

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Wednesday, 17 October 2018**

The SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia) took the chair at 10:31 and read prayers.

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

*Bills***ROYAL COMMISSIONS (EXTRATERRITORIAL APPLICATION) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 September 2018.)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (10:33): I continue my remarks from 5 September 2018 which, before seeking leave to continue, I commenced with, 'Further, it,' referring to the High Court, 'would have considered whether the commonwealth is impliedly immune from an exercise of the powers' conferred by sections 10 and/or section 11 of the Royal Commissions Act 1917 (SA) on the basis that they modify or impair the executive power of the commonwealth or substantially interfere with or curtail the operation of the executives of the commonwealth.

These matters, as I have indicated, were to be tested in the High Court. However, given when the matter could be listed to be heard and its proximity to the completion date of the commission, the commissioner, Mr Walker, raised the utility of the proceedings with me. In the absence of any extension of time to complete his report, he withdrew the summonses. Given that the proceedings would have been heard in October at the earliest and that his report was due in February 2019, even a successful result in the proceedings could not have come to make the summonses useful.

Since those proceedings were discontinued, I was pleased to see, in correspondence provided by the commission, that the commonwealth and the Murray-Darling Basin Authority agreed to voluntarily participate in the commission's proceedings by providing written submissions and some additional supporting information. I am further advised this week that the material has been received, but the commonwealth has declined an invitation to be available for questions in respect of the documentation provided and/or to further assist the commission.

When this bill was introduced on 20 June this year, the deputy opposition leader said in her second reading speech, which she claimed was introduced urgently:

...following the commonwealth government and the Murray-Darling Basin Authority both seeking an injunction to prevent commonwealth officials from having to appear before the South Australian royal commission.

As I have said, the commonwealth and the authority recently agreed to participate in the commission's proceedings, and the proceedings have been discontinued. For those reasons alone, this bill does not need to be further considered. Indeed, for the matters I raised on 5 September, this bill was not effective in any way in remedying what the opposition claimed to be the ill when introducing this bill.

As to whether there needs to be broad legislative change, including giving the act extraterritorial effect, the government will consider changes in due course. After all, it is the Royal Commissions Act of 1917, and I think it is fair to say that it is in need of overhaul, but not in the content of the bill that is before us now. During the course of the operation of the commission and the opportunity I have had to meet with Mr Walker, he provided advice to me in respect of other inquiry legislation around the country—

The Hon. J.W. Weatherill: Have you apologised yet?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —which he described as being more modern and effective. That material is under consideration by my office. We will, of course, look towards receiving the commissioner's report in due course and any recommendations he may have in relation to his terms of reference. I thank him, along the way, for his supportive advice on how we might look to modernise our royal commissions provision, which is sadly far behind the advance of some other jurisdictions in the country.

Time expired.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10:38): I will close the debate relatively briefly, but I would like to make a couple of points about this matter. The Attorney-General has indicated that this bill was unnecessary. Its entire purpose is to unfetter the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission so that it is able not only to receive material from the other states and from the commonwealth but to require witnesses to attend and answer questions. The Attorney-General has just now suggested that it is no longer necessary because the commonwealth has belatedly returned, in part, to its original position, which was that they would fully cooperate.

More recently, it has said, 'We will provide some material.' Providing material is not the same as providing witnesses. We have had an exercise in futility while waiting for this government to give permission to the royal commission to do the job it needs to do. High Court proceedings were in train to determine whether the royal commission was, without this legislation, able to summons witnesses and require information. The royal commission realised that it needed an extension of time if it was going to be able to make that occur. It therefore asked the government if it could have some more time so that it could say to the High Commission that what it was attempting to do was not frivolous and not a hypothetical situation and that, if the government did rule in the royal commission's favour, then it would be able to act on that.

According to the royal commission, that letter was misrepresented by the Attorney-General in public. After a toing and froing, it was made explicitly clear that this government would not give an extension to the royal commission, which means they were unable to proceed with the High Court matter, which means they were unable to issue summonses that required officials to attend. That is the sequence of events that occurred.

Because I only have a few minutes, I will not read all the letter from the royal commissioner to the Attorney-General following his initial letter and then following the public statement made by the Attorney-General, but I will read some highlights. He points out that he is afraid there has been some misunderstanding that should be cleared up:

My letter did not say that because I have not requested any extension of time within which to report that I am obliged to withdraw the summonses with the likely consequence of rendering the High Court proceedings moot.

To the contrary, my letter was written on the following basis. First, I issued the summonses because I considered I was empowered to do so and they were appropriate.

Second, although I can make what I hope would be a useful report without the benefit of the material and evidence sought by the summonses, I would much prefer to obtain that benefit. That material and evidence, I stress, is regarded by me as highly desirable to be considered by my Commission, in the interests of everyone, including South Australia and South Australians, affected by the Basin Plan.

This is not a matter of politics. This is not a matter of the government adjourning my bill until after the High Court matter is settled and then saying, 'She said it was urgent and it hasn't happened.' It was adjourned every single time on division because we required them to vote in the interests of their politics and not in the interests of South Australia and the River Murray. This letter makes it absolutely explicit that a Sydney royal commissioner is working harder on our water coming down the River Murray than this government is.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Dr CLOSE: The job of a government is to stand—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: You haven't spoken to Bret Walker.

Dr CLOSE: Haven't I?

Mr Pederick interjecting:

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

Dr CLOSE: The job of a royal commissioner—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

Dr CLOSE: —is to hear all the evidence—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader and member for Hammond!

Dr CLOSE: —and to ask people questions. There may be whistleblowers who would not otherwise choose to present evidence, who would come up with the evidence if they were required to.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members will not interject.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members!

Dr CLOSE: As the royal commissioner points out:

This is a decision for the Government and the Government alone. If you or those advising you choose to characterize my request to know the Government's position as a kind of request for an extension of time, so be it. It would be quite wrong for anyone to proceed on the false basis that I would withdraw the summonses simply because I have not formally asked for an extension of time...

Since reading your response and during my writing this reply, I have been informed of a public statement from your office about these matters. It is wrong, discourteous and inappropriate.

He ends the paragraph by saying, 'I am owed an apology.'

This is a New South Wales-based royal commissioner paying more attention to the law and more attention to the River Murray than this government.

Time expired.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 19
Noes 26
Majority 7

AYES

Bettison, Z.L.
Brown, M.E. (teller)
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Rau, J.R.
Wortley, D.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Piccolo, A.
Stinson, J.M.

Boyer, B.I.
Cook, N.F.
Hughes, E.J.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Weatherill, J.W.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Brock, G.G.
Cregan, D.

Bedford, F.E.
Chapman, V.A.
Duluk, S.

Bell, T.S.
Cowardrey, M.J.
Ellis, F.J.

NOES

Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
Whetstone, T.J.

Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Second reading thus negated.

