endurance event after all.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Education is called to order. The member for Giles has the call.

### REGIONAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:03):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister assure the house that regional impact statements have been undertaken for savings measures in the primary industries and regions portfolio?

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** You are going to ask that question with a straight face?

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure is called to order.

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** Ask Rory McEwen about that.

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier is called to order. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:04):** Welcome to the shadow ministry. You have been elevated to be able to ask a proper question, so thank you. It's good to have you here, Eddie.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! It was a fair question. It was in order. Minister, please answer it.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Hear, hear! Thank you, and I thank the member for his question.

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Waite is on two warnings.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Yes, the regions have been given to me as a priority, as is primary industries. What I will say is that all the regions matter. Every region will have—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I believe the minister is attempting to answer the question. Please do not interject.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Every region of South Australia will have an impact assessment done on them, every region in South Australia. Every region will have the support of this government to help it grow, to help it prosper, to make sure that we've got our skills minister making sure that we can upskill our population, making sure that we can actually put a workforce into the meatworks, making sure that we can put a workforce on the ground within horticulture and agriculture.

This is a government that is actually prioritising regional South Australia. Albeit that they are 28 per cent of the state's population, the regions of South Australia are of critical importance to the state's economy. What I will say is that regional South Australia, which I visited previously—in the last 10 days 13 regions I visited, so, yes, I am out there, prioritising, meeting, understanding what the regions—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —are meaning to South Australia's economy. While we had the opposition leader over there bleating and getting lost one day and ending up over on Eyre Peninsula, this government is visiting—

**Mr PICTON:** On a point of order, Mr Speaker: 98, debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order, for debate. When you talk about Eyre Peninsula and the Leader of the Opposition travelling there—

**An honourable member:** It's an oxymoron.

**The SPEAKER:** It could be an oxymoron, but it is not really relevant to the question. Minister, would you like to wrap it up.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** What I will say is that this government, the—

*The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier is warned.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —Marshall Liberal government, will give the support to the regions of South Australia that it needs. For 16 long years that it has been—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader will cease interjecting. I give him great latitude most days.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** For 16 long years, the regions have been put on the backburner. What I will say is that this government has promised, has delivered and will continue to prioritise the regions of South Australia because hashtag #RegionsMatter.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left! The member for Reynell is on two warnings, and I warn her again that she is on two warnings.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition! Shortly, I am going to have to ask him to leave if he continues this way.

#### REGIONAL IMPACT STATEMENTS

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:07):** Supplementary, Mr Speaker: does the minister believe that the requirement to prepare these statements does not apply to him?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:07):** Would you please repeat the question?

**Mr HUGHES:** Does the minister believe that the requirement to provide these statements does not apply to him given the answer or the non-answer given?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I think we have the question—twice.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Thank you for the question. If we are going to talk budget cuts within primary industries and regions, obviously you have a very, very short memory. The forward estimates in the previous government: \$28.6 million of cuts that we had to implement, \$28.6 million of cuts. This government has acted responsibly, with a strong budget to support the regions of South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** We will prioritise the regions; we will give them the support that they have long needed. The 16 years that they have been forgotten will not happen again.

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Elizabeth will not interject, and he will refer to members by their electorate names when he is able to speak.

#### **PARK-AND-RIDE FACILITIES**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:08):** My question is to Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Reynell can leave for half an hour.

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** And the member for Waite will be leaving shortly after—yes, you! The member for Reynell will leave for half an hour. Thank you.

*The honourable member for Reynell having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**Ms LUETHEN:** Can the minister update the house on the state government's increased funding for O-Bahn park-and-rides, including the Golden Grove park-and-ride, in the electorate of King?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford is warned.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:09):** I would like to thank the member for King for that question and do note very much her hard work in this area in advocating on behalf of her community.

Whether it is Golden Grove Road, whether it is investigating the options in relation to extending the O-Bahn services to Golden Grove, we are investing and committing more into the north-east of South Australia and, more than that, actually delivering on our commitment of a Golden Grove park-and-ride as part of this budget. We committed \$18½ million to deliver the park-and-ride that the Speaker so desperately has been badgering me for, as well as delivering a Golden Grove park-and-ride for the people of the member for King's community.

This is an extremely important measure because we know it is such a good and growing population. The O-Bahn services are such an integral part of our public transport network that getting more people to be able to park their car and use those services for getting into town does wonders for our traffic congestion, and it also does wonders for helping to incentivise people to use public

transport. Those opposite did not think that the Golden Grove park-and-ride was a priority. They didn't think that the Paradise park-and-ride was a priority.

**The SPEAKER:** Outrageous!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** This government has made them a commitment, put the money on the table in the budget—\$18½ million to add to the \$15 million that was already in the budget to deliver these projects.

I have been excited by some of the early works and discussions that have been had in relation to these projects and in relation to the time line. I look forward to seeing the Golden Grove park-and-ride completed as soon as possible. In fact, the suggestions are it's going to be delivered sooner than we thought. I look forward to sharing that information with the people of South Australia and the people of the north-east who want a government that is going to invest where it is needed. The areas of Golden Grove, Greenwith and those surrounding suburbs have been significantly expanding over time.

What they have been let down with is a bus network that hasn't delivered for them. It is why this park-and-ride at Golden Grove is so important—because it provides access for those communities and gets them into town. I look forward also to being able to share with the house more about our plans and our studies into the best way to extend O-Bahn services out to Golden Grove. This is a fantastic and growing part of our state. It is one that has been very well served by a local member who is a fierce advocate for her community. I look forward to delivering once again on one of the many election promises that the Marshall Liberal government took to the state election.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Giles.

#### **REGIONAL ROADS AND INFRASTRUCTURE FUND**

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:11):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Why has the government reduced regional road funding this year? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain my question.

Leave granted.

**Mr HUGHES:** Last financial year, more than \$94 million was spent on regional road maintenance works, while the current state budget papers outline that under the new Regional Roads Maintenance Fund this will be reduced to \$71.5 million this financial year.

*The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier is called to order.

*The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Primary Industries is warned.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:12):** As the Regional Roads and Infrastructure Fund falls under my portfolio, I am happy to take this question.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is on two warnings.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Can I say that members opposite have been pushing around this figure of \$94 million, or whatever it is. I have actually tried to get to the bottom of what this figure is, but nobody has been able to tell me what that figure relates to. Nobody has been able to tell me what that figure relates to.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** It may be that they have just plucked it out of the sky, 'Well, this figure sounds good. This sounds like more than what they were doing. Let's just put it into the public sphere.'

I tell you what we have been able to deliver in our first budget: duplication of Port Wakefield Road and the overpass, \$200 million towards the Joy Baluch Bridge and the Penola bypass. These are all fantastic regional road and infrastructure projects that we are delivering for the people of South Australia. We took them to the election, we delivered them in the 2018-19 budget and we are actually going to deliver better regional road funding, more regional road funding, for the people of South Australia.

#### PRIMARY INDUSTRIES AND REGIONS DEPARTMENT

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:13):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister rule out any job losses in regional offices of the Department of Primary Industries and Regions from the functional review savings measure in the budget?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:13):** I thank the member for Giles for his question. What I can say is that we have had to inflict budget savings through the forward estimates of a previous government.

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light is called to order. You are interjecting.

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurna is on two warnings. He keeps interjecting.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** The \$38.6 million of forward estimates savings that were inflicted upon primary industries and regions—

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light is warned.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —in South Australia were an act that this government had to responsibly and diligently implement. It's all very well for the members for Light and Giles to squirm and point accusations at me as the minister. What did you do when you were in government?

**The SPEAKER:** What did the opposition do when they were in government.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** What did you do to stick up for the regions of South Australia? What did you do?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Yes, a big fat zero.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** What I would—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is very close to the edge today.

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light is called to order.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** We are taking ownership of the regions. We are taking ownership of PIRSA, primary industries here in South Australia.

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Elizabeth!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** We have made budgets that will fit within PIRSA, that will fit within the department of regions. Any job losses primarily will go in the communications department.

That's where it was the department of spin by a previous government. We are a government of substance. We will enact change within those departments so that we reduce any job losses, making sure that regional development and primary industries are the economic drivers here in South Australia.

#### ADELAIDE FILM FESTIVAL

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:15):** My question is for the Minister for Industry and Skills: can the minister update the house on the state government's investment to support the Adelaide Film Festival?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (15:15):** I am very pleased to receive this question from the member for Colton. I know how interested he is in opportunities for young people in South Australia. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to creating the right environment to grow and promote South Australia's creative industries. Last week, I had the pleasure of participating in the launch of this year's Adelaide Film Festival. Our festival is unique in that it includes an investment fund that supports our outstanding and growing South Australian screen industry.

The Marshall Liberal government is pleased to provide \$1 million for the festival and the fund. The Adelaide Film Festival Investment Fund supports production of feature films, short films and documentaries. To receive support, films need to have some connection to South Australia, whether it be production, post-production or being shot here. This is very important, of course, because this is where the jobs can be created for our young people.

A final condition of receiving support from the fund is that these films have their Australian premiere in Adelaide. On this year's opening night film is *Hotel Mumbai*. I have already had the pleasure of seeing the film and recommend it to all of you. Filming, production and post-production of the film took place in Adelaide. In fact, a luxury Indian hotel was recreated within the hallways of the Adelaide Studios.

The movie has been widely acclaimed, most recently at the Toronto Film Festival, with reviews such as, '*Hotel Mumbai* tells an astonishing true story of the victims and survivors of the devastating attacks on Mumbai in 2008,' and, 'It is an excellent white-knuckle thriller—and an unlikely crowd-pleaser,' as well as, 'The film is gripping in its execution,' and, '*Hotel Mumbai* is a nonstop, intense thrill ride that will shake you to the core.' I can certainly relate to those critics' commentary.

It's also important for Australian audiences to see Australian stories on the big screen, and the Marshall Liberal government is very pleased to be able to facilitate and support that objective. Our strong local film history has a great deal to be proud of. The diversity and incredibly high calibre of the screen industry in South Australia is globally recognised. The Adelaide Film Festival is a brilliant showcase of the best of our local industry, which is full of potential and continued growth. The Marshall Liberal is committed to continuing support for the screen industry here in South Australia.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:18):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and a Regional Development. What consultation occurred with the South Australian Research and Development Institute before the decision was taken to increase its fees payable to the primary industries department?

*The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier is warned for a second and final time.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:18):** Again, that is an important question. What I would say to the member for Giles is that we did not have to inflict a forward estimates budget cut of \$35.8 million—

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** Here we go.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light will cease interjecting.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** As I previously stated, I would like—

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hurtle Vale is called to order.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Sir, I would like to correct the *Hansard*: it was \$28.5 million of forward estimates cuts. What I can proudly say to the shadow minister is that there were no cuts to SARDI in the budget.

**Mr Picton:** Increase in fees?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** There is an increase in fees, yes.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** It's called fee for service.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** What I will say to the shadow minister—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —and he, I'm sure, will have some form of an understanding, is that SARDI is a very, very valuable R&D organisation here in South Australia. It is world renowned. For too long we have seen the previous government continually take funding and cut the budget to SARDI over 16 long years. We continually saw cuts into SARDI. This year, for the first year in 16 years, there were no cuts to SARDI.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mount Gambier has been patiently waiting and has the call. I will come back to you, member for Giles. The member for Mount Gambier.

#### STEM EDUCATION

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:20):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house regarding STEM Works being undertaken in my electorate of Mount Gambier?

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Waite, you can leave for half an hour.

*The honourable member for Waite having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:20):** I am pleased to advise that—

**An honourable member:** But his comment was appropriate.

**The SPEAKER:** Whether his comment was appropriate or not is irrelevant.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —the STEM Works program, which of course was announced a few years ago, including a \$250 million investment by the taxpayers of South Australia announced by the former minister and supported by the opposition to improve science, technology, engineering and mathematics facilities in our schools around South Australia, is underway. Those works are underway. A number of them have been opened, and I have been pleased to assist in local members' participation in a number of those openings.

In Mount Gambier, I am advised, there are indeed three programs in relation to STEM Works facilities, totalling \$6 million. There will be \$1 million for the Mount Gambier North primary school and \$2½ million each for Grant primary school and Mount Gambier High School. I know those school communities are very grateful to the taxpayers of South Australia—as indeed they are the



taxpayers—for delivering those facilities. The local builders Dycer Constructions were appointed for the projects at Grant High and Mount Gambier North primary. Kennett Pty Ltd are doing the building works at Mount Gambier High and Grieve Gillett Andersen are providing the architectural services for all three projects.

The project at Mount Gambier North primary school was completed in May, as the local member would be aware, as I believe he is definitely going to be involved in the opening of that in coming weeks. I thank him for doing that on behalf of the government. In that case, there are refurbishments of three existing buildings, allowing students from all year levels access to facilities, including technologies and modern ICT.

Work commenced on Mount Gambier High's project in March this year. That redevelopment is expected to be completed before around the end of this year, in the break between the end of term 4 and the beginning of next year. There is a makerspace, a dark space, a green wall, access to CAD programs, two centralised broader spaces. That will be a great project. The Grant High School redevelopment is scheduled to be completed next month, in October. That will include new STEM learning spaces in a central location, with accessibility to adjoining classrooms for breakout groups engaging in collaboration.