ROAD TRAFFIC (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:51): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The SPEAKER: The question before the house is that Order of the Day No. 5 be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
Noes 21
Majority 3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cowdrey, M.J.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Bell, T.S.
Cregan, D.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.
Duluk, S.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Piccolo, A.
Stinson, J.M.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hughes, E.J.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Weatherill, J.W.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E.
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
Rau, J.R.
Wortley, D.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

*Condolence***KENIHAN, MR Q.**

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (10:57): I move:

That this house expresses its deep regret at the death of Quentin Kenihan and pays tribute to his significant contribution to the South Australian community.

Quentin Kenihan was small in stature but immense in heart. He mixed with the stars. For Russell Crowe he was, 'My little mate, the bravest bloke I ever met.' To Mike Willesee, 'He was such a tough little bugger who always defied the odds.' Of course, Quentin became a star himself. He got a TV show and a radio show. He appeared in a *Mad Max* film. He wrote a memoir. He said there was nothing he had tried that he had not been able to achieve. He hustled; he was always busy. He just would not give up. What a star.

Born with brittle bone disease, Quentin said he stopped counting the fractures when they got to 560, but he never complained. Nothing stopped him. As a nation, we fell in love with him when he was seven. It was then that he told Ray Martin he had given an 'exclusive' on his life to Mike Willesee. It rated well; how could it not? Quentin gave us 43 years of being as cheeky as he was cheerful. He did not hide; he was out there on our streets, always smiling, eager to talk and never feeling sorry for himself.

Quentin's true genius was in the inspiration he gave not only to those who were physically challenged but to all the people of our state. He once said, 'I wanted to show people that if this guy can do it, maybe they can follow their dreams, too.' What an epitaph. He asked us all to do more for the disabled. He wanted to more himself by getting elected to the Adelaide city council. Alas, it was not meant to be, but Quentin will never be forgotten. The South Australian community will make sure of that by establishing an inclusive playground as his legacy.

Quentin, wherever you are now, your star is continuing to shine. You will forever be an inspiration to all of us. Our condolences go out to Quentin's family and his army of friends. Vale, Quentin Kenihan.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (10:59): The sadness of last week's news of the passing of Quentin Kenihan was not that his life had ended but also that a new stage was set to begin. Whilst his life was often viewed through the lens of celebrity, those close to him know that he was getting set for a new phase. Quentin wanted to give back what his community had given to him, and public representative service would be the vehicle to do it.

I am indebted to his close friend Abby Edwards for an insight into the Kenihan strategy to turn fame into effective advocacy for vulnerable South Australians. Abby says that the tragic part of his passing is that, while he had been a media personality for 37 years, this was to be the year that he could start a new life as the man he always wanted to be—a change-maker.

He had been making meticulous plans to underpin his bid for a position on the Adelaide city council. His bid would be to act not only as a councillor but also as a disability advocate and as a community advocate. As he said himself early in the campaign when asked why he was running:

Because I have the advocacy experience to take the needs of the constituents to the council and be heard, so that they can then be turned into actions.

One cause that he advocated for was in partnership with a Sydney-based family, John and Justine Perkins, who had lost their baby daughter, Olivia, at just eight months old, to a rare disease. During Olivia's sickness, the Perkinses had realised that many children, including children with disabilities, miss out on the opportunity to play. Together they launched Touched by Olivia to advocate for play spaces for all, where everyone would belong. Quentin became an ambassador for Touched by Olivia, and that was one of his council campaign issues.

But there were many more, and they were not confined to his concerns but embraced the entire community. He spoke about traffic issues, pedestrian and motorists' safety, homelessness, violence in nightclub areas and much more. As Abby says, Quentin was about to come into his own; it was the right time for him to use all that he had learned in his crowded 43 years to become a change-maker. And he had learned plenty.

He had worked as a social commentator, a disability advocate and a champion for the vulnerable. He was an actor, writer, inspirer and influencer who saw boundaries as a challenge, not a barrier. In his childhood, he defied medical boundaries others placed on him when it became clear that brittle bone disease would make life almost impossible to bear. He had his own television show, a successful book and fulfilled his dream of acting, as the Premier mentioned, by being cast in *Mad*

Max: Fury Road. His autobiography, *Not All Superheroes Wear Capes*, is an insight into the other hurdles that confronted him, including what he admits were his own failures.

We had been following the self-described Q-man's life since Mike Willesee's 1982 documentary introduced Quentin to the entire country. Australia loved his wit and unique take on life. He became an active filmmaker, writer, comedian, radio host, disability advocate, media personality, actor and film critic. He wanted to show that living in a wheelchair does not mean staying still.

His untimely passing came as a shock to his close friends because he had often been in hospital, often been close to the edge, often sicker than he was at this time. He had spent a year preparing to launch his campaign for council and was widely expected to be successful. It is incumbent then that we remember the lessons from a life lived in a most extraordinary way. 'No matter where you are and what your challenges,' he said, 'follow your dreams and reach the highest level of success'.

I would like to congratulate the Premier and the government on its endorsement of Quentin's call for an accessible play space. That is a win for Quentin, and it is also a win for those vulnerable South Australians he championed and inspired. To his friends and carers; to his parents, Myles and Kerry, and his extended family; and to his daily companion, his chihuahua Patchy, our condolences and our thanks for his contribution to our community.

On a personal level, Mr Kenihan spent the last few years of his schooling at the same school I went to, Mercedes College. He had a profound impact on the school and its community, as he did everywhere. May he rest in peace.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:04): Saturday 6 October saw the unexpected passing of Quentin Kenihan, an individual who epitomised the label 'little Aussie battler' by living life with humour and a never-say-die attitude. Quentin was born in 1975 with eight broken bones. Shortly after, doctors diagnosed him with osteogenesis imperfecta or brittle bone disease. Doctors initially predicted he would not survive three months, and over his lifetime he suffered almost 600 broken bones because of the condition.

Quentin was thrust onto the national stage at aged 7 when, in 1983, he was first interviewed on television by legendary journalist Mike Willesee. He became a household name in Australia and formed a strong friendship with Willesee over a series of stories. I can remember as a child growing up watching him on *A Current Affair* and following his brave story to learn to walk, but mostly his positive outlook on life despite the obstacles that his body confronted him with.

Quentin would go on to defy the doctors' prognosis of a short life and become an author, filmmaker, movie star, as well as a disability advocate. He had a television series on Channel 10 and acted in the 2015 film *Mad Max: Fury Road* as Corpus Colossus. To quote Quentin on his role as an actor:

I'm not known as 'that brave little boy' anymore...I'm not just seen as a person in a wheelchair but as an actor, which is what I've always wanted.

Quentin also performed at the Adelaide Fringe Festival where his humour was on display for all to appreciate and he released an autobiography entitled *Not All Superheroes Wear Capes*.