These projects are important. The government will continue to support educational facilities. This year's budget identifies a forward works program in excess of \$1 billion in improving our capital works in our schools. Some of those have been in train for some time. Some of those have been announced but are now in the forward estimates. This government will do all we can to support our schools, including those in the member's electorate.

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:23):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. When the minister was made aware his office had directed his department to compile a list of public sector employees who were assigned to the former minister's office, why didn't the minister immediately inform the House of Assembly? Was he at any time advised to do so?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:23):** It was great to see him, as the member for West Torrens departed the chamber, toss his scraps to the deputy leader to follow up this particular sordid rabbit hole that we were down yesterday.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I am being screamed at, Mr Speaker. I will wait until you have pulled the screaming into line.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, I am listening.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. I made it very clear yesterday the situation that unfolded with regard to this. I think the member for West Torrens and the entire opposition were appropriately embarrassed when the full facts of the matter were revealed.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I will answer the question, but I think it is important to put out some facts and context.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I did not come back to the house because (1) I was not asked to; (2) I made no commitment to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —(3) I did not feel that I had misled the house; and (4) when I discovered—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —what had happened, as I said yesterday, it became apparent to me that that is exactly the sort of thing that I would expect my Chief of Staff to be doing—formulating a high-quality, high-functioning ministerial office to serve the government of the day. As I said yesterday, as I clearly outlined to the house, the standard which we are setting for our ministerial officers, the standard that we are setting in terms of our interaction with the South Australian Public Service, is so different from the sordid, disgraceful standard that was set by the previous government where mates were dragged into—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale has a point of order.

**Ms COOK:** Just relax. Point of order, Mr Speaker: number 97, debate.

**The SPEAKER:** For debate, 98. The member has a valid point. There was a fair bit in that question. When we start talking about the opposition and their behaviour, we are going a little bit off track. Before that point, the answer was germane, so please continue.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I think it is very important to compare and contrast good behaviour, good standards, with what came from 16 years. It's interesting that—

**Ms COOK:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: he continues to defy your order.

**The SPEAKER:** I'm listening carefully, member for Hurtle Vale. Please be seated. Minister, please wrap it up.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** It is interesting to note that the staff who are now working in my ministerial office are doing so in a way where they feel empowered, they feel valued and they feel respected, and that is certainly not what happened under the previous government where staff were frightened to front ministers in case they were sworn at—

**Ms COOK:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: he continues to debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I uphold the point of order. Thank you, minister. The member for Colton was standing up, no? The deputy leader and then the member for Mount Gambier. Deputy leader.

**The Hon. D.G. Pisoni:** Is this a question on TAFE?

**Dr CLOSE:** I know about TAFE. Don't you worry, I know about TAFE.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Industry and Skills is called to order.

*Mr Cowdrey interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Colton is also called to order. Deputy leader.

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:26):** My question is again to the Minister for Environment and Water. How many public sector employees on the list compiled by the department on the direction of the minister's office did the minister or his Chief of Staff assign to his ministerial office and in what capacity?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:27):** I outlined this information to the house yesterday. I'm not going to go back to this matter.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The member for Port Adelaide is better than this. This is an embarrassing matter for the opposition.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister is being provoked. I ask him not to respond to those provoking remarks and I ask members on my left to cease interjecting or I will not be taking points of order about other matters.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I have said enough about this matter. Mr Speaker, you have cleared me of wrongdoing in this matter. The standards set after 16 years of Labor's abuse of the Public Service, what shocks them—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —what shocks the opposition is that we would do the right thing by the Public Service and not follow the road map of absolute disgrace which they set out over many years, exemplified by none other than the member for West Torrens, who has a sick obsession with the way that I run my ministerial office.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, minister. The member for Mount Gambier and then the deputy leader.

### REGIONAL HEALTH BOARDS

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:28):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Can the minister provide an update on the regional health boards, in particular in my region of Mount Gambier?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:28):** Thank you, member for Mount Gambier, and I know your very genuine and deep interest in country health, particularly in Mount Gambier in the South-East. Everybody in this house would know that we took to the last election a policy to establish regional health boards and we said that we would introduce legislation within the first 100 years—100 days of the election which, of course, we did.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** We're planning to be here for a while!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** So, yes—

**Mr Pederick:** 25 terms. Read it and weep.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is warned.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** We said that we would introduce legislation within the first 100 days—that would last for 100 years—and, yes, in fact, we did that. That legislation passed this place on 26 July this year, the regional health governance amendment bill, which actually officially sets up those health boards to come into effect on 1 July 2019. On 2 August this year, we outlined the specifics of the regions: six country ones and four metropolitan ones. The country ones are the same boundaries that have existed for a while.

On 2 August, we also announced eight of the 10 board chairs. The other two were for your electorate, member for Mount Gambier, and Eyre Peninsula. Friday last week applications closed for those last two remaining board positions, so no doubt the Minister for Health will make an announcement very shortly about those last two, one of which, of course, is very relevant for your electorate.

Let me say that we are not wasting any time. We are getting on with the job. On 1 July next year, these boards will be in effect. We are actually working through an operational transition between now and then. It's not going to be one system until 30 June and one on 1 July. We will work it through

so there is a fairly seamless transition. Those boards will work with a service level agreement with the state government, which—

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Kaurana!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —covers both local area health deliveries as well as statewide obligations, which of course each of these boards will be expected to fulfil. Member for Mount Gambier, I am sure that as soon as the health minister has made a decision on the new chair for the South-East board—and of course the same for the member for Flinders with regard to the EP—I am sure the health minister will advise you as quickly as he possibly can.

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:31):** My question is again to the Minister for Environment and Water. What process did the minister and his office follow to assign the public sector employees in his ministerial office, as he informed the house today and yesterday?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:31):** Mr Speaker, we—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, please be seated.

**Mr Malinauskas:** I would like to hear the answer.

**The SPEAKER:** I would like to hear the answer, too, leader. Thank you. Minister.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** We followed a process that would be utterly foreign to the opposition: a merit-based process.

#### FRUIT FLY

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:32):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister inform the house of how the state government is putting in place new measures to protect South Australia from fruit fly?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:32):** Thank you to the member for Hammond and I—

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** He got advice in Texas about it.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light is warned.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —share his concerns and understand his keen interest in what being fruit fly free means to South Australia—not only to South Australian regions but to our economy. Keeping South Australia the only state fruit fly free has been—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is on a clean sheet.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —a monumental task by Biosecurity SA. Previously, we have seen—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I beg your pardon?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister does have the call.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** We have seen over a number of years the benefits of having a horticulture industry being fruit fly free. Of recent times, we have also seen the benefits of having area freedom, particular within our export markets, and we now understand exactly what that means

to our economy. The horticulture industry is worth approximately \$1.2 billion to the state's economy, but to protect it and keep it fruit fly free has been a monumental task for both government and industry.

What I can say today is that this government is actually taking it seriously and putting extra measures in place so that we can actually address the growing pressures on our borders.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Elizabeth, the member for Giles!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Those on the other side might think it's a joke, but I can assure you it is not a joke.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will be seated for one moment. I would really not enjoy removing the Leader of the Opposition for half an hour before grievances. If he continues to interject, I will. Minister.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Some of the measures that this responsible state government is putting in place are that we have now appointed a liaison officer both in partnership with industry and government, and he will be out there on the ground making sure that bins that are coming from interstate into South Australia are clean and they are fruit fly free. We are also putting in extra roadblocks, increasing them to 14. We are going to open the Pinnaroo quarantine station earlier this year, 1½ months early. What we are also going to do is put in the extra measures, as promised in an election commitment, the extra quarantine bins installed on the Wentworth road and on the Mannum road.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** That's why the member for Hammond is so interested, because he cares about the horticulture industry, unlike the others opposite. We are also in the process of installing—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —extra signage and making sure that all the arterial roads into the Riverland are better signed. Also, for the first time in South Australia a sterile insect technology release and male annihilation technique baiting in interstate buffer zones will be introduced.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** This is a good lesson for you, to listen instead of talking.

**The SPEAKER:** I'm listening.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** What I would say is that this government will continue to check the 7,500 trap sites across the state; that's over 100,00 checks per annum. Through these extra measures, we are being proactive. We are being proactive to look after a \$1.2 billion industry here in South Australia to keep our state fruit fly free, to make sure that hashtag #RegionsMatter.

#### MINISTERIAL STAFF

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:35):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. If the minister and his office undertook a competitive merit-based process in the assignment of public sector employees to his office, why did his office direct the department to compile a list of public sector employees who had been assigned to the former minister's office?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right! Would the minister like to have a go at that question?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:36):** You can't have both—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** When a minister initially takes office—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —there is a need to second people from the department to create that skeleton workforce to support the minister in the execution of their duties in the short term until a merit-based process is undertaken. That is the way it works. The member for Port Adelaide—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left! I am trying to hear this answer.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The member for Port Adelaide would be very familiar with this. She is one of those people who moved from revolving door to revolving door between ministerial office and Public Service with huge questions hanging over the merit-based selection process as to how she ended up as an executive director. She had—

**Dr CLOSE:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, please be seated. I take it that the member has taken offence to the comments made about merit-based selection.

**Dr CLOSE:** Absolutely.

**The SPEAKER:** I have it and I respectfully—

**Dr CLOSE:** I have had a competitive approach for every single job I have undertaken.

**The SPEAKER:** I have it and I respectfully ask—

**Dr CLOSE:** How dare you!

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I respectfully—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left and right will be quiet. I respectfully ask the minister to withdraw those most recent remarks about that issue and please—

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I will withdraw it, but I—

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I withdraw—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has withdrawn.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —but I ask that the member for Hurtle Vale withdraw her point.

**The SPEAKER:** One moment, minister. This is the last question of question time until estimates. Please get on with answering the question, the substance of the question. Members on my left will cease interjecting or they will be booted out, regardless of whether they have grievances coming up. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Mr Speaker, I have finished providing my answer, but I do ask that the member for Hurtle Vale withdraw her disgraceful assertion that I have a problem with women, which is the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** One moment. Please be seated. Will the member for Hurtle Vale please withdraw that comment?

**Ms COOK:** I withdraw the comment—

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Ms COOK:** —that I said, which was not that. I did not say that he had a problem with women.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** One moment. I will hear it.

**Ms COOK:** I said that it was because she was a woman. That doesn't mean he's got a problem with women. It's how you interpret that.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the minister offended by that, or will you get on with answering the question?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Absolutely offended. I do not understand the motivation behind the member for Hurtle Vale's assertion.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hurtle Vale, I ask you to withdraw.

**Ms COOK:** I will withdraw that comment.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. Minister, please get on with answering the question.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I've finished answering the question.

**The SPEAKER:** You've finished.

**Mr PICTON:** Point of order: you asked him to withdraw and apologise.

**The SPEAKER:** I asked him to withdraw.

**Mr PICTON:** He did not apologise.

**The SPEAKER:** I asked him to withdraw, and he did withdraw.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I heard him say 'I withdraw.' The question before the house is that the house note grievances. I respectfully ask members to please leave quietly so that I can give the Leader of the Opposition the call. It is a miracle he is still here, but he is behaving very well and deserves to be heard in silence. Please leave quietly. The Leader of the Opposition.

#### *Grievance Debate*

#### **MILLER, MR T.**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:39):** I rise to pay my respects to the late Terry Miller OAM. Terry Miller was a tireless advocate for South Australian asbestos victims, dedicating almost two decades of his life to support families, campaign for improved laws and continue to educate the public about the ongoing dangers of asbestos. Terry, someone whom I counted as a friend, passed away on Thursday 21 May 2018, aged 76. He is remembered by his children, Karen and Scott, two grandchildren and two great-grandchildren, and my condolences certainly go to the family.

Terry suffered severe asbestosis following two decades of heavy asbestos exposure from working at the James Hardie pipe factory in Elizabeth West until the factory's closure in 1987. During his employment, Terry would return home covered in asbestos dust, which was stuck to his clothes, skin and hair. Over a beer, Colin Arthur would talk with Terry Miller, as they shared stories about

their difficulties breathing. Upon realising that they shared symptoms, the pair decided to see whether anyone else who worked at Hardie's had the same symptoms. An advert went into the local paper and, surprised by the response, they got together and decided to hold a meeting.

Terry was part of a small group that met. That meeting grew over the following months to 70 or 80 people and resulted in members seeking medical advice on the causes of their symptoms. One by one, they received the same advice: their breathing problems were caused by exposure to and the inhalation of asbestos dust. By the year 2000, the meeting again evolved and became the Asbestos Victims Association of South Australia (AVA).

Under Terry's leadership, the AVA advocated for groundbreaking legislation, the Dust Diseases Act 2005, which made it easier for hundreds of asbestos victims to claim compensation and support. Terry became an important figure on the national stage in the fight against James Hardie as the Asbestos Victims Association campaigned to ensure that the company provided adequate compensation to its victims.

The work that Terry did over his time ensured that South Australians had a support network for people living with asbestos disease. Under Terry's leadership, the AVA created a permanent memorial at Pitman Park in Salisbury, and that site is now home to the annual Asbestos Awareness Memorial Day. In the short time I have remaining I thought I would pass on my personal thoughts regarding Terry's demeanour, generally.

Mr Terry Miller, I think it is fair to say, was a very earthy character. He was a man of great sincerity and certainly passionate for his cause. He had a unique working-class capacity to be able to cut through the rubbish. When Terry looked you in the eye and made a request, he went straight to the point. He was very matter of fact and very deliberate in his earnestness. I think that attitude, that demeanour—that no rubbish, no frills, straight to the core of the issue attitude—certainly served Terry's organisation well. More importantly, it served well the interests of all those people in our community who have suffered from asbestos-related disease.

Probably one of the most significant and unrecognised aspects of the AVA's work is not just their assistance to those people who suffer from asbestosis and other asbestos-related diseases but also the work they do in ensuring that the community at large remains very aware of the real threat that asbestos still presents. Terry's organisation was at pains to ensure that all South Australians, particularly young people working in heavy industries, are aware that much asbestos still exists within our society. Keeping up community awareness around what asbestos looks like, under which circumstances it may be found and what to do but, more importantly, what not to do when encountering asbestos, were issues the AVA treated very seriously.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that there are people—hardworking people—who have to use their hands on a daily basis who are alive today as a result of the work of the AVA. My condolences to the family. I am very grateful for the opportunity to put on the record the extraordinary respect I have for Mr Terry Miller OAM. May he rest in peace.

#### CHAFFEY ELECTORATE

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:44):** I have great pride in rising to talk about some great local events in Chaffey that I have recently attended. The Loxton Museum of Agriculture and Technology Open Days are in their third year. The event ran over two days in the Riverland in August. The agriculture museum is a primary economic generator in the Riverland and in the region. The evolution of agriculture chronicled in a museum focused on the local region and what it has meant to the Riverland region, in particular the dryland farming sector that associates with its neighbouring horticulture sector, and is second to none.

The range of events and exhibitions showcase the region's agriculture history and the local produce. More than 1,000 people attended from all over the state, despite the weather conditions in the Riverland. It was great to see so many diverse sectors of people. The museum is located at the historic Kaesler's Landing on the outskirts of Loxton. The Kaesler family's farm lies adjacent to the River Murray and was an important trading location in the paddle steamer days. The PS industry provided cruises along the beautiful Murray River, as well as having a large range of market stalls and variety food stalls.



Well done to the Loxton Museum of Agriculture and Technology chairman, Paul Kaesler; vice chairman, Tom Fielke; secretary, Raelene Harvey; treasurer, Merv Gladigau; publicity and stall coordinator, Leanne Kaesler; and committee members, Allan and Tony Hucks, Lance Pech, Rodney Schubert, Ian Nitschke, the renowned Peter and Carla Magarey—for the tireless work that they do for the history of the Riverland and particularly Loxton—Nathan Jericho, Melvin Fielke, Jo Oldman and Raelene Gladigau. The event plays a crucial role in passing on this information to our future generations.

I also attended a great event, a fantastic event, at the Chaffey Theatre—the Riverland Primary Schools Music Festival, now in its 22<sup>nd</sup> year, where hundreds of people attended performances over three nights. Four hundred students from across the Riverland combined to sing to their hearts' content in a series of three concerts for the annual Riverland Primary Schools Music Festival, and I want to commend the organising committee behind it. Well done to all the primary school children. Not only were they great singers but they were accompanied by a really accomplished 13-piece student band and supported by various assisting artists.

I also attended the St Joseph's School Parents and Friends Father's Day Breakfast, which was a really great morning, and there were many young fathers there. The morning was to acknowledge the great work fathers do in parenting, alongside the mothers, and the event showcased the 120 students who participated, along with 100 adults. They were not all fathers. Some were grandparents, but they came along to support an event that was just an outstanding local community event at St Joseph's School. The aim of the breakfast was not only to emphasise the importance of the role of fathers in their children's lives but to showcase what parenting is as a shared responsibility. Thank you to Don DePalma, the principal, and a special thanks to the staff and volunteers who coordinated the event.

It has been a busy month, but what I would say is that the Riverland continues to showcase some of the great country events in the state. This coming Friday and Saturday, along with the Premier I will be attending the much-anticipated Riverland Field Days. Coming up, we also have the 99<sup>th</sup> Loxton Annual Spring Show. I am sure I am going to get some of my jam into that show because it certainly is one of the great country shows in the state.

The Barmera Mainstreet Markets and the Waikerie Street Festival are also great events, and further into the month we have the Riverland Wine and Food Festival and the Riverland Rose Festival. People come from all over the globe to visit Renmark for its now world-renowned rose festival. The Waikerie and Districts Community Flower Show is always a great event because, with its beautiful dry and warm climate, the Riverland is one of the premier rose and flower growing regions in the country. There are also the Loveday 350 and Relay for Life events, just to name a few.

Well done to the Riverland and the Mallee. Well done to the communities and volunteers who make most of these shows possible. They are absolutely wonderful calendar events, and I look forward to spring coming. We all know that when spring is in the air, the flowers and the vines are out, all horticulture is in full bloom. It is great to see that the Riverland, its people, its volunteers and its communities are wonderfully on show.

### **TORRENS ELECTORATE SCHOOLS**

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:49):** The South Australian Electoral Commission boundary redistribution saw significant changes to the electoral boundaries in South Australia and in particular in the seat of Torrens. Some of the suburbs are now part of the seat of Enfield, and another falls into the seat of Newland. While it was disappointing to lose the suburbs to other electorates, the reality is, of course, that they have not moved, so I still get to meet up with the many families I have come to know so well when I am out and about in the community, at local events, sporting functions, shopping centres and school events. In addition to the Port Adelaide Enfield council and the Tea Tree Gully council, I also now have the Walkerville council.

The redistribution saw the new suburbs of Vale Park and Manningham become part of the Torrens electorate along with the remaining parts of Dernancourt, Klemzig and Gilles Plains. I made it a priority to learn everything I could about the new areas so I can work with them for the benefit of each suburb, the Torrens community as a whole and of course our wonderful state of South Australia.

Today, I want to highlight some of what is important in my electorate of Torrens, with a particular focus on education. Three public schools in Torrens were among the 139 South Australian schools to benefit through the former Labor government's \$250 million investment in the STEM Works program, a program that delivered new or upgraded facilities for science, technology, engineering and maths in 77 public primary schools, 44 high schools and R-12 schools across the state.

Last week, I was delighted to see the enthusiasm and the passion that children at Wandana Primary School in Gilles Plains demonstrated for their new STEM building. I look forward in coming weeks to the opening of new STEM facilities at Hampstead Primary School and also Hillcrest Primary School. As a former teacher, I am proud that education is always a high priority for a Labor government.

I have spoken in this place of the great importance to the local community of Avenues College, comprising the amalgamation of two schools—Windsor Gardens Secondary College, formerly known as Gilles Plains High School, and Windsor Gardens Vocational College—with the Gilles Plains Primary School. Labor committed the value of the Gilles Plains site, which at the time was \$6.7 million, to the amalgamation, with an additional \$8.3 million as an election commitment, taking the total to \$15 million. I have written to and met with the new minister, requesting that the Liberal government meet Labor's commitment for the infrastructure build, which includes a new preschool and an upgrade to the existing buildings, which were built in the late 1950s, so that the primary and secondary students could be adequately accommodated.

We have already missed the time frame for moving the Beatty Avenue campus to the McKay Avenue campus for the intended 2019 opening. I have met with the minister on this issue, and with an increase in value of the Gilles Plains site and an additional \$2.8 million, taking the total to \$9.7 million, the move is now scheduled for the beginning of the 2020 school year. That is a good 12 months behind. While the minister's recent approval of the \$2.8 million is welcome, it is a long way off what the current and future students of Avenues College need for them to have the adequate, appropriate facilities they deserve. The minister can be assured that I will continue to knock on his door—

**Ms Bedford:** You're going to get calluses, too.

**Ms WORTLEY:** Yes, I will fill his email box, and I will continue to request meetings to this end. Again affecting the students at Avenues College is the cancellation of the Labor government's laptop program, a program to supply a free laptop to every public school student in year 10. Within two years, all public students in years 10, 11 and 12 would have had a government-funded laptop to use at school and to take home to assist with homework in their years 11 and 12 studies. Also, they would have been able to keep the devices after graduating, setting them up to commence further studies at university or TAFE or to assist them in joining the workforce. The laptop for students program would have ensured all students—

Time expired.

### **GOLDEN GROVE FOOTBALL CLUB**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:55):** I rise today to talk about the wonderful achievements of members from the junior football team in my electorate of King. On Sunday 9 September, the under-13 team from the Golden Grove Football Club took out the division 1 premierships when they defeated Broadview at Prospect Oval. Not only did the Kookaburras under-13 team win the premierships, which was awesome, but what was even greater about this feat was that it was the team's third consecutive premierships, having previously won the under-11 and under-12 premierships in 2016 and 2017 respectively.

The team's three-peat is such an incredible achievement that I wanted to use this time to publicly share their story. This is truly a local success story. Within the team, nine boys have also been selected for the Central District SANFL development squad, while two others have been picked by Norwood and another by North Adelaide. I have also been told that there could be even more players from the team who will be represented in these development squads for the next season.

In addition, throughout the season the team also celebrated the 150<sup>th</sup> junior game of Sebastian Wauer, Liam Fawcett and this season's association best and fairest winner, Connor Butcher. The list of incredible individual achievements does not stop there, with Waylon Casey leading the association in goal kicking, and Tyson Murphy finishing as the runner-up.

Players lucky enough to enjoy the team's triple-premiership win were Tyson Murphy, Brayden Rachwal, Brandon Bray, Connor Butcher, Lachlan Butler, Jack Johnston, Sebastian Wauer, Kael Murdoch, Liam Fawcett, Declan Tomney, Noah McDonald, Brodie Harrigan, Joshua Hartwig, Oliver Robinson, Brodie Tilley, Rory McGlone, Jake Winter, Bevan Wood, Max Kenward, Thomas Delia, Waylon Casey and Jack Stevenson.

It is so inspiring to see these local players within the King electorate achieving such great things. I hope I hear their names not only now, when they are younger, but when they play for the Adelaide Crows or Port Adelaide in the AFL, if they choose to. It is especially exciting for me to see not only these wins but the community pride and feel around this team and around the Golden Grove Football Club in general. These boys would not have been able to achieve these great things on the field were it not for the love and support of those parents, guardians, volunteers, coaches and water runners who make it all possible.

I especially want to thank the team's coach, Jason Murdoch; assistant coach, John Butcher; team manager, Gregg Stevenson; runner, Mike Butler; first aid volunteers, Mark Wauer and Nikki Harrigan; and the regular ground marshal, Meredith Tilley. Without the support of this group of volunteers, the boys would not have had the opportunity to showcase their immense talent. I give my sincerest thanks to you all.

It is stories like these that make me so proud of my community and those people who are working towards the betterment of people living in our area, putting this ahead of their time and themselves. These volunteers are the lifeblood of recreational clubs around our state and they do all they can to help. It is community groups like this that every parent, including me, hopes their children can be a part of, and for this I pass on my sincere thanks. There is a real community feel around the Golden Grove Football Club under-13 division 1 boys and across such a big club where we have the biggest junior squad in the country. I look forward to cheering them on in the coming years and seeing them flourish. I also look forward to seeing many of the members on the weekend at the seniors' presentation and the juniors' presentation. Well done to all.

### **NEW ZEALAND WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE ANNIVERSARY**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:59):** Today, I want to congratulate the New Zealand parliament and people on the 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary of suffrage for women in their country. On 19 September 1893, the New Zealand parliament passed the Electoral Act 1893, with Governor Lord Glasgow subsequently signing it into law, which gave all women in that country the right to vote, becoming the first self-governing country in the world to do so.

The New Zealand government has created a very informative website devoted to the anniversary and has made it a tier 1 commemoration event, acknowledging the importance of the passage of the bill as an event of significant impact on the nation—a world first. To mark this milestone, Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern yesterday led a march through central Auckland at dawn, I imagine to highlight the new dawn for women who 125 years ago began to enjoy the rights of enfranchisement—the ability to change their lives through the power of the vote.

After the march, the Prime Minister addressed the crowd, some of whom were dressed in 19<sup>th</sup> century garb, according to media reports, and paid tribute to the trailblazing women of the past and reflected on the strides still needed to be made towards equality. Winning the right to vote in New Zealand was the result of years of work by campaigners led by Kate Shepherd and her supporters, many from among the ranks of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. For three years, they compiled a series of massive petitions, around 31 in all, containing over 61,150 signatures calling for the right to vote.

Today, the idea that women could not or should not vote is rightly seen as completely ridiculous. As with the suffrage campaigns here in Australia, Britain and northern Europe, Canada and the USA, the work in New Zealand began in the mid-1800s, part of a worldwide movement

shaped by the idea that women should have equal rights to men and that women would use that right to ensure better lives for all by improving society, particularly via moral reforms such as limiting the consumption of alcohol, which had become a real problem, especially for families. Opposition to women's suffrage began to mobilise in all countries, warning that the disturbance of the natural gender roles of men and women would have terrible consequences. Much of this opposition was led by the liquor industry, fearful that women would support prohibition.

Just as in those places, many men supported the women. It is only fair to mention that some men and women thought that women voting was not necessary, one being Queen Victoria. They all thought women's lives would always revolve around the domestic affairs of housekeeping and raising children and that only men were fit for public life and the rough and tumble world of politics. We have heard that sort of language coming out of Canberra lately: politics being described as robust, among other euphemisms? Things seem not to have really changed much in 100 years. All of this suffrage activism was happening at time when not all men had the right to vote either.