Quentin was also an advocate for inclusive playgrounds and was an ambassador for the inclusive playground at Park Holme. The location is on the Hendrie Street Reserve, alongside the Marion Outdoor Pool, which was previously a barren grassed area with low utilisation. In November 2017, Quentin, as the ambassador, was in attendance for the soil turning ceremony to mark the start of building this first inclusive playground in South Australia for children with disabilities.

Speaking with Quentin at the soil-turning ceremony, he was passionate about the need for this playground, and it was a joyous day in August this year when the playground was officially opened by the Governor. The playground caters for people with a wide range of disabilities, including mobility, vision and hearing impairments, and autism. It includes ramp access for wheelchairs to all areas including a merry-go-round. It was developed in partnership with the Touched by Olivia Foundation and has been custom designed to allow children with special needs to play alongside others.

The playground is also alongside Duncan Avenue. Located on Duncan Avenue a few minutes' walk away is the South Australian School for Vision Impaired and also the Kilparrin School for children with sensory impairment and additional disabilities. Quentin was again present when the inclusive playground was officially opened in August and all those present got to experience firsthand the joy on the faces of the students from the nearby Kilparrin School who were also present on the day. The principal of Kilparrin School, Cathy Roche-Wells, said, 'There's not a lot for children in wheelchairs, so it's a wonderful opportunity for our kids to explore and discover the world around them.'

The playground itself has quickly become a regional playground, with families and children coming from a wide catchment area. Quentin said it was heartwarming to see children of all abilities playing alongside each other. He said, 'When I was growing up there was nothing like this for me and my brothers and sister, so I didn't get the chance to play with them.' He was also excited by the inclusion of a bike track in the playground, saying 'I wanted my own little off-road racetrack, so I put forward the idea and they surprised me this morning. The track has been put in and it's amazing.'

Taking this advocacy to the next level and to give back to the city where he had lived for 20 years, Quentin was running for the Adelaide city council at the upcoming local government elections in November on a platform of improved services for the disabled and community advocacy. One of his platforms for his council campaign was for an inclusive playground in Adelaide similar to the one at Park Holme. So it is wonderful that the state government, in conjunction with the Adelaide city council, have committed to find a new location for a new inclusive playground that can be built in the city for children living with a disability and also to commemorate his legacy.

Quentin has been an inspiration to thousands of people and was well known for his positive personality and his ability to overcome adversity against all odds. He will be missed by many. My thoughts are with his family and his many friends.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham) (11:10): I rise to support this motion and add my remarks to those that have already been made honouring the life and service of Quentin Kenihan.

In October 2016, I was honoured to launch Quentin's book, *Not All Superheroes Wear Capes*. It was a funny book, a sad book and, in places, shocking. Quentin discussed the topic of his being an inspiration to others, a status which had induced in him mixed feelings over the years ever since that first interview with Mike Willesee and his arrival to what we would now call the status of a reality TV star. In typically straightforward language, Quentin addresses all the pain and advantages, as he realised them, of being such a public figure. He states that, despite having started with nothing, he has achieved everything that he sought to achieve in life. He chased his dreams and he shared with others what he learned on that extraordinary journey.

The condition that he suffered from profoundly shaped him as a person not only physically but also in the way it caused him to respond to those challenges. Anyone born with many broken bones, who once as a child was dead for six minutes and had had countless visits to hospitals and rehab centres over the years, could be nothing but affected by this extraordinary condition. I think if there is a word that leaps out when considering the life of Quentin, it is one of courage when facing all those extraordinary disabilities. But in his own words, which he uses many times during the course of his book, he just would suck it up and keep going.

He had moments of triumph and exhilaration, but he also went through dark times. It is impossible to experience that degree of disability and pain without feeling depressed. Sadly, we know that people with disabilities have a very substantial, above average experience of depression than the broader community. What is extraordinary is to have these massive challenges but then to stare them down and keep going.

This toughness, this resilience but all the time this self-awareness and a willingness to share his challenges, understanding that that could provide some basis for others experiencing disabilities of either that sort or a different kind, was something that I think we should honour and respect. He acquired a maturity and perspective that come to all of us with age. He demonstrated a willingness to forgive people he felt had treated him badly but also to apologise to those he had given a hard time.

Quentin was very successful in a professional sense. He has written, produced and directed all kinds of television programs and movies. He had a regular slot reviewing movies on the ABC. He of course starred in the one-man Fringe show, and mention has already been made of his *Mad Max* appearance. He was also a great citizen of Adelaide and South Australia. He lived here virtually all his life. Although he had a lot to do with people and projects in the Eastern States, he chose Adelaide as his home and knew the square mile of Adelaide intimately. He knew the local film and arts sectors intimately and has been identified with it strongly.

During my period as minister for disabilities between March 2004 and July 2008, we often talked about what should and could be done in this important field. His overriding interest, though, was of course not to talk about disability policy in the abstract but to do practical things to improve people's lives. He was the living embodiment of the idea of focusing on what you are able to do rather than on what your disability prevents you from doing.

For any of us who, from time to time, think that life has turned against us and thrown some burdens upon us, one only needs to look to Quentin's example to realise that challenges can be overcome. On behalf of, obviously, this parliament, his many friends across the state and the nation and indeed the world, we honour and respect the life and work of Quentin Kenihan.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:15): I rise to likewise support the motion put forward by the Premier this morning recognising the life and contribution of Quentin Kenihan to our great state. Much has been said in the media and other mediums about the life of Quentin over the past week, with many recognising Quentin's contribution to our community and his wideranging achievements. I also want to tip my hat and recognise Quentin's role in disability advocacy and his desire to serve our community to a greater extent.

Quentin is one of many who have collectively changed the narrative on disability in our state and country, certainly over my lifetime. While I only met Quentin on a handful of occasions, mostly due to our passions obviously being different—creative industries versus sport—I have always admired his resilience and his passion.

As a member of this house, I wish to recognise Quentin's legacy. He will ultimately be remembered for his outlook on life, his positive demeanour and, importantly, his achievements and his ability. He will be remembered and honoured with an accessible playground in his name, but his greatest achievement will be the many hearts and minds he touched and the perceptions he altered. He was a change-maker and may he rest in peace.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:17): I rise to support the Premier's very decent motion regarding Quentin Kenihan. Quentin, as we have noted, was born with osteogenesis imperfecta. I have broken a bone a couple of times; I cannot imagine breaking 600 bones. It is quite incredible to think that someone could go through life with such pain and such challenge and be able to be so inspiring in spite of it.

I met Quentin Kenihan several times through my life: firstly, at the Women's and Children's Hospital when I was training as a registered nurse. I was quite gobsmacked at this little boy's ability to be so funny and so cheeky, to be so independent and ballsy in the face of such adversity. It changed my thinking at that point regarding the use of the word 'ability' rather than 'disability', because, for those people who face those challenges and just get on with life, the word 'disability' does not do them justice at all.

I met him several more times during our lives. I bumped into him on occasions. He would wink and be cheeky, as usual. At one time I had the great privilege of looking after one of his very close family members in intensive care where I was working, and I saw a really vulnerable side of Quentin that I had not seen before. I am really grateful for the times that we chatted and shared moments together during that very challenging period in Quentin's life.

Later, I bumped into him a couple of times. He shared some words of wisdom with me, some of which I will not share but will keep to myself and smile and chuckle at. In August, when I was with the member for Morphett and the minister for disabilities in the other place at the opening of the playground down at Park Holme, he called me over and said, 'I think I'm going to be a councillor.'

I said, 'Really? What sort of counsellor? A grief counsellor or social work? What are you planning to do?' because I was thinking, 'How do you have time between everything else?' He said, 'No, no, a councillor with the City of Adelaide,' and I said, 'Oh, for goodness sake. Well, I think you'll be perfect.' He said, 'Well, I just want to check in with you about that because I know that you have had a public profile for a really challenging thing and then gone into parliament,' and his words were, 'People with their own stupid, bloody-minded, pathetic biases question your motives for doing what you do, and I wonder whether the same will happen to me.'

I said, 'Quentin, you're far too brash to let any of that bother you, far too ballsy.' I said to him at that point, 'Remember your name in the movie, and the irony that the words "corpus colossus" loosely translated mean "huge body". The irony of that, and the way that you can laugh at yourself, is going to stand you in such good stead. You'll be an absolute asset, and I think you'll see playgrounds pop up all over metropolitan Adelaide, Quentin, because you won't just stick with the city square; I am sure you will spread that infectious goal and that infectious drive.'

With that, I said to him, 'I promise you I will make sure that we get more of those playgrounds,' because that was already in a plan. We very much have a shared view in this parliament that it is time to make sure that everywhere is accessible, everywhere is able to be used equally by all members of our community, and we should do that in Quentin's name. So vale, Quentin Kenihan, and thanks for the laughs and all the cheeky conversations.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:21): I rise to speak to pay tribute to an outstanding South Australian, whose passion for empowering people with disabilities to live their best possible life and fully participate in every aspect of community life warmed all our hearts and whose determination to make sure their voices were heard loudly and clearly drove us, and many wise and inclusive initiatives, forward. He was a conversation starter, a change-maker and a visionary whose drive absolutely could never be ignored.

He was relentlessly focused on making sure, through discussion, through humour and through the way that he lived his life, that anybody with disability would always shine and be accepted for the person they were—and shine and fight for that goal Quentin did. I had the pleasure last November, as then minister for disabilities, to turn the sod with him on our inclusive playground in Park Holme that many others have spoken about. From my conversations with him that day, it was clear that he would never ever accept that disability should ever prohibit any child from playing or from following the pursuits they love.

The inclusive playground at Park Holme, the first of its type in South Australia, is called Livvi's Place, and the playground rightly includes many specialised pieces of equipment and facilities. Everybody who attended was delighted to have champion and ambassador, Quentin Kenihan, at the sod-turning ceremony. It was clear from Quentin's words and actions that day that, for him, that playground was absolutely just the beginning and that he wanted all children with disability to be able to play and access the equipment that enabled them to do so. It was very clear that he would not stop speaking up until that goal was reached.

I say thank you to Quentin for that playground and for the voice he brought to ensuring the City of Adelaide inclusive playground would become a reality. Thank you to him for the incredible gifts of positivity, determination to overcome hardship, humour and wisdom he brought to our state. He made our state stronger, better, fairer and kinder. Quentin is a hero to many, a star in so many people's eyes and a star that will continue to shine brightly. I know he will continue to inspire others to speak out for what is important, to find their leadership, to find their way to shine and, as he did, to find their way to make a difference.

Thank you, Quentin, for your voice and for empowering the voices of so many. His work, his life and his energy have been transformative. His courage has lifted so many others up, and his work will continue to inspire others forward to achieve progress and to make sure everyone is included. My condolences go to his loved ones. Vale, Quentin Kenihan, and thank you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (11:25): I thank all members in the house for their contributions. I think they show the depth of feeling that we have and the way that the people of South Australia feel about the life and contribution of Quentin Kenihan. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

Motions

INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR DISASTER REDUCTION

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:25): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that Saturday 13 October is International Day for Disaster Reduction;
- (b) expresses its appreciation to all emergency services workers, professional and volunteer, who work so hard to protect our community throughout our state; and
- (c) calls on the state government to work with our emergency services to ensure that they are adequately resourced to prevent and respond to natural disasters.

It goes without saying that, like almost all of us in here, I have enormous respect for our emergency services—for each and every one of them who puts their life on the line and who puts their own personal time aside in order to help others, often selflessly and often under very extreme circumstances. I have had the good fortune—firstly, as an MP, of course, like most of us—to have very good relationships with my local emergency services. It is great to see their training and their dedication firsthand. No matter what the weather, they come out and they train. I have also had the good fortune to have worked firsthand, as a police officer, with many of our emergency services.

There are often jokes between the services about who is more valuable and who is worth more, but over the top of all that there is a camaraderie that they are all in it together and that, when the chips are down, everyone pulls together. They have one goal, which is to keep people, property and our entire community safer, often while we sleep and often while we are unaware. We are often unaware of the work that our emergency services do every day.

Of course, this camaraderie was on show at an event on Monday. Along with the Minister for Emergency Services and the member for Croydon, our leader, I had the good fortune to attend the retirement celebration for the outgoing chief officer of the MFS, Greg Crossman. That camaraderie was on show amongst the uniformed officers who were there, including all the chiefs of the services: the SAFECOM CEO, Malcolm Jackman; the new MFS chief, Michael Morgan; the SES chief, Chris Beattie; CFS chief, Greg Nettleton; and of course the police commissioner, Grant Stevens, who played a role in that ceremony.

Many officers and rank and file members of those organisations came out to pay their respects to Greg Crossman and to celebrate the camaraderie that sits behind all these emergency services. Greg made a very moving address—and, I think the minister will agree, quite lengthy, it has to be said—to the gathering, during which he and the police commissioner shared that good-natured banter I spoke about.

I think the police commissioner's words were, 'God invented police so that fireys could have something to aspire to,' but it was all very good natured. I think it shows that, from the top down, those organisations work well together, and I have enormous respect for them. Unlike the police, corrections and road safety, though, emergency services largely escaped the budget cuts that we saw in recent times. I think we should be thankful for that. I think that \$38 million over four years for the police is a stretch and that the privatisation of the ARC was completely unnecessary, but, as I said, emergency services has largely been quarantined from that.