New Zealand's women worked closely with their sisters here in Adelaide, themselves very near to having a bill put through the parliament. The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in South Australia was led by Elizabeth Webb Nicholl, who watches proceedings in this chamber from the tapestry to my right. They were instrumental in our final petition, gathering in excess of 8,000 of our over 11,000 signatures.

Other groups were working for the vote. Mary Lee led the Women's Suffrage League, and on that committee was our own Muriel Matters' uncle, Charles Matters, the Matters family being strongly in favour of equality. The National Council of Women was another group that was active then and still is today. I note their esteemed member Jessie Street from New South Wales twice ran for the federal seat of Wentworth—another very topical issue.

The enormity of the New Zealand bill and its ramifications cannot be overstated. It gave hope that progress could be made all over the world, that women could be and do more than be responsible to their fathers and then their husbands, that their right to education up to university level would mean that they would be able to contribute to making the world a better place and that their ideals and ideas were relevant and worthy of consideration and implementation.

The bond between Australia and New Zealand is indelible and undeniable and has been forged through war and peace. In fact, our shared democratic values mean that governments change through the power of the pencil rather than the gun, a symbol of our shared commitment to a democratic process that values peaceful transition of power and embraces the roles of men and women in society.

As we in Australia grapple with female representation in parliaments and elsewhere, and recognition of First Nation Peoples, we would do well to look to the example of New Zealand in many ways. Why should we all care about the value of the vote and the right to vote? Because I have come to know, just as women did 125 years ago, that it is through these basic democratic rights that we truly become part of a participatory democracy.

#### **MARTLEW, MS K.**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (16:04):** Today, I would like to speak about a young lady in Port Pirie. Her name is Kellie Martlew. Kellie was born in 1979. She was diagnosed with mild cerebral palsy and epilepsy at the age of 18 months old when her family thought something was not right. She was not sitting properly or doing things an 18 month old should do. The family at that time was living in Adelaide. For the next five years of her life, she was sent to Regency Park for development and learning. This was a positive experience for the whole family. Kellie could not talk, so they taught her sign language to communicate. She also could not walk properly, but with intense physiotherapy every day, five days a week, she learnt to walk. She had intensive speech therapy as well.

After her parents' marriage broke up, they moved back to Port Pirie, where Kellie started school at Port Pirie West Primary School and then St Mark's College, which at the time had some programs for intellectually challenged students. Kellie transferred in about year 7 and stayed there until year 11. Her brother Paul was a major influence on Kellie, and she matured and grew as a person and student.

Kellie went through four major operations on her throat and saliva glands but, with support from family and the community, this very brave young girl was able to come through these challenges. Her mother, Nancy, said that this was a very hard time, with lots of tears, and that lots of love and patience were needed. However, Nancy and her family had great support and strength from family and friends. When Kelly left school, she worked for Orana for five years and for the last 16 years she has worked at the local Woolworths store, where she is known and loved by everyone. She will always say hi or wave, and she is a joy to see.

Twenty-two years ago, Kellie's life changed for the better when Maxine Bowden started up the Special Olympics team in Port Pirie. Kellie was always interested in basketball, playing with her brother, but she was not allowed to play in the Port Pirie Basketball Association. She has always enjoyed her sports and was a swimming champion in 1996, 2000, 2001, 2005 and 2006. Basketball has played a huge part of Kellie's life, but her first love is tenpin bowling. For the last 10 years, every weekend Kellie has travelled to Adelaide to attend training at Ivor Burge basketball for athletes with intellectual disabilities. Kellie has had huge success in the sport since 2006 and has travelled to Perth, Ballarat, Albury, Townsville, Gawler, Maitland, Canberra, Launceston, Dandenong, Ipswich, Bendigo and Gosford.

However, tenpin bowling is why she is attending the Special Olympics world games in Abu Dhabi in 2019. Kellie has worked extremely hard to get to this position. She has attended four regional competitions over the state to become eligible for the state team and attended state games from 2001 to 2018 in Sydney, the Gold Coast, Adelaide, Melbourne and the Special Olympics in Adelaide this year. She also participated in the Masters games in Port Pirie.

It was very amusing that during these games in Port Pirie the games organiser had a celebrity tenpin bowling competition. As I was mayor of Port Pirie at that time, I was involved in this competition. Having recently achieved a championship in the games held in Shanghai in 2007, Kellie decided to personally coach me in the art of tenpin bowling. With her tuition, Kellie was sure that I would be successful in being crowned the champion. Needless to say, after my not getting anywhere, Kellie stated that she would never coach me again as, in her words, I did not adhere to her teaching instructions.

Kellie has achieved numerous awards, including the Stan Wickham Award, Sportswoman Achiever of the Year 2007 and Special Olympics Female Athlete of the Year in 2007. She was awarded the key to the City of Port Pirie at a mayoral reception in 2007 and Australia Day Citizen of the Year in 2008 for Port Pirie. She attended the Special Olympics games in Shanghai in 2007, representing Australia. Kellie has achieved all these things through great personal adversity, despite being born with a disability.

With the love and support of her family and the community of Port Pirie, she has achieved so much. Kellie is a very warm individual with a sassy nature that everyone in our community loves. She is a valued member of our community. It is because of these attributes that a group of about 10 people has formed a fundraising committee to assist her to participate in Abu Dhabi in 2019, with many fundraising ideas, from cake stalls to a major cash raffle. However, the last word has to go to Kellie. She said: 'Friends, family and sports are my life. I love watching basketball, and I hope to achieve a score of over 200. I will do my best in Abu Dhabi to represent my family and the community.' All I can say is: good luck to Kellie on her ventures.

#### *Bills*

### **APPROPRIATION BILL 2018**

#### *Estimates Committees*

The Legislative Council gave leave to the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas), the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment (Hon. D.W. Ridgway), the Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink) and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. S.G. Wade) to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (BUDGET MEASURES) BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:11):** It is in these circumstances where there is no supervision or trained responsible persons to intervene, unlike the hotel and club industry. Put simply, you can lose your house while gaming from your lounge room. A number of reviews have been undertaken in this space. In September 2015, the commonwealth's Barry O'Farrell review found that online gambling is the fastest growing gambling segment, growing at 15 per cent per annum with over \$1.4 billion gambled online each year.

In South Australia, the Independent Gambling Authority, which is to be dissolved under this bill, recently undertook work and an inquiry into online gaming. The authority recently called for submissions and conducted a public hearing around the growth and impact of online gambling in South Australia. This inquiry involved public hearings with a limited number of attendees. It is expected that this consultation will be used to develop new strategies for reducing the incidence of problem gambling and harm caused by gambling.

Whilst I do not believe that the result of this consultation attracted a very significant number of submissions, the work undertaken will continue to be used by the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner should he take over the IGA's role with the passing of this bill. Notwithstanding the comments of the member for Lee yesterday, I am advised the IGA will complete this inquiry prior to the changing of the regulatory model; that is, the passage of this bill which will still take some time has allowed the continuation of the work of the IGA. I thank Mr Alan Moss and those board members who are still there for their continued work, noting that two have resigned in recent months.

So we must remember that online gambling is a huge national issue. Gaming providers operate across the borders, not just in South Australia, and to this regard I entirely agree with some of the member for Lee's observations which he recorded in the parliament yesterday as to the need to be across this issue. He was critical at the time of the slow advance of a term of reference before the Economic and Finance Committee, which the member for Waite chairs, relating to online gambling.

But I make this point: he may wish to progress some further investigation in a committee of the parliament and, if the committee of the parliament feel that this is an area of interest or priority, of course they can do that. In fact, we did it a few years ago here in the parliament and I would commend the committee to have a look at it because they also flagged issues in relation to online gambling when there was a select committee investigating gambling in South Australia.

In any event, I want to reassure the house that, notwithstanding that and notwithstanding that there is a new and evolving industry or subset of industry in relation to online gambling, we are aware of the need for further regulation. Can I therefore bring to the attention of the house that at the commonwealth level, as I have indicated, the Barry O'Farrell review took place. They were asked to advise on how to tackle illegal offshore wagering.

The commonwealth government was concerned that illegal offshore wagering presents a serious risk to Australia, including through the lack of legal and standard consumer protections for Australians using online wagering sites. As part of the Australian government's response to the O'Farrell review, the Australian government reached in-principle agreement with state and territory ministers to introduce broad reforms to provide stronger consumer protection measures to prevent harm caused by online gambling through the adoption of a National Consumer Protection Framework (NCPF).

I am advised that a third meeting of state and territory ministers took place in September 2017 under the former government. Ministers, including our minister from South Australia, reaffirmed their commitment to ensuring greater protection for Australians gambling online and the establishment of strong, consistent and best practice NCPF. I am not sure what the former attorney-general did in the next six months before the election—it probably had a bit to do with getting re-elected. Nevertheless, there does not appear to be any evidence of urgency on the

part of the former government. There were no other announcements or initiatives undertaken I am aware of that would suggest that he was in a hurry to deal with this matter. Nevertheless, obviously we want to get it right.

Subject to the finalisation of the detail of these measures and each jurisdiction's formal approval process, let me remind the house that ministers agreed to adopt the following measures:

- the establishment of a centralised national self-exclusion register to allow a person to exclude themselves from all gambling sites across all phone and web-based digital platforms;
- the implementation of a voluntary opt-out precommitment scheme to allow customers to set precommitment betting limits at account sign-up and options to review such limits at regular intervals;
- the offering of inducements to be consistent with existing responsible gambling requirements;
- to mandate the provision of customer activity statements on demand and on a regular basis;
- nationally consistent gambling messaging;
- mandatory responsible gambling training for all staff who are involved in the provision of online wagering services;
- reducing the current 90-day customer verification time frame to a maximum of 14 days (noting that ministers agreed that a 72-hour customer verification time frame is preferable, the Australian government will explore the feasibility of this within 12 months of implementation); and
- the inclusion of a simplified customer-initiated account closure mechanism to be enshrined within the NCPF.

Since 2017, as I have indicated, the six months under the former government, there seems to have been zero movement in respect of online gambling. I was pleased to meet with the chair of the IGA, Mr Alan Moss, upon coming into government and noted his commitment—it was fairly early at that stage—to an inquiry of his authority into online gambling. We are now moving on a national harmonisation and taking an active approach on the review from the former government.

We have a situation where a review was undertaken and reported back to the government in 2016. Since that time, it took a change in government to look at the report and begin progressing the conclusions Mr Anderson made in it. The first actions we have taken are around the IGA and forming a better regulatory framework for gaming in South Australia. This is the first step and will begin assisting with the harm caused by online gaming.

Our next step with the commissioner is to review the entire legislative framework of gambling in South Australia. As we have seen in the amendments before us, there are many acts relating to gaming. In streamlining these, the other conclusions of Mr Anderson's report can also be considered and implemented if appropriate. I particularly note the role that SAPOL has played here and the submissions they made to Mr Anderson's review.

The police have submitted that they require additional powers to investigate money laundering frauds, particularly within the sports betting and online gambling space. We intend to take a cross-agency approach to develop strategies and responses to assist with problem gambling, particularly in the online space, where people simply do not have the same protection and support they may have in hotels, clubs and at the Casino.

The general thrust of the national reform is in recognition of online opportunities and obligations we now have in national law in respect of the registration requirements in relation to gaming options that are available. This is why we have a situation where some of these are accessible: because they have been allowed to have an address, say, in the Northern Territory, and people access them once they are registered.

There are offences in relation to breaches of the regulatory regime that are set up in respect of overseas trading in Australia without compliance. This is really an early start to a much bigger issue. Certainly from my perspective, I have nothing against gambling directly, but I will say that this: it is absolutely important that we protect the vulnerable and that ever-growing cohort of youth—and I include people under 40 in that cohort.

Time expired.

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (16:21):** I also rise to make a few comments on the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Budget Measures) Bill 2018 and provide a bit more of an opportunity to discuss some of the important things that this new Marshall Liberal government is doing—undertaking, deciding, leading, making tough decisions—in our first budget on this side of the house for some time.

There are some key premises in the budget that I think all South Australians need to know about and also appreciate, and that is to support more jobs, lower costs and provide better services to all South Australians. That will be the mantra of this Marshall Liberal government and all members of it. After the long years in the wilderness and coldness of budgets presided by those opposite, it is really important to support more job growth in South Australia. It is real job growth that will be important for the future of our state.

The Department of Treasury recently released some key economic indicators for the state. Obviously, employment growth as of August 2018 is steady and unemployment fell marginally, but it was about 1.8 per cent higher than last year. From where we were several years ago, we are in a much better place, but it is vitally important that this government and all governments put their energy into creating employment opportunities for South Australians because it is employment opportunities that grows economic growth. They grow retail spending, exports, imports, housing approvals and dwelling construction, which of course is so important. More importantly, they create confidence and human dignity, which are fundamental.

An issue of concern to me and the government is our youth unemployment rate. Over the past 12 months, we have been sitting at about 13.3 per cent youth unemployment compared with 12.1 per cent nationally. 'Youth' is determined as people aged 15 to 24 who are obviously in the workplace. That is always going to be a key difficulty for young South Australians.

I would hate to think what youth unemployment would be in South Australia had we not seen the exodus of millennials and gen Ys from the state over the last five to 10 years because we have seen a huge number of young people leave. In his previous contributions, the member for Chaffey talked about his kids being interstate, and I have also mentioned that I have siblings interstate. For them, the job opportunities have not been here in South Australia in the last five to 10 years. That is a real challenge for us as a government, and we need to be doing all that we can.