This motion is about disaster reduction, and I have some concerns about some of the measures that this government has taken, or has allowed to happen by simply not being there. The first is around SAFECOM, of course. We learned in the weeks after the budget that the CEO, Malcolm Jackman, had requested and had been granted leave to reduce his working hours from five days to three. This, of course, from Malcolm Jackman's perspective is perfectly reasonable. Everyone has a right to try to negotiate their own working arrangements; that is fine.

What it also did was precipitate a general review into SAFECOM's operations. I quizzed the minister about this in estimates. It is still a bit unclear where that review will end up, but there are two overarching concerns. One is that the timing of these announcements—Mr Jackman's working arrangements and the review—so close to bushfire season could cause some confusion and perhaps

even some lack of morale within the organisation and in the organisations that SAFECOM is there to serve and work with. This is a concern.

The other concern is a broader concern and one that I asked the minister about. He told me that it is not the case—but it remains to be seen—that it is a deliberate attempt to run down SAFECOM, to come to the conclusion that perhaps it is superfluous and to get rid of it altogether. I hope that is not the case. I certainly hope that it is not the case that this process has been put in place so close to bushfire season. There is a time and a place to make these reviews. On the cusp of bushfire season is not the time to go messing around with an organisation that is charged with setting the strategic direction for our emergency services.

I understand from conversations with my friend the member for Kaurana, who is a former emergency services minister, that Mr Jackman had a similar conversation with him a year ago and that for the very reasons I have outlined the member for Kaurana did not accede to that request. This is neither here nor there; these are just concerns I have. We will wait to see how that plays out.

Another concern in emergency services, in terms of the potential for our emergency services to respond to disasters, is two separate matters that can be put together under the same heading, which is that perhaps the minister has not been as focused on operations as he should have been in the first six months of this government. The first is the Alert SA app. We talked about this at length in the estimates process. I am still not satisfied that things were carried out as expeditiously as they could have been. I will not go over the details now, but again the member for Kaurana as minister last year—

The Hon. C.L. Wingard: Scrapped it.

Mr ODENWALDER: He did scrap it. He scrapped it under advice, and he wore the opprobrium for it. He set in place a process to replace that system very quickly, and he set it in place so that over the caretaker period that process could unfold and whoever formed the next government could start off on the front foot and get something in place very quickly. I still do not understand from the questioning in the estimates process why that process has taken so long. There are more questions on notice about this, and we will see how that unfolds.

It is a similar case with the control centre for the SES and CFS. It became very apparent during the recent unprecedented disasters around Sampson Flat and Pinery that the SES/CFS control centre was not adequate. Government became aware of the urgency of this last year and again set in train a process by which whoever was elected after 17 March this year could very quickly get rolling on a new facility. We knew that a new facility was critical so that our emergency services could adequately respond to major disasters like Pinery and Sampson Flat. Again, the government has had six or seven months to consider the proposals but, as far as I am aware, has done nothing. I look forward to some announcements in this space.

Those minor quibbles aside, we largely have a bipartisan approach in this parliament to the importance of emergency services, and a wholly bipartisan approach in regard to the esteem in which we hold our emergency services. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (11:35): I rise to speak in support of this motion that this house recognises the International Day for Disaster Reduction on 13 October 2018. The International Day for Disaster Reduction started in 1989, with the approval of the United Nations General Assembly. The UN General Assembly sees the day as a way to promote a global culture of disaster reduction, including disaster prevention, mitigation and preparedness.

The International Day for Disaster Reduction provides an opportunity to acknowledge how people and communities are reducing the risk of disasters and raising awareness about the importance of disaster risk reduction. Knowledge and awareness of natural disasters and prevention measures are important in ensuring lives, properties and livelihoods can be protected. Each year the day is themed. This year, the theme is to reduce direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product.

South Australia is recognised for delivering great emergency responses. We express great appreciation to both professional and volunteer emergency services workers throughout our state.

Those involved in the emergency services sector show outstanding commitment in supporting and assisting the community. This includes the work of South Australia Police, the SA Ambulance Service and the SA Metropolitan Fire Service, as well as the volunteers at the SA Country Fire Service and the SA State Emergency Service.

Disasters can come in many forms. South Australia is the second driest state in the driest continent on earth and subject to more fires than we deserve. If it is not fire season, we could have floods and storms to contend with. I note that there were storms earlier this week and that the SES responded to over 300 callouts from across the state. It is reassuring to know that there are hundreds of SES volunteers who are always ready to go above and beyond to help in their own communities and further afield. The government is committed to identifying and investing in opportunities to support front-line services in this sector to assist in disaster prevention, mitigation and preparedness.

Working in partnership with the emergency services sector and the community to achieve sustainable disaster risk reduction includes ongoing support for the recruitment, retention, training, equipping and maintenance of paid and unpaid personnel in all aspects of the emergency services to strengthen our capability to respond to and recover from natural disasters. The government is committed to strengthening our state's emergency services by incorporating new technologies to assist emergency services personnel and the general public with disaster relief efforts.

In fact, just this morning I was at Brukunga, at the CFS training base, looking at the roadshow going around showing new training mechanisms that can help our CFS brigades prepare for the season ahead. It was fascinating to see a lot of virtual reality displays. One of the pieces of technology on display was an app which was put together by our very own Country Fire Service and which is now being showcased right around the country. A training trailer was also put together by the CFS here, and other states are showing great interest in adopting this trailer technology and taking it around their states as well. I commend all involved with that project.

The government is adding another nine firefighting aircraft to the CFS fleet, taking the total number from 17 to 26. These aircraft are increasingly important to bushfire response and disaster relief and provide great support to ground crews. This truly is a great initiative. Aircraft that respond immediately to a bushfire emergency are able not only to begin to suppress the fire from the air but also provide timely information to the community about the scale and movement of the fire.

The government is implementing a new CFS air base at Hoyleton, in the Clare Valley. This will house two fire bombers, a tactical coordination helicopter and an intelligence helicopter and allow the creation of a new primary response zone in the Mid North. Where before planes and helicopters would need to be redirected from the Adelaide Hills to help out in the Mid North, this new air base will mean quicker response times and safer communities within our region. There are now four primary response zones: one on the West Coast, one in the Mid North, one in the Adelaide Hills and one in the South-East. This government has increased those primary response zones with extra aircraft, which I know is greatly appreciated by the local community and the CFS.

The government is working on developing the new Alert SA mobile app and website, which the shadow minister mentioned. What he did not mention was the disaster created by the previous government when they just went in and scrapped it. They did not pull it apart or try to fix it or tweak it: it was in a state where they felt it had to be totally scrapped, totally deconstructed and thrown away and now it has to be rebuilt from the start. Yes, the procurement process did begin before the election, but what I do note, and the shadow minister failed to mention, is that they set about procuring it but did not allocate any money in the budget to actually deliver this project. That is not a surprise because that is what this previous government did: it talked about a lot of stuff but did not deliver the funds to deliver this project.

However, on this side of the house, we went through the processes, we have delivered the funds and we are delivering the app. To make sure we do not have the catastrophe that happened with the previous Labor government, we are doing everything in our power to make sure that we take the time and give the resources to the company that is building the app. We want to do everything we can to make sure this is as sturdy and stable as possible, given what happened under the previous government.

We know, though, that during the bushfire season communication is very important, and the emergency services have been building their capability in this area. I want to take this opportunity to implore everyone who lives in a bushfire danger zone and pretty much all South Australians travelling around during a bushfire season to be intensely aware of their conditions and their surrounds. Bushfire information can be gathered from the radio, social media and also the internet.

We implore people to have a number of ways of receiving this information. Do not rely on just one source: make sure you have a few. Be aware of your surroundings and make sure you have a bushfire survival action plan in place and you are ready to execute that plan. We know that the foothills, especially the Mount Lofty Ranges, are a very vulnerable place in our state, and we want to make sure that people are as safe as possible. We implore people to take responsibility for their own plan and make sure that their family and the people around them are aware of the plan and that on high bushfire danger days, and when and where appropriate, they take the appropriate action.

I cannot stress that message enough, Mr Speaker. You may well get sick of hearing me talk about it over the coming weeks and months. I hope everyone in this house drives that message very hard. If you have any questions or you want to get any information, go to the CFS website and it is all there for you. There are numbers for people to contact as well if any more information is needed.

This government works closely with local communities, local rural and regional CFS and SES branches, to assist with their specific needs. In the last budget, we also committed \$5 million—\$2.5 million over two years—to upgrading local CFS stations. In the lead-up to the election, we found that a number of stations right around the state had been left to go into disrepair. Simple things like the electrical system within some of these CFS stations had been left to run down and do not have a safety switch or things such as backup power generators. We want to make sure they have the facilities they need, so we have put a program in place to try to deliver on as many as of those requests as we can because we know they have been ignored under the previous government for far too long.

Working together and harnessing local knowledge can play a significant role in both limiting the impact of natural disasters and aiding recovery efforts. Working with volunteers is something we are very keen to do. We are grateful for the efforts undertaken by both professional and volunteer emergency service workers throughout our state. Recognising International Day for Disaster Reduction provides an opportunity to recognise the emergency services sector and acknowledge that we must continue to reduce the risks associated with natural disasters and raise awareness about the importance of disaster risk reduction.

With that, I want to take this opportunity to truly acknowledge the volunteers, who do such an outstanding job within our community. I would like to take a moment to address a point made by the shadow minister, who was at the farewell for MFS chief, Greg Crossman, the other day. He specifically said he spoke to the SES, the CFS, SAPOL and SAFECOM chiefs, and that was really great to see.

He talked about the review of SAFECOM, being at this time of year as we head into the fire season. If he had spoken to the SAFECOM CE he would know that SAFECOM has no operational role in summer—or in winter, for that matter. They do not have an operational role. Operations are done by the CFS, the SES and the MFS; they run the operations and SAFECOM is the overarching body.

The CE did ask to go to three days a week, and it is interesting that the shadow minister mentioned that the CE asked that of the previous Labor minister, the member for Kaurna, who dismissed that request. However, that did not trigger him to think, 'If the CE can go to three days a week, maybe I should look into this and look at why a CE can go to three days a week.' We are doing that, and will report back on it a later date.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:45): I rise to speak on the motion acknowledging International Day for Disaster Reduction and note that this year's theme is 'reducing disaster economic losses in relation to global gross domestic product'—rather a

mouthful, and I suspect somebody from the United Nations General Assembly has come up with that clumsy but nevertheless thematic description.

Essentially, I suppose this directs our minds to the fact that disasters obviously affect not only people's lives and property but also their productivity, and they are asking us to consider that and recognise how that occurs and its impact on the world. It is designed to ensure we promote a culture of disaster reduction, including prevention, mitigation and preparedness.

I have listened many times in this house to members talk about the reduction of fuel loads as we approach a fire season, and it has been touched on again today. It is a real and present danger we have in this state, and I heard just recently a proposed advance in some districts in South Australia in terms of closure of the fire operating season, essentially bringing forward the fire ban and enabling us to reduce fuel load.

Sometimes this is important, but it is equally important when we get early rains in autumn, and I again say to those who are in a position to make a decision on this matter that we need to look at bringing forward the opportunity to burn because, in my view, one of the big issues is that every year we have a lucky dip and we play Russian roulette in dealing with the protection of our environment when we fail to reduce the fuel load.

The minister has implored others to step up and take personal responsibility in respect of preparing their own properties and families in the event of a natural disaster, particularly a bushfire, and I thoroughly endorse that. I also say that it is important we have a culture, throughout our government and our instrumentalities in South Australia, of making sure that spring and autumn are used to maximum effect to undertake cold burns.

Fire, flood and storm damage are well known to us as being natural disasters, and power failures, interruption to the distribution of potable water, homelessness, injury and loss of life are all very direct and dire consequences. However, we should look at some of the newer and emerging not necessarily natural disasters but issues that have a human element, such as the vulnerability we have in relation to cybersecurity. Our state could, quite literally, shut down in its operations, with a massive impact on our productivity should we have a cyber breach, the theft of data, the extortions that sometimes follow, and threats in relation to shutting down access to data in business and in government.

This is a 21st century natural disaster, I believe, and it is one that we should understand is ever present. We only have to look at recent challenges in relation to access to data at the Land Services office, which was recently privatised by the previous government, and the concerns raised in relation to access. In terms of the stealing of data and identity theft, the value of this material should never be underestimated. The threat to our economic operations as a government and as a state is a real and present danger.

With regard to pest infestation, for a state that prides itself in being fruit fly free in its operation, and having protection against serious diseases in relation to our stock, given it is clearly our most significant income producer for the state, again, there are massive problems if that occurs. We have had a taste of that sort of thing. We had the flu that came in and affected all the horses, asses, donkeys and so on in Australia. As I recall, that was some mishap or failure on behalf of AQIS many years ago, coming through one of its international ports. These incidents have very serious consequences when they occur. In that case, we had to have a major quarantine shutdown and no movement of those animals off or on properties, etc.

Human disease outbreaks should be obvious. We only have to look around the world to see the legacy of recent disasters where there has been a contamination of water and there have been disease outbreaks and serious consequences for our health services and our emergency responses. May I also place on the record the significance of the legal costs in respect of a major disaster. I say this as a proud, newly minted member of the council that sits in relation to emergency management in South Australia. The costs that occur in relation to these types of events should never be overlooked.

In respect of this year's national theme, let's not forget the cost of insurance—not just claims but the disputes and litigation in respect of them—and litigation in respect of the liability and damages arising out of a person or persons who might be responsible for the failings in relation to that.

Sometimes we have had royal commissions. I think of Queensland's major inquiry into the then Labor government's failure to release enough water out of its water reserves. When a storm event and large rain events came, there was massive flood damage in that state.