On that note, as Chair of the Economic and Finance Committee, at the end of this month we are about to kick off an inquiry into migration into South Australia. It is not just about the important role of migrants in the South Australian community and economy, and it is not just about what we need to do to attract more skilled migrants especially into our state and, in particular, into our regions: it is about what we are doing in terms of policy settings to keep young South Australians here in this state to ensure that, when they finish their high school or their tertiary education or their VET training, they actually choose to stay in South Australia to continue their work, to buy a house, to start a family, to play, to invest and to participate in our full economy.

As I said, jobs are an important factor. In fact, they are almost the number one issue in the budget. What are we doing directly to stimulate job growth? We are cutting payroll tax. In the member for Hammond's contribution earlier this morning, he talked about the importance of cutting payroll tax to many businesses in his electorate. I am looking forward to going to Murray Bridge next week with the Economic and Finance Committee. The member for Hammond is going to join us.

We are going to talk to some great local industries in his electorate about the importance of economic growth. We are going to get the parliament out there into the regions to find out what is happening. I could not tell you the last time the Economic and Finance Committee visited a regional place under the former government, so I am really looking forward to going out there to talk to businesses about the importance of payroll tax reduction, whether it is in his electorate or my electorate.



The cut in payroll tax is going to be great for South Australia. It is really going to lift our competitiveness across the board. Of course, increasing that payroll tax threshold to well over \$1 million is going to make us one of the more competitive jurisdictions in the nation, and that can only be good for South Australia. Delivering that change to the tens of thousands of small businesses in South Australia is going to be so important.

I remember in my old banking days at the ANZ that one of the biggest issues my business customers faced was the cost of utilities in running their businesses—the cost of water, power, energy and, of course, payroll tax. People just could not understand why the government was penalising them for employing people. It is so important that the government takes appropriate measures to help stimulate economic business. There have been some great reports, particularly out of Deloitte and Business SA, talking about the economic drivers of reducing payroll tax.

As part of the budget measures bill, we are going to remedy some of the deficiencies in the owner-driver exemptions within the contract provisions to ensure that contracts become exempt, or taxable if they do not fall within the relevant exemption. These are the amendments to be introduced in other jurisdictions following the adverse decision in the New South Wales Supreme Court decision. We will also allow for deductions to be made for motor vehicle allowances to account for business use following the changes made to the commonwealth government's income tax legislation. That is some of the rats and mice stuff occurring in this bill.

Some of the other important provisions in the budget measures bill include changes to stamp duty and land tax. Once again, these are decisions that this government has made to facilitate and foster economic growth. Changes to stamp duties and premiums will help people who are transacting real asset transactions, whether it be expanding the current stamp duty exemption for family farm transfers to involve companies—that is a great benefit for many traders out there—or providing stamp duty exemption on premiums paid in relation to multi-peril crop insurance policies entered into from 1 January 2018. I know that is another issue that the now government pursued quite heavily when we were in opposition.

Of course, there are going to be changes to the land tax regime as well. For years, South Australia has had one of the more uncompetitive land tax regimes, and we are going to do everything we can to make sure that South Australia is a more attractive place in which to invest and to do business. The changes in land tax will increase the tax free threshold from \$369,000 to \$450,000 and introduce a new tax bracket of \$1.2 million to \$5 million and a marginal tax rate of 2.9 per cent on land tax from 2020. This is expected to benefit over 50,000 land tax ownerships, including around 8,000 that will no longer have a land tax liability.

I really think it is important to pursue land tax reform because there are many mums and dads out there in the community whose primary investment superannuation means of looking after themselves is actually through an investment property. Not every South Australian has historically been attracted to the notion of compulsory superannuation, and many people who are self-employed—many migrant families, including my own—have relied on the value of land as a form of investment but, more importantly, as a form of savings, and, even more importantly, as a form of not relying on government assistance. I think it is fantastic that this Marshall Liberal government has seen fit to seek some land tax reform. As I said, that will mean that some of the 8,000 land tax ownerships will no longer be subject to land tax liability, which is really important.

I will go through some of the key economic indicators of where the state is at the moment for those who are interested and those who will benefit from the budget decisions. Dwelling approvals for the last 12 months to July 2018 are actually down 0.6 of a percent and private sector housing approvals fell 0.9 per cent during July to be 2.7 per cent lower than a year ago. Housing dwelling approvals, Deputy Speaker, as you know, are one indicator of where the economy is heading. It certainly is a bit of a lead indicator. It is an important indicator for government, for Treasury, to be aware of because it shows some indication of confidence in the economy and, of course, it is so important that we have strong confidence in the South Australian economy so that we continue to grow.

Housing finance commitments have also increased 0.1 per cent in the period. That is what South Australians are outlaying on finance commitments, and that is why it has been so

fundamentally important to assist with cost-of-living relief for South Australians. That is why the reduction in the emergency services levy—putting some \$90 million back in the pockets of South Australian householders—is a welcome relief for so many South Australians.

I have no doubt that when they recently received their ESL bill mums and dads in my electorate and across the state were relieved to see it roughly halved from where it was 12 months ago. It is a relief that this Marshall Liberal government is giving back to the South Australian people. We understand that times are a bit tough at the moment, so providing ESL relief to people's household budget will allow them to meet other expenditures or help with housing affordability.

In the area of environment protection, which is covered in this bill as well, we are seeking to recover costs on environment management issues such as soil and groundwater contamination and odour facilities for underground petroleum storage systems required to hold an environmental authorisation. In terms of investing back into the environment—and it is fantastic to be working with the new environment minister, minister Speirs—in my area is the government's practical investment of \$100,000 into Brownhill Creek conservation. That is the government partnering with groups like the Brownhill Creek Association to provide practical, on-the-ground Landcare management, which is so important.

Other issues covered off in this legislation include local government reform, and we are meeting our election commitment of abolishing royalties on extractive minerals for councils where the minerals are sourced from council borrow pits and used to build and maintain local roads from 1 July 2019. Another important part that is covered more broadly in our budget agenda and the agenda for the state is council rate capping.

It is a real shame that the other place, particularly the ALP and the SA-Best and Greens crossbench, are not supporting our policy to cap council rates. We have now gone to two elections with a policy of capping council rates. Of course, it was a policy that was widely supported by many members of the South Australian community as another example of reducing cost-of-living pressures on South Australians. I find it incredible that the ALP in particular do not seem to care about cost-of-living pressures for average South Australians. Obviously it has been too good for them for too long.

Something we are doing that I think is actually quite important is removing the royalty concession on new mines from 1 July 2019 with fair and reasonable transitional arrangements. In terms of share of employment in the South Australian economy, as of August 2017 mining represented 1.1 per cent of employment and in August 2018 accounted for 0.9 per cent of total employment. In terms of economic output, in 2015-16 mining accounted for 4.6 per cent of South Australian economic output and 4.2 per cent in 2016-17. So we are actually going backwards in the mining and resources sector space, and I think that is something we need to be very wary of.

Mining is fundamentally important to our economy. It is a very strong job creator and, naturally, it is a very strong job creator in our regions, especially in the northern parts of South Australia. If we are going to support our regional communities, we do need to have a strong mining industry; coupled with that, on the back of it, are transport, logistics and the benefits that mining brings across the board. So ensuring that we are looking at those matters is vitally important.

Other things tidied up in this body of work relate to a more simplified and efficient gambling regulation regime based on the recommendations of the Hon. Tim Anderson QC, in an inquiry established by the member for Enfield, the former attorney-general, and the transfer of the IGA's existing powers and functions to the Liquor and Gaming Commissioner through Consumer and Business Services from 1 December 2018.

I think in the gambling space there are about four or five different bodies—through what was the IGA but is now being transferred; through the Office of Consumer and Business Services; Treasury, which of course has a gaming function; and then the gaming industry itself, which has a regulatory function as well—so it is probably an area where there is a lot of duplication of regulation and oversight, but important regulation and oversight. No-one here supports problem gambling; nevertheless, I respect people's choice to gamble. Another area covered in this legislation is around liquor licensing fees. There will be some further clarity to the extent of the regulation-making power in the act in relation to fees and, of course, that regulation.

This piece of legislation couples with where we are at in relation to the whole budget. It is about setting the agenda, not just for this issue and not re-addressing some of the ginormous legacy issues over the past 16 years—and there are plenty of them. I have no hesitation in blaming the Labor Party for many of the ills in South Australia over the last 16 years. Listening to some of the contributions from members opposite, you would have thought they had been in parliament for only six months, not 16 years.

I hope they do take stock of what is in this year's budget and understand that tough decisions need to be made by government. That is the difficult part of government. It is important that government makes sensible and wise decisions because when it does not, when it creates a budget deficit of almost \$400 million, there are implications for creating such budget deficits. I think it is an issue of morality and an issue of the way society conducts itself when government acts in a reckless manner.

Ultimately, somebody else, the grown-ups in government and in politics, have to make tough decisions to get the budget back into balance to continue to provide services, to find \$500 million, as we have found, to go into the education sector to fund programs such as phonics, the Literacy Guarantee and the important parts of education. All those really important decisions to fund infrastructure, to put money back into the healthcare system, to fix local roads, as we are doing in the Mitcham Hills, all come at a cost and this budget reflects that. I look forward to its passage through the parliament.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (16:42):** I am very pleased to be able to summarise the second reading on behalf of the government. It is an honour to have been able to handle this bill in the second reading stage. The government will provide ministers—either me or the Deputy Premier, or both of us—to support the committee stage, which we do not propose to enter into beyond clause 1 tonight, certainly not at this stage anyway.

The government is grateful to the members for Hammond, Lee, Schubert, Bragg and Waite, who have given outstanding contributions on this debate. I particularly enjoyed the member for Waite's contribution. I thought that he summarised the bill in an outstanding fashion. He is indeed a fine legislator, and the constituents of Waite have never been better served. He is as equally a fine member as the Hon. Stephen Baker. The last speech was a highlight.

The members for Bragg, Schubert, Hammond and Lee all made fine contributions. There were fine contributions particularly from those on the government side. I thank the member for Lee for his contribution, and I understand in his contribution he raised a number of matters. Given that we have this opportunity between now and the October sittings, we will endeavour to respond to a number of those questions and issues he raised, potentially in clause 1, although we have the estimates next week into the Appropriation Bill. It may well be that a number of those matters are potentially ventilated there, where there are matters of appropriation that touch on those issues relevant to the budget measures bill.

For the benefit of members, the bill traversed a number of issues. It dealt with the payroll tax, remedying deficiencies in relation to the owner-driver exemption and also continuing to allow deductions to be made to the value of motor vehicle allowances to account for business use following changes to commonwealth legislation. Of course, that is important. The bill deals with stamp duty and facilitates the collection of data as a result of the commonwealth government initiatives.

It expands the current stamp duty exemption for family farm transfers to include those involving companies, for reasons that have been outlined by other members, and provides a stamp duty exemption on premiums paid in relation to multi-peril crop insurance policies entered into from 1 January this year. This was a very important measure that the government took to the election. I remember well being in Port Pirie, I think, when the now Premier announced that this would be one of the policies that we took forward. I know this is welcomed by many in the community.

Land tax policies taken to the election by the government are enacted in the bill. The bill increases the tax free threshold, introduces a new tax bracket and marginal tax rate on land tax from 1 July 2020. Indeed, 50,000 land tax ownerships are set to benefit from this measure, including 8,000 that will no longer have a land tax liability. Many constituents in my electorate of Morialta will be

grateful for this measure being in the bill, and I certainly encourage the parliament to support it in total.

The second aspect of the land tax changes are those that will inspire increased confidence and increased investment in the South Australian economy, getting the state moving so that we can be all that we can be. There is going to be a lot of that in the years ahead as we continue to expand the pie and build the economy of South Australia. It is an exciting time ahead, I have to say. This is one of those many measures that we are doing to build confidence in the South Australian economy.

In relation to environmental protection, the bill will support environmental protection through the requirement that facilities with underground petroleum storage systems hold an environmental authorisation, which will indeed require a licence fee, which will be in relation to recovering costs that come of things like remediation, groundwater contamination, odour, and soil vapour.

In relation to local government, the abolition of royalties on extractive minerals for council, where the minerals were sourced from council burrow pits and used to build and maintain local roads from 1 July next, I know that this is something that a number of councils have raised. I am sure that it will work well. In relation to mining, we are removing the royalty concession on new mines from 1 July 2020, and the bill provides fair and reasonable transitional arrangements.

The closure of the Office of the Commissioner for Kangaroo Island I do not think will come as a surprise. Kangaroo Island is a tremendously important part of South Australia, as are the people who live on Kangaroo Island and the people who work on Kangaroo Island, and I think of the government benches full of people who have grown up on Kangaroo Island. The Kangaroo Island community is, of course, very well represented in this parliament. Not only do they have a local member of parliament—or at least a member of parliament who represents their local area—they have a slew of members of parliament who have either grown-up on Kangaroo Island or studied on Kangaroo Island, like the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Police, and I think one or two others.

Kangaroo Island is always going to be a priority for the government as a key region that draws in so many international tourists. The need for them to have a commissioner has always been, in my view, less well explained, and we look forward to that work continuing by government in supporting the people of Kangaroo Island and supporting industry, tourism and agriculture on Kangaroo Island without necessarily needing the extra bureaucracy to ensure that it can continue to be supported. This government will support Kangaroo Island without a commissioner.