In recent times, we have also had a number of coronial inquiries that occur as a result of deaths in relation to major events. Every death is significant in these circumstances, but I think probably the most significant of those were the 11 or so deaths arising out of the fire north of Port Lincoln some years ago—

Mr Treloar: It was 2005.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —in 2005, 13 years ago. I think every member of the house should read those coronial reports. It is a sobering reminder of what on occasions we have failed to do, and what we must ensure we do if we are genuine about being prepared and actually protecting people's lives. No less important is the work of the forensics experts. Forensic Science SA provides considerable support, both in litigation and in coronial inquiries arising out of these types of disasters. The testing alone is expensive, as is reporting availability for evidence in court litigation, etc.

There are unforeseen but extraordinary costs that come from these events and nothing less should be considered than the rebuilding of people's lives. When the fire has gone, the fire trucks have gone home, when the fences have been rebuilt and when the fights with the insurance companies have occurred, people have to then work out how they are possibly going to rebuild their enterprise to actually be productive again. This is the hidden cost in relation to that.

I, too, wish to acknowledge the work of the first responders, many of them volunteers across South Australia in relation to our disasters. Of course, we thank them for the work they do and the trauma they themselves have to go through, sometimes sacrificing their own limb or life to do so. However, it is important to understand that when a community has to rebuild after these traumatic experiences, it is an extremely costly event, both economically and emotionally, and it should not be underestimated.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (11:54): I also rise to support the motion about the reduction of the impact of disasters. It is very difficult to plan how to respond to disasters because there are so many things that can affect our communities. Certainly, the obvious one in our region, through the Adelaide Hills and Fleurieu, is bushfire. Over the years, we have seen many significant fires through the region. The one that really comes to mind is the 1983 Ash Wednesday fires. I was at boarding school at the time here in Adelaide. I remember looking out over the Hills mid-afternoon and barely being able to see them because of the smoke and dust. An extremely eerie orange glow came through that smoke and dust.

Back then, it was quite frightening because we were unaware of what was occurring. Communications were nowhere near where they are today. We knew that there were fires burning right through the immediate parts of the Adelaide Hills in the Stirling and Aldgate region, but we also knew that there were fires burning down at Kuitpo and Meadows that were possibly heading to my family's property. We were unable to know exactly where they were going and what was happening. Likewise, there were fires down in the South-East.

The improvements in communication have been an important part of minimising the impact of these disasters, allowing people to know what is happening as quickly as possible so that they can prepare when these sorts of disasters occur. I think that one of the greatest improvements in this space has been Alert SA and the previous CFS app, which allowed people to understand where fires had started and where they were travelling.

It is imperative that we get that back up and operating to give people a communication tool that communicates to them rather than them having to seek information by going somewhere to look for it. The problem is that those few minutes from when the fire starts to when you react are so important. As the Deputy Premier said, it is also very much about preparation. As a landholder and farmer, one of the key things that I am very conscious of, from about this point in the year onwards, is how to minimise fuel around the property. It goes back even earlier; it certainly goes back to early winter.

I very much need to go out around the home and the dairy on the farm to make sure that we spray all the grass to minimise growth under trees, etc., in the areas around the buildings. That is the preparation to reduce the load right back at that point in time. It continues right through to the day the fire season is announced, when we make sure that we continue to reduce any trees, etc., that have fallen down and may be an issue. We try to get rid of the fuel load from the area, whether it is burned or just moved somewhere else. Those are the sorts of things we have to manage.

The volunteer sector is certainly an extremely important part of our network to minimise the impact of disasters. My grandfather had a very long history in the EFS and CFS. Following a fire back in the fifties, he was one of a few people who decided that they needed to set up a brigade to work together to try to protect themselves and their assets from a fire. That was the start of the Port Elliot emergency fire service, as it was at the time. It later became the CFS down there. These have emerged right across the region. There are eight CFS stations based in Finnis. Within Region 1, which is the Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and Kangaroo Island, I think there is a total of 80-odd stations. Finnis has about 10 per cent of those. The volunteers are the key people who keep them functioning.

There are many other disasters that could occur. In 2010-11, a dairy farmer friend of mine was involved in the floods in Queensland. His property went under and the damage to that business still affects him today. He is no longer a dairy farmer. He changed to cropping because of the risk from a future flood. Livestock are much harder to manage in a flood than crops, particularly when you need to milk them twice a day. He has changed the way he operates on his property to minimise the risk to him. That is what we do: we learn from a disaster to make sure that next time it does not affect us as badly. We see that continue to this day. We learnt a lot from the two Ash Wednesday fires, we learnt a lot from the fires through Victoria more recently and we continue to learn. We need to keep changing what we do to make sure that we protect people from these sorts of disasters.

The Deputy Premier mentioned the disaster of biosecurity. I have had many hours of training and interest around the biosecurity risks that we face and the impact that would have on our economy. Many years ago now, the Australian government and the state governments, along with all the livestock industries, decided there was such a large risk that they set up a disaster plan, effectively, to manage any major disease outbreak that affected livestock across the country, and the Emergency Animal Disease Response Agreement (EADRA) was established. That plan is always monitored, tweaked and changed to make sure that it meets the needs of industry and government to protect livestock.

As livestock producers, our greatest fear is a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak in Australia. That would be a complete and utter disaster. It is very much about making sure that we not only minimise the risk of that coming into our country—making sure that we continue to do research on how that disease behaves and reacts, the changes it makes as it evolves and the different strains that are out there—but also make sure that, if it does get here, we have a way to try to get our industries back into an operating state. If the disease did get here, there is now the ability to vaccinate all the animals within an area around an outbreak to stop it spreading. We need to make sure that we continue to monitor what is out there and what ability there is to protect our industries.

As the Deputy Premier also mentioned, we have a stock standstill policy, which we are able to implement. There is agreement between industries and governments around the country on how to manage these stock standstills. They can be implemented at very short notice. There is also the understanding that you cannot just say, 'No-one can move.' There has been a whole heap of planning put in place to allow a permit system to operate with quick and easy access to get those permits.

For example, if you are a dairy farmer and your dairy has a road going through the middle of it and the milking cows are on the other side of the road from the dairy, those cattle need to be moved at very short notice to get them back to the dairy to be milked. A permit can be sought and granted extremely efficiently to make that happen. I thank the member for bringing this motion to the house and I wholeheartedly support its intent.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:04): I rise to support the motion:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that Saturday 13 October is International Day for Disaster Reduction;

- (b) expresses its appreciation to all emergency services workers, professional and volunteer, who work so hard to protect our community throughout our state; and
- (c) calls on the state government to work with our emergency services to ensure that they are adequately resourced to prevent and respond to natural disasters.

All South Australians should take a moment to pause and reflect on the hard work and commitment provided by our emergency services workers. These workers across the Country Fire Service, Metropolitan Fire Service, SAPOL, SA Ambulance Service and State Emergency Service selflessly give their time to protect and help others. When we need them, they are always there, just a phone call away.

I think one of the most important days when we learned the value of our emergency services was on 16 February 1983, which was Ash Wednesday. On this day, more than 2,500 homes were destroyed, hundreds of thousands of animals were lost and 28 South Australians lost their lives, including volunteer firefighters Andrew Lemke from Lucindale, Peter Matthies from Summertown and Brian Nosworthy from Callendale. This tragedy brings home the reality of working in our emergency services and the dangers they face.

On a personal note, the dad of one of my very good friends in primary school was severely burnt in the Ash Wednesday fires and only survived by having dead animal carcasses on top of him as the fire front passed through. I grew up around Lambert Verhoven, who had compression bandages and the effects of very severe burns for a fair part of his life and my adolescence.

While we are at dinner or enjoying family celebrations, our emergency services personnel can be out attending car accidents, house fires, trees across roads and a whole range of other situations. When bushfires threaten lives and properties, we look to our emergency services for safety. Often, they conduct training at their own expense and on their own time to keep up to date with the skills necessary to do the job. For volunteers, there is no financial reward, just the knowledge that they are contributing and making a difference to their community.

Many of the emergency services workers and volunteers in my electorate of Mount Gambier have been in the job for decades, a testament to the dedication of regional communities. Simon Poel is the Mount Gambier and Districts State Emergency Services unit manager and has been a volunteer with the service for 34 years. He joined the service at the age of 17, the week after his dad, Tom. Simon says that it is the satisfaction of helping the community as to why he enjoys the job. He jokes that some weekends he does not even see his wife as he is always out somewhere with his team of 25 volunteers.

Earlier this year, Simon was out with the SES team when a young man crashed his ute through the fence surrounding the Blue Lake and narrowly escaped with his life. At that incident, which happened at 11 o'clock on a Friday night, Simon set up a forward command post, sent abseilers down the cliff face and liaised with other emergency services at the scene. It is not all serious jobs though. Simon donates his time to local fundraising events and even directs traffic and floats at the Mount Gambier Christmas Pageant. Every few months, he heads to training courses that last all weekend. He jokes that if he had been paid for all the time he has devoted to the SES, they would never be able to afford it.

I tell Simon's story to illustrate how much regional communities rely on the good people who choose to give their time to our emergency services. Next year, he and his father, Tom, will be awarded long service medals. Simon and Tom epitomise the community spirit that makes South Australia such a great place to live and work. I take this opportunity to commend every South Australian who has taken the time to contribute to our emergency services.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:09): I rise to support this motion brought to the house by the member for Elizabeth and congratulate him on that, recognising that he was, for a time at least, a member of SAPOL and, as part of that, I am sure he was involved in emergency response from time to time. The motion reads:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that Saturday 13 October is International Day for Disaster Reduction;

- (b) expresses its appreciation to all emergency services workers, professional and volunteer, who work so hard to protect our community throughout our state; and
- (c) calls on the state government to work with our emergency services to ensure that they are adequately resourced to prevent and respond to natural disasters.

I must admit that, before seeing this motion, I was not aware that we had an International Day for Disaster Reduction, but it is an important day and has been celebrated and recognised each year since 1989. It has been entrenched by the United Nations. The UN General Assembly called for the International Day for Disaster Reduction way back in 1989 as a way to promote a global culture of risk awareness and disaster reduction. That includes disaster prevention, mitigation and preparedness, and the contributions we have heard today and will continue to hear will touch on all of those things.

The day celebrates how people and communities around the world are reducing their exposure to disasters, whatever they may be. They can come in any guise. For example, this year it is about reducing disaster economic losses in relation to global GDP. I was just thinking about what I might say prior to this. Of course, the global financial crisis of 2008 would be described by some as a disaster: it was a financial disaster for many of the big financial institutions, primarily in the United States of America but it had repercussions around the world. That could be deemed as a disaster.

It has covered many things and has been themed each year. Some of the themes are: Knowledge for Life; Resilience is for Life; Living with Disability and Disasters; Women and Girls: the [in]Visible Force of Resilience; and Making Children and Young People Partners for Disaster Risk Reduction. Each and every year a theme is identified. The one that particularly caught my eye was the theme in 2008: Disaster risk reduction is everybody's business. I guess that is the crux of the message today.

I acknowledge the emergency services that are active in this state. The member for Elizabeth highlighted them: the MFS, the CFS, the SES, the South Australian Ambulance Service and, of course, SAPOL. Many of our service providers are professional people and many, of course, are volunteers. Particularly for those of us who represent country electorates, and certainly in Flinders, this is the case as the vast majority of our emergency services are manned by volunteers.

On the back of the state budget, I would like to quickly talk about a number of things that we as a government are doing to assist in the management and response to disasters in this state. Obviously, bushfire is the most likely and usual disaster that we face in this state. Way back in 1983, we saw Ash Wednesday, as the member for Mount Gambier mentioned. I am old enough to remember that day. Even though it did not impact my district, it did impact much of the state, including the South-East and the Adelaide Hills. We will have fires again, make no mistake, and we will have bad fires again. Unfortunately, that is part of the landscape and the scenario of where we live.

A big part of our emergency services is paid for by the emergency services levy. Of course, as part of our state budget and election commitment, we have reduced that levy to taxpayers and our constituents by \$360 million over the next four years. I would particularly like to highlight this positive move by the government. When the previous government took away support in relation to the ESL levy, it really got the backs up of a lot of our volunteers. I certainly had CFS brigades in my electorate who took a stand against that and made the decision not to attend any emergency fire situations on government land. I am not exactly clear on whether they ever took that stand, but the point was that they put it out there in protest against the decision made by the previous government.

In the latest budget, we have allocated \$9.2 million for additional aircraft to aid firefighting efforts in South Australia. I need to declare an interest: my future son-in-law is a firebomber who works for Aerotech and plays a role in manning the Port Lincoln station during the fire season. We are establishing a new base at Hoyleton in the Mid North. There is an existing base in the Mount Lofty Ranges and one in the South-East. Those areas deemed high-danger and high-risk zones due to their rainfall, topography, landscape and vegetation have much better coverage now.

We have increased the number of aircraft from 17 to 23, including a chopper at Port Lincoln, which is most exciting. I have not actually seen it yet, but it will certainly aid reconnaissance and observation. I do not know whether it is a water-carrying aircraft but it will be able to observe and direct the fixed-wing aircraft to where they need to be. We have also allocated \$5 million for CFS

facility upgrades. That is really good news because any of these tiny little towns, which are sometimes not much more than crossroads, have a focus on their CFS sheds. These sheds are a big part of any particular district's capacity to react to an emergency. CFS volunteers are not just called out when there is a fire; often, they assist the SES, ambulances and South Australia