In relation to the Independent Gambling Authority, I think that the member for Waite put an outstanding contribution forward in relation to this. Of course, the Anderson review has informed the government's policy framework here significantly. I was particularly pleased when I saw the Deputy Premier was in a position to put that on the record earlier this month, which had been awaited for a little while. This bill deals with liquor licensing fees. The revised fee structure has been identified by others, again in relation to the Anderson review.

As to real property, the Registrar-General will be able to recalculate registration fees on transferred land based on the correct value of the land, including on land where stamp duty is not payable in all cases, where fees have initially been paid based on the basis that does not accurately reflect the value of the land. The bill gives the Registrar-General powers to secure a charge against the title for any unpaid stamp duty.

That said, I thank once again the members for Hammond, Lee, Schubert, Bragg and Waite, who have made further contributions on this bill. I look forward to the committee stage, which will take place, I would imagine, in October. A range of information will be available through the estimates, and information that is not available through the estimates we should have available when we debate clause 1 in detail. I commend the second reading to the house.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

*Parliamentary Procedure***CHAMBER MEDIA ACCESS**

**The SPEAKER:** I advise members that I rise to address the issue of media access to film proceedings. Yesterday in the house a point of order was raised as to whether I had directed media to leave the public galleries. I advised the house that, as I had not been notified of the media's intent to film from the gallery, I advised one of the attendants that they were to leave. I take this opportunity to clarify the situation concerning media access to the filming of the proceedings of the House of Assembly.

As members would be aware, the parliament commenced broadcasting its proceedings last year, which included access to media organisations accredited by the Speaker to the broadcast material. I refer the house to the terms and conditions relating to the transmission and broadcasting of proceedings, as set out in standing order 400 with reference to the following:

6. The instructions of the Speaker or the Speaker's delegate in respect of broadcasting in the House of Assembly shall be observed.
7. Camera operators and still photographers must operate within the guidelines issued by the Speaker.
8. No other filming or sound recording of proceedings of the House is permitted except by express permission of the Speaker.

Where previously media organisations were required to be in attendance to film proceedings, with media access to the broadcast of proceedings it was considered no longer necessary for the media to have access to the chamber to film the proceedings. However, should the media request access for a particular reason, they could make an application to the Speaker for specific permission.

The standing orders relating to the transmission and broadcasting of proceedings reflect this new paradigm and now operate in such a way so that any media organisation who wish to film proceedings in the House of Assembly need to seek the express permission of the Speaker. As I advised the house yesterday, not being notified of the media's intent to film from the gallery and not having received a request for permission to film, those media representatives were advised to leave. This is consistent with the standing orders. On a related matter, I refer to footage that has formed part of television news services that filmed members of the public in the House of Assembly gallery recently.

As outlined in the standing orders, camera operators must operate within the guidelines issued by the Speaker. On 2 August this year, I advised the house of updated conditions for granting the privilege of still photography and publishing proceedings of the House of Assembly. Part of those conditions included any event other than on the floor of the chamber cannot be published without specific approval. This equates to no filming of the public galleries unless specific approval is sought and provided.

Further, I refer the house to the filming rules and guidelines established by my predecessor the Hon. Michael Atkinson that apply to the camera operators of the broadcasting system and equally apply where applicable to anyone, including media organisations given permission to film proceedings of the House of Assembly. Those guidelines clearly state that filming is not to provide coverage of the galleries. The prohibition on filming people in the public galleries is a long established condition of filming in the House of Assembly and is consistent with the practice of numerous parliaments, not only in Australia but around the world.

The restriction discourages people who attend the parliament from engaging in disturbances that could be filmed and later shown in the media. There are also those members of the public who may be dissuaded from visiting the parliament should they know their attendance could be filmed and later publicised. As I have pointed out, given the number of schoolchildren who are also in attendance in the public gallery, this highlights the importance of control measures around this issue.

I can assure all members that with the introduction of the broadcasting of proceedings, accredited media organisations now have access to 100 per cent of the proceedings that take place in the House of Assembly chamber. If there are any media organisations that feel they need to have additional access to the proceedings, I invite them to apply for permission. Any application will be

considered on its merits and, should permission be granted, it will be subject to the same rules and guidelines where applicable that govern broadcast camera operators together with any directions that are imposed by the Speaker.

I now refer to recent comments that have been made in the media concerning public access to the various galleries of the parliament. Standing order 69 clearly indicates that only the Speaker may admit strangers into the Speaker's gallery. Members of the Legislative Council have privileges of admission there. The Speaker's gallery needs to be distinguished from the strangers' gallery, which is the public gallery on the upper level. Members of the public wishing to visit parliament and observe the proceedings of the House of Assembly do not need the permission of the Speaker to sit in the strangers' gallery. I trust this simple explanation will make it clear that the public are free to visit the parliament to observe its proceedings from the public galleries without the need for any permission to do so.

**Mr PICTON:** On a point of clarification, Mr Speaker, I remember when the previous Speaker, the former member for Croydon, brought in the previous rules in terms of filming in the house. He said that one area which had not yet been decided was in relation to cutaways. To compare our house with the federal parliament, where there are no external cameras allowed into the house, there are quite extensive cutaways that are allowed and happen in the broadcasting system. For instance, if there were people who were guests in the federal parliament when the federal parliamentary system films them as part of the broadcasting system—

**The SPEAKER:** They have allowed some cutaways. I have seen that.

**Mr PICTON:** Have you made a determination in terms of whether the system will allow such cutaways, whether it is in terms of people who are being talked about in the chamber but also in the public galleries?

**The SPEAKER:** I am more than aware of what the federal parliament do. I am happy to take that on notice, have a look at what is exactly determined in the rules about cutaways and come back to the house at a later date.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** On a further point of clarification, sir, when the television journalists were asked to leave by attendants on your instructions on two days, I understand your ruling led not only to the TV cameras being evicted but also the journalists themselves. Is it your ruling that journalists must seek your permission to be in the strangers' gallery?

**The SPEAKER:** I am quite happy for journalists to be in the strangers' gallery. Let's be very clear about this: it is particularly about the filming that I am referring to. However, if a journalist has a camera in their hands, I can understand how perhaps that message could be unclear, so I trust in good faith that this will now clarify that issue.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** So journalists are free to watch the proceedings of parliament, as they see fit?

**The SPEAKER:** Absolutely.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** They were asked to leave.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, so I hope that clarifies that situation.

#### *Bills*

### **SUMMARY OFFENCES (DISRESPECTFUL CONDUCT IN COURT) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 August 2018.)

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (16:59):** I indicate that I am the lead speaker on the bill. What a delight it is to be speaking on the disrespectful conduct in court bill in these hallowed halls of parliament where we never see any disrespectful conduct occurring whatsoever! I want the *Hansard* to note the sarcasm in what I just said. Even in question time today, sadly, we heard some very disrespectful conduct from the environment minister in this place.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Kaurna, stay on the bill, please.

**Mr PICTON:** Yes, I think it is very important to talk about disrespectful conduct in relation to the disrespectful conduct bill.

**Mr Pederick:** Look inside the glass house.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurna will be heard in silence. Continue.

**Mr PICTON:** Thank you for your protection to prevent this disrespectful conduct from occurring in this place while I am debating. This is not the first time that the now Deputy Premier has introduced this bill, having previously introduced it when she was in opposition. I have to say that, when we were in government and she introduced this bill, we did seek advice at the time from the judiciary. The feedback at the time was that there was no reason for this bill.

There was not an advent of mass disrespect in courts for which judges and judicial officers did not have the ability to deal with within the current laws and rules of the court as apply at the moment; hence, it was not something that we supported in government. Now that the Deputy Premier, the member for Bragg, is in government she has reintroduced this bill. Between those times, I do not think that there has been any great outbreak in disrespectful conduct in our courts since we sought that advice from the judiciary, but she is now the Attorney-General and this is obviously something that she has been keen to push.

However, I do note that it has been on the *Notice Paper* for some time and keeps getting delayed. We have been told that it is not really a high priority piece of legislation for the government to deal with, which I think highlights the fact that there really is not so much disrespectful conduct in court that necessitates urgent legislation for the government to deal with because the government itself does not regard it as a particularly urgent piece of legislation for us to deal with.

With all that in mind, now that the government is in place, it is obviously a key priority for the Attorney-General now and we are happy to pass this legislation and support it. We will not be opposing this, but we do think that there are very significant questions the Attorney-General needs to answer about this legislation and how it is going to be in place. We will be scrutinising it both in this place and via our shadow attorney-general in the other place.

The Summary Offences (Disrespectful Conduct in Court) Amendment Bill will make it an offence for a person to engage in disrespectful conduct before the court during proceedings. The maximum penalty introduced is \$1,250 or three months' imprisonment. I have to say that I am very glad that you, Deputy Speaker, or your colleague the Speaker do not have this power to deal with members in this place if there is disrespectful conduct here because our prisons would be full with at least 47 MPs who would be coming up for some imprisonment at some time. Disrespectful conduct has been defined in the bill as:

- (a) refusing to stand up after being requested to do so by the court; and
- (b) using offensive or threatening language; and
- (c) interfering with or undermining the authority, dignity or performance of the court;

In her second reading explanation, the Attorney-General advised that the bill is heavily based on the New South Wales Courts Legislation Amendment (Disrespectful Behaviour) Act 2016, which introduced an offence of disrespectful behaviour. The Attorney-General also used the New South Wales act to justify the introduction of this bill. However, as pointed out in the Law Society's submission—I note that the Attorney-General was always very keen to note the Law Society's submissions when she was in opposition but perhaps not now that she is in government—there are some very significant differences between the content and context of the South Australian bill and the New South Wales act.

The New South Wales act sets the maximum penalty of 14 days' imprisonment or 10 penalty units, which is \$1,100, or both. We are basing this on the New South Wales legislation, where you have 14 days' imprisonment, but we have decided not to double that, not to triple it, but significantly to increase it, from 14 days' up to 90 days' imprisonment in this legislation.

As I said, there does not appear to be any evidence of this mass outbreak of disrespectful conduct in South Australia. In terms of the New South Wales act, a number of people have refused to stand before the judge on the basis of their religious or other beliefs. There is no evidence of that sort of behaviour occurring here, but perhaps the Attorney-General can furnish the house with some statistics. For example, how many people have been held in contempt of court in South Australia each year? This is of course the court's ability to deal with such disrespectful conduct.

We are not saying that respectful conduct is advisable, permissible or to be encouraged. We are saying that the courts have the ability to deal with that at the moment, as they have had for time immemorial through the ability to hold people in contempt of court. I am interested to know how many people are being held in contempt of court. Maybe our gaols are full of people being held in contempt of court because of this outbreak of disrespectful behaviour. I would also be very keen to know how many people have refused to stand in court, which is what the Attorney-General is claiming as one of the key reasons to bring in this bill. Is there any other evidence that this is actually a problem? Is there any other evidence she can point to that requires this bill to be put in place?

A further difference between the New South Wales legislation and what the Attorney-General is proposing is that a judge must refer the conduct of the Attorney-General for potential prosecution. It is not clear why that provision has not been carried over into the South Australian bill. I understand that the Attorney-General's Department advised that the penalties for disrespectful conduct within this bill are consistent with the contempt penalties in the Supreme Court and District Court but not in the Magistrates Court, where I understand it is \$8,000 or two years' imprisonment, or in the Youth Court, where it is \$2,500 or six months' imprisonment for a child or \$10,000 or two years' imprisonment for an adult.

However, I am told that further advice from the Attorney-General's office indicates that the definition of 'consistent' has been interpreted to mean—and I am quoting from an email from the Attorney-General's adviser here—

...the power to punish contempt is flexible in the Supreme Court and can include a fine or imprisonment, without expressly setting a maximum or minimum. The penalties contained in the Bill are consistent with the penalties that the Supreme Court may impose, in the sense that the penalties in the Bill sit below the maximum penalties which can be imposed by inferior courts, such as the Magistrates Court or the Youth Court. As such, the maximum penalties in this Bill are lower than any of the maximum penalties which can be imposed by any of the courts for contempt, including the Supreme Court.

That seems to be a very broad-ranging definition of the word 'consistent'. It brings me back to former president Bill Clinton, who had to debate what 'is' means. Here, we have a very peculiar definition of what the word 'consistent' means. Within the language of the Attorney-General's office, 'consistent' means something completely different, but we move on. The Attorney-General might like to provide some comment on how she considers this to be consistent. Using such a definition of the word 'consistent', almost any penalty would be consistent.

The Law Society's submission proposes that an explicit defence provision be included in the bill where a person is physically unable to stand. There may be some benefit in considering whether explicit defence is for a person with a mental disability as well. I would be very keen to hear from the Attorney-General whether she would consider such a defence for somebody who is unable to stand due to a physical or mental disability and, if not, how she considers the bill will not mistreat a person in that situation.

The bill makes no differentiation between minor or more severe and repeated disrespectful behaviour. The penalty is the same. There is no regard for people appearing in court for the first time who have no idea of court processes and procedures and who may be unaware that they are in contempt of court because of their behaviour. The bill ignores the various cultural behaviours which may appear disrespectful even if there is no actual determination or malice, or understanding or appreciation on behalf of those people whom they are trying to be disrespectful.

The Law Society submission also notes that there is no requirement that a person must be warned about their disrespectful behaviour prior to being charged and suggests that such a provision be included. I would be very interested to hear from the Attorney-General why there should be no warning provision in place that somebody should have to get over that hurdle before they are charged with these offences.



Whilst acknowledging that it is unfortunate that sometimes judiciary and court officials are exposed to disrespectful behaviour, the existing laws and rules of the court were more than adequate to deal with such instances without resorting to new criminal penalties. The Law Society submission also said that the courts already have statutory and common law powers to deal with disrespectful behaviour. We can therefore conclude that the proposed amendments are unwarranted and an unnecessary duplication of existing court rules and laws.

We support the bill, but there are these very important questions to answer. There does not appear to be any dramatic reason, statistics or information to suggest that there is an outbreak of disrespectful behaviour before the courts. If there was, the current provisions available to the courts in terms of contempt of court do not deal with that. Secondly, there seem to be some very significant differences between what is being proposed here and the New South Wales legislation.

There seem to be some huge differences between the current provisions for contempt of court and what the provisions are here, particularly in terms of the Magistrates Court and the Youth Court. There seems to be little regard for consideration of people with physical disabilities, no regard for whether there should be a warning in place, and there is a different process in place between what is in place in New South Wales, or how a prosecution should proceed, and what is in place in this bill.

Whilst it is not something we are opposing, we think that there are some very serious questions the Attorney needs to answer. We think that there is not a huge amount of evidence to indicate that this bill is required, and therefore we will be asking a number of questions at the committee stage, both in this house and in the other place.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (17:12):** I rise to commend the bill to the house. The bill provides for an amendment to the Summary Offences Act by the introduction of a new part 11A, section 60—Disrespectful conduct in court.

In answer to some of the remarks made by the member for Kaurna just now, this is first and foremost yet another delivery on a commitment made by the new Marshall government. We are doing what we said we would do. We are working on developing a reputation for doing just that and building confidence in the community of South Australia for doing what we say we will do and being good on our commitments, and this is just another example. We have gone about it in an orderly way and, since the bill was introduced in the house on 5 July, it has progressed along with the rest of the very ambitious and practical agenda of the government.

Secondly, I commend the Attorney-General, the Deputy Premier, for her advocacy and support of this reform, stemming from the introduction of this bill, in her capacity in opposition, as a private member's bill in 2016. The Attorney has seen this through from the start and to its fruition, so it is a reform for which the Attorney ought be rightly proud as having led from the beginning all the way through. I note that what appears to be the now somewhat grudging support of the opposition for the bill is welcome. On this side of the house, we are certainly ready, willing and able to get on with enacting it and bringing it into force.

I will address briefly this question of intent and the role this new summary offence will play in the context of the other sanctions available for behaviour of an offensive nature in court. I would say to the member for Kaurna that it is clear on the face of the bill and the definition of 'disrespectful conduct'—and it could not perhaps be any clearer, on my reading—that there is certainly a requirement for an intentional disrespectful act in order to constitute the offence under section 60(1), as it would apply.

Specifically to the member for Kaurna's posited hypothetical about someone who is in a position where they are unable to stand, I suggest that it is disingenuous to suggest that the bill might have any application in those circumstances and note that the definition specifically includes reference to examples, the first of which is a refusal to stand up on being requested to do so by the court. Refusing to stand up does not encompass the inability to do so, and so that is one matter that might be dealt with very quickly.

It may be correct to note that the notion of a summary offence for disrespectful conduct comes in the context of a range of sanctions that are available to the court to deal with inappropriate

or offensive behaviour. It perhaps sits on the spectrum between the sanction of a warning, reprimand or removal on the one hand and contempt and proceedings for contempt at the other end of the spectrum.

It is to be noted that the Supreme Court Act 1935, at section 72, provides for the court to set out its own rules in relation to dealing with contempt. It does so in chapter 14 of the rules. Clearly, court rules 301 to 306 have set out how it will go about dealing with contempt in the face of the court, whether inside the courtroom or outside. So much is clear. The new summary offence of disrespectful conduct is intended to operate as a complement to those powers and, in a practical way, operate to recognise that civil and respectful behaviour is required in our courts and that it will not be tolerated if offensive behaviour ensues.

The member for Kaurua referred to submissions made about the necessity for an offence of this nature to be introduced and referred to questions as to whether or not there was a great and urgent need immediately to deal with constant and ongoing disrespectful conduct in our courts. With respect to the member for Kaurua, I observe that that is really not the point. The matter is one of ensuring that, so far as those who interact with our courts are concerned, in the course of dealings with civil society generally we make clear in a public way that we as a community will not tolerate disrespectful conduct and that an offence is there, if necessary, to recognise that fact.

There is another practical issue that this may serve to overcome. That is that the genesis of contempt of court goes back a very long way and indeed exists as a means by which the court can go about vindicating its authority. It has raised over the long history of the jurisprudence a question as to whether or not in circumstances of contempt the contemnor must purge their contempt before they will be further heard by the court.

Lord Denning had something to say about this and the genesis of the notion of contempt in the case of *Hadkinson v Hadkinson*, a case heard in 1952. He observed that it is a rare event for the court to refuse to hear counsel for a party, but it is nonetheless a matter that the court is clearly bringing into focus in circumstances where it is proceeding for contempt. I note as well that Lord Denning, when making those remarks, observed that the notion of contempt was not a rule of common law but one of canon law that was adopted by the ecclesiastical courts. Those courts adopted a rule that they would not hear a party who had disobeyed their orders.

So there is a history in relation to contempt that means that the bar is inevitably raised to a serious level where contempt is involved, and as a practical matter it may have the effect of disrupting the court's process in circumstances where it may be more appropriate to send a very practical signal to a badly behaved individual who finds themselves before the court by providing a sanction for their disrespectful conduct while not invoking the traditional concept of proceeding for contempt so as to vindicate the authority of the court.

With those remarks, I share the member for Kaurua's desire to see the swift passage of this legislation without further delay, so rather than embark upon further remarks in the course of the afternoon I will leave it there and commend the bill to the house.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (17:23):** I have listened carefully to the remarks of my colleague the member for Heysen and also to the remarks made by the member for Kaurua, and I, too, rise to speak on the Summary Offences (Disrespectful Conduct in Court) Amendment Bill 2018. The amendment bill introduces a new part 11A to the Summary Offences Act. That part, if passed in this house and the other place, would make it an offence to intentionally engage in disrespectful conduct in court. If made out, the offence would be punishable by a fine of \$1,250 or imprisonment for three years.

Nothing in the amendment is intended to fetter the power of the court to make findings of contempt. Certain other amendments are contemplated to give effect to the new offence. The administration of justice depends on trust and confidence in the integrity of the court process. It is particularly important for victims of crime that participants in the court system show respect for that administration. The failure, particularly of an accused person, to show respect for the court process risks compounding the distress earlier suffered by a victim at the time of the offence especially, but not only, for victims of certain offences against the person. Perhaps that is a part answer to the member for Kaurua.

I want to reflect briefly on contempt of court. Contempt in the face of the court is an act which has the tendency to interfere with or undermine the authority, performance or dignity of the courts or those who participate in their proceedings. What is the relationship between this amendment and contempt in the face of the court? Contempt is preserved by this legislation, or by the bill if it becomes legislation. Findings of contempt are infrequently made. This legislation is intended to crystallise an offence to which reference can be made and which may ultimately be used to achieve respectful conduct in court, where necessary.

Examples of contempt include abusing and swearing at a magistrate, filming witnesses with a view to intimidation, prevaricating or refusing to answer questions, refusing to take the oath or give evidence, refusing to leave the court when directed, and disobeying court orders, including a subpoena issued by a court. I point out to the house that there is a difference between rudeness and contempt and, I believe, between rudeness and disrespect. In *Ferguson v Walkley*, Justice Harper remarked at 36:

It is no offence simply to be angry with the authorities (including, of course, judicial authority). Some people can articulate their anger in measured language that clearly explains their reasons for feeling as they do. Others, especially when their anger is combined with high emotional stress, or alcohol, or other debilitating factors, cannot...

Depending always on all the relevant evidence, it would probably be quite wrong to charge someone with an offence simply because such language was used in anger.

It has been the practice of judges in this state to warn contemnors that their conduct, if they persist in it, will likely give rise to contempt. While the practice of the court is rightly a matter for judges and magistrates, I trust this sensible approach will continue even after this new offence is added to the armoury.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:28):** I wish to thank members for their contributions to this debate, in particular the members for Heysen and Kavel, and the member for Kaurana on behalf of the opposition. He presented an indication of their view on this matter, although I was not entirely sure whether or not they intend to formally oppose the bill.

**Mr Picton:** We are not opposing.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Thank you. Clarification is sought for some matters. Can I refer to one matter that had been raised—and I am happy to go into committee. The Chief Justice very kindly forwarded to me a copy of the Explanatory Note on the Judicial Process and Participation of Muslims prepared by the Australian National Imams Council (ANIC). It is a very interesting document.

One of the things that I thought I should bring to the attention of the parliament, on the basis of it having been raised in the media coverage of the bill and some commentary made, is how this might target or apply to people from the Muslim community. Under chapter 3 on page 4 of the material, this document confirms that there is no prohibition under Sharia law to facilitate standing up for a magistrate or a judge in court protocols, bowing to a magistrate or judge, or, under the dress code on page 6, providing for a female witness to remove her hijab or burqa. In those three instances, there is no prohibition under Sharia law to facilitate that to occur.

In other words, there is no impediment to someone of the Muslim faith committed to other religious commitments that says they cannot stand, bow or remove their headdress for the purpose of identification. In fact, the document goes on to point out the significance of insisting that there can be no-one accused or evidence be given against a woman under their practices that would impede them from any court process. I thought it was important that I let the parliament know. I thank the Chief Justice for making the provision.

The other matter that has come to my attention is that, although there has not been a glowing response from those consulted to support the need for having this legislation, one of the things that the judge of the Youth Court questioned in her contribution to us—after agreeing that this law should not apply to youths who come before her in relation to criminal matter—is why care and protection cases that come before her should not have the application of this law, because often the parties in that regard are parents versus some government agency and can get highly distressed and emotional and exhibit difficult behaviours. She has sought some indication as to why those cases should be excluded from the application of this law.

These are all matters of interest which I hope will assist in the consideration of this matter. I am aware that a number of questions were raised by the opposition in briefings on this matter, and I have sought responses in relation to a number of them, if they have not been adequately outlined in the briefings provided. Accordingly, I ask that the matter now go into committee.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

**Mr PICTON:** For the benefit of the committee, I probably have about 10 questions. I am happy to split them up by clauses or we could just push through all of them in clause 1, if people are happy with that.

**The CHAIR:** We have four clauses, so we will spread the load, if the Attorney is happy.

**Mr PICTON:** We will push ahead. I am wondering at the outset if the Attorney-General can outline whether there have been any cases that she can provide us with information on where judicial officers have not been able to deal with a particular case under the contempt of court powers that are available to them and hence would require this change in legislation. What are the specific instances that have occurred in South Australia?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I think it would be clear that, because we do not have this law in South Australia, this would not be an option for them to be able to pursue. Of course, if there was not a sufficient threshold of behaviour that has occurred—that is, it was not sufficient, in their view, to call the person in for the purposes of a contemptible conduct—then they would not be doing so. At the moment, we have a contempt option and nothing else.

If a judge were hearing a matter and there was constant swearing by a party to the proceedings, yelling from the dock, all sorts of disrespectful conduct on the face of it but not sufficient for contempt proceedings, then we would not know about those cases because, of course, they would not have been progressed. It is possible that there have been cases where contempt has been threatened or warned, but we would not know about whether they are going to be successful or not because they have not occurred. There is not any data on cases that do not exist because at this stage we do not have an option.

**Mr PICTON:** So there is no information that you can provide on that front. I wonder if you have consulted with the head of the jurisdictions, the head of the courts, to seek their feedback on the bill generally and also on whether they continue to share the concerns about the need for this that they had the last time this was being debated, or whether they have any new desire that this is particularly needed now.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Firstly, can I say that, in respect of the consultation on the bill, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the Chief Judge of the District Court, the Chief Magistrate, the senior judge of the Youth Court, the state's courts administrator—that is, of the CAA—the South Australian Bar Association, the Law Society of South Australia, the Legal Services Commission of South Australia, SAPOL and the DPP were involved. I think that the member has already identified some of the issues raised by the Law Society in respect of how it is to apply.

I have referred to the senior judge of the Youth Court raising the question as to why it is not applying to her care and protection cases. That is something that is worth having a look at. I think we were certainly of the view that children are largely represented in relation to criminal cases in the Youth Court, and therefore we had not really considered the question of the care and protection cases, which she quite rightly points out largely relate to adults, unless the parent of the child is a child themselves, which can of course happen on some occasions. We will certainly have a look at that. That is the level of consultation that has been undertaken.

I think the evidence of what has occurred interstate is a worrying trend, hence the need to consider how we might ensure that there is an effective mechanism for management of disrespectful conduct in the absence of it having adequate provision at the moment. I can recall coming into the

parliament early after 2002 and the then premier, Mike Rann, had heard of an occasion on Melbourne radio where cats and potentially dogs—

**Mr Picton:** Did you think that was a good idea?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —yes—were going to go into food and that there was a risk that they were going to be used as a meat source, a protein source. The Premier came back to South Australia and said, 'Look, there is a risk this could happen here in our restaurants and we need to consider how we might deal with that, just in case.'

**Mr Picton:** That's what you've done in this bill.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No, that was in a circumstance though where there had not been any identified occasion at all in the other state, just the possibility of it, just a spectre that it might happen. I remember raising at the time that, if there is already a law which says you cannot actually kill an animal, a dog or a cat, for the purposes of human consumption, and there are already several other laws in respect of that, why do we need to have another law which prosecutes the eating of it in a restaurant?

**Mr Picton:** You're just arguing against your own bill.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No, I am just getting to it. He did that within an environment where there was no known case, but of course he persuaded the parliament, probably by the numbers that he had in the lower house, that it was necessary to consider that pre-emptively. Here we not only have examples interstate which we have looked to in order to consider law reform in our own state. This is if it is on its own its way here—and terrorism laws and serious and organised crime laws are ones that come to mind.

We know that the threshold in respect of proving contempt in court, and the seriousness that is attached to that, namely, the capacity to be able to keep people in prison for a very long time, is one which involves taking the prisoner away, going and issuing information to deal with the charging of contempt, the process that goes with that, the holding indefinitely in custody. These are all pretty serious steps to take for a judge. We are providing a summary offence option, a much lower threshold, capacity in definition of what is to be considered disrespectful conduct and that we should do so. That is exactly what we are doing here in this bill.

**Mr PICTON:** I thank the Attorney-General for basically making my argument for me, comparing it to the eating dogs and cats laws in the almost identical situations where there is a hypothetical risk of something happening. But there is no known evidence of that happening in South Australia, so you are legislating on the risk that something might happen.

My question originally was about what the judicial officers have told her. She said she has consulted with them but did not tell us what they had said. Given that she has not outlined that, could she table the advice that she has received from the judicial officers because I think it is quite important for parliament to know what their views on this are, given that they are the ones who are in this situation and they are the ones who parliament should be hearing from as to whether there is a case for these laws and whether they are appropriate or not.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** In this instance, those who did respond were not supportive of it, but I remind the house—

**Mr Picton:** Which ones were they?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The Chief Justice and the Chief Magistrate are relevant. In the same category, I might say that, together with the Law Society, I can think of a very significant number of our serious and organised crime and anti-association laws that were strongly opposed by all of the relevant parties. Similarly, there is the legislation to enable detention in terrorism cases, obviously without charge in some instances, both independently and in conjunction with commonwealth laws. These are the sorts of laws that have met with very strong opposition from many people in the legal profession and the judiciary.

Notwithstanding that, former attorneys-general have brought those matters into the parliament and, as the shadow attorney on behalf of the opposition at the time, we consented to a

number of them. We argued the point on some of the detail of them, but in general terms we have supported the development of law in respect of those particular areas in the face of trenchant opposition from the judiciary and the legal profession, or some aspects of them. We do not make laws down here entirely just on what the police ask us to do, what lawyers ask us to do, what judges ask us to do—

**Mr Picton:** Will you table that advice?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The member fully knows that, in relation to judicial officers and in relation to departmental advice, we do not. In relation to the Law Society, which is one that did answer, I think you have a copy of their letter, and they make that available publicly; if you do not, we are happy to provide you with a copy of it. However, as some of your questions have copied exactly details and phrases that were used in the Law Society letter, I assume you do have it. I do not recall having anything from SAPOL. I will check that between the houses, but I do not have it in front of me.

Clause passed.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The CHAIR:** I acknowledge the former member for Schubert in the public gallery.

#### *Bills*

#### **SUMMARY OFFENCES (DISRESPECTFUL CONDUCT IN COURT) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Committee Stage*

Debate resumed.

Clause 2.

**Mr PICTON:** Bring back the former member for Schubert, I say. I think what Attorney-General has just said is quite incredible, in that with this bill, which is supposed to be about supporting the judiciary and helping out the judiciary, we have the judiciary telling the parliament that they do not support this bill. That is absolutely staggering. In terms of the powers that the judiciary currently has, which is contempt of court, I wonder if the Attorney-General can provide the parliament with the stats in terms of how many people in the past year have been charged or imprisoned on a contempt of court charge?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am advised that the Courts Administration Authority has advised that it does not maintain formal records on the number of charges or convictions for contempt committed in the face of the court. There is certainly nothing in our annual reports, but this is the advice we have from the CAA. It is not possible to speculate about the prevalence of contempt in our courts and tribunals. In many instances, disrespectful or disruptive parties are informally dealt with by a judge or magistrate through alternative means, such as being given a formal warning rather than being charged with an offence for contempt. Frankly, we would expect that to occur in the first instance in any event. I am happy to give you some further detail on that but, in short, they do not keep any data.

**Mr Picton:** What about Corrections? Do Corrections keep that data?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No.

**Mr Picton:** Who has been in prison, they wouldn't keep records?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Yes, but they do not keep a record of what the charges are.

**Mr PICTON:** Given there is now no information in terms of how many people are in contempt of court in South Australia, if any, I wonder if the Attorney-General has information on how many people have been charged under the New South Wales legislation, which supposedly this law is going to be based on.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Yes, I am aware that there have been two charges under their law, with one conviction; one was quite recent. In that matter, the accused was convicted, I am

advised, of nine counts of failing to stand and sentenced to 75 hours of community service. Confirming how effective that can be, it can be dealt with summarily, executed and sentenced.

**Mr PICTON:** Not a very strenuous penalty was imposed there. Given what the Attorney-General was referring to in terms of her knowledge of the Law Society's submission, has she given any consideration to whether there should be a defence for being physically unable to stand, and should there be a defence for any mental health concerns that a person might have as well?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The feature of the bill is that the offence will apply only to relevant parties who intentionally engage in conduct which is disrespectful to the court. People with physical or mental incapacities, who involuntarily engage in conduct which may be viewed as disrespectful according to the usual standards and conventions of a court, will not be captured by the offence. For example, a person who is in a wheelchair and is wheelchair-bound and unable to stand before a judge would not meet the requirements of the offence. By contrast, a person who deliberately fails to stand after being requested to do so by the presiding judicial officer may still be acting disrespectfully, even if the person did not intend to cause disrespect by remaining seated.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

**Mr PICTON:** Why has the Attorney-General made the decision not to graduate offences based on the level of seriousness?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Largely, we leave that to the discretion of the court because they can do just that. There are maximums that are prescribed and, of course, they can do anything underneath that.

**Mr PICTON:** Can the Attorney-General outline why a decision was made not to include the requirement for a warning to be made for disrespectful behaviour? Are judges able to have that discretion and, if so, why is that not a feature of the legislation?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** They have that discretion. They exercise it now. They give warnings plenty of times. If any members of the house have not been down to the courtrooms to see how they operate, I urge them to do so. They would quite often see the edict from the bench indicating that certain consequences will occur if there is not a change of behaviour. Sometimes it is to barristers, sometimes to the witness and sometimes to the accused or others. They have that power already. There is no need to legislate for it. They exercise it when they consider it prudent. We leave it as their responsibility to then determine what the appropriate course of action is in that regard.

**Mr PICTON:** Given that the Attorney-General said that she is basing this legislation on the New South Wales legislation, why has she made the decision to increase the maximum penalty imposed from 14 days, times it by six, up to three months' imprisonment, particularly when we have seen, as evidenced by her, that the only penalty in place that has been imposed in New South Wales for seven counts, I think she said, was for 75 hours of community service?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The answer quite simply is that the penalties proposed here are consistent with what we already have in disorderly conduct charges in other law.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

**Mr PICTON:** You will be glad to know we are winding down, Chairman. Can the Deputy Premier outline how she believes these penalties are consistent with what the courts impose, given that, in terms of contempt of court already, there are vastly different penalties in place under the current legislation in terms of the Magistrates Court and the Youth Court penalties?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** It is less than we have for contempt. It is consistent with disorderly conduct, which is an offence in itself under our current law, so it is both measured and consistent.

**Mr PICTON:** You will be glad to know that this is my last question, but I will reserve my right in case any follow-ups are required. Can the Attorney-General outline whether this bill covers the

Independent Commission Against Corruption and any hearings that it might hold? Has she had any discussions with the commissioner in terms of how this would apply to his hearings?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Within the definition of 'court' in proposed subclause (7) it would be included but, because it does not have any parties, it would not apply.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:56):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**INFRASTRUCTURE SA BILL**

*Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 11, page 6, line 17 [clause 11(1)]—Delete '5' and substitute '3'

No. 2. Clause 20, page 8, after line 32—After subclause (1) insert:

- (1a) In preparing the Strategy, Infrastructure SA must—
- (a) consult the public by publishing a notice on its website informing the public of the preparation of the Strategy and inviting submissions on the Strategy within a period (which must be at least 21 days) stated in the notice; and
  - (b) publish on its website a summary of the submissions received.

No. 3. Clause 20, page 8, after line 37—After subclause (3) insert:

- (4) Infrastructure SA must, in preparing the 20-year State Infrastructure Strategy or a revised Strategy, comply with the principles of consultation published by Infrastructure SA for the purposes of this subsection.

No. 4. Clause 22, page 9, line 29 [clause 22(2)(b)]—After 'publicly available' insert:

within 14 days of its adoption by ensuring that it is published on Infrastructure SA's website

No. 5. Clause 25, page 10, line 23 [clause 25(2)(b)]—Delete paragraph (b) and substitute:

- (b) must make the adopted Statement publicly available within 14 days of its adoption by ensuring that it is published on Infrastructure SA's website.

No. 6. New clause, page 12, after line 26—Before clause 32 insert:

31A—General requirements in preparing a strategy, statement or plan

In preparing a strategy, statement or plan under this Act, Infrastructure SA must use a method of cost benefit analysis that it has approved and published on its website.

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I move:

That amendments Nos 1 to 6 be agreed to.

In the lead-up to the election, we made some very strong commitments about providing a new and better way to deliver infrastructure projects in South Australia. I think that the decision the upper house has come to is a very reasonable compromise, providing some minor amendments to the bill in relation to time frames for publishing things and a couple of other minor amendments.

This is an absolutely fantastic day for South Australia. We now have a legislated process about how we are going to deliver better infrastructure projects in South Australia. It is a fantastic achievement. I thank the upper house for their work and look forward to this becoming law in South Australia.



*Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. J.A.W. Gardner.*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am pleased that the council has made some amendments and that the government has accepted some of the opposition's amendments, although they have reworded some of them. It was interesting to speak to the crossbenchers about their concerns of not having a legislative framework for Infrastructure South Australia, given that the government withdrew legislation for the first time since the Olsen government with the productivity commission.

I think the crossbench in the upper house felt that they had no option other than to support amendments that perhaps, if the government had not threatened to withdraw the bill as they did with the productivity commission, may have passed. Nevertheless, congratulations to the government. They have passed their legislation. My concern is that the opposition attempted to move amendments in the other place not to allow Infrastructure South Australia to consider the construction of infrastructure that would impose toll roads on South Australia and that the government opposed that.

It gives me great concern that a minister is in secret attempting to have a body begin the contemplation of infrastructure built by private companies. Experts from the private sector will obviously fill this board, including three public servants, who may now recommend that toll roads be recommended. I would say to the government that South Australia functions well without toll roads. The government has no mandate to introduce toll roads.

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** It was actually expressly part of our election commitment not to have them.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The minister interjects that it was expressly part of his election commitment not to have toll roads, yet when the opposition attempted to move amendments not to allow Infrastructure South Australia to contemplate toll roads the government voted against those amendments. I think it should serve as a great concern for the people of South Australia that the government and the minister are considering infrastructure to be privately funded, which would then not allow free—

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** You've got to give him something. The poor bloke has been roundly beaten.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am not sure how the majority getting legislation up is being roundly beaten but, anyway, whatever floats your boat. I have grave concerns about it, but we shall see the operation of Infrastructure South Australia. We look forward to seeing how it is populated. We look forward to seeing how it operates and whether the amendments moved in the upper house, which the government will accept, allow for greater transparency and greater reporting. That is important because the government did attempt to have this body operate almost entirely in secret. The opposition did all it could to try to make it operate as transparently as possible, but as we are learning, this government seems to enjoy secrecy, being opaque and keeping things hidden. In those two remarks—

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** You almost couldn't keep a straight face then, Tom—the edges of your face.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Mr Chair, thank you for your protection during my remarks. You have been a fierce advocate of mine during my remarks.

**The CHAIR:** Continue, member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I really appreciate the fairness and evenness with which you have shown your defence of ministers, at the end of a long day, feeling tired and emotional and yelling things out, Mr Chair. I commend the bill to the house.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Hang on, I think we will take that to mean that the opposition are now going to vote for this amendment bill, which I think is a fantastic step forward. The whole point of Infrastructure South Australia is to tell some very uncomfortable truths to government. The idea that we would put restrictions on what truths we ask them to bring forward, I think, is patently ridiculous.

This is a fantastic day for South Australia. We can start to rebuild confidence in the way that we deliver infrastructure projects. We can actually get some independent advice to help challenge government, to help keep government honest and to make sure that taxpayers' hard-earned dollars are spent on the most important projects. This is a system that is going to lead to not only better designing and decision-making around what projects to deliver but better structure on how we deliver these infrastructure projects and undertake post-project evaluation. Through a much more rigorous structured process, we are going to improve government decision-making here in South Australia.

I would like to take this time to thank the Premier for his work in championing this piece of legislation for such a long time and for this finally getting up. We very much look forward to the operation of this very important legislation and its being something that this government, for the many terms that it will be in power, and also future governments potentially of different persuasions, will have to take heed of.

Motion carried.

At 18:07 the house adjourned until Tuesday 16 October 2018 at 11:00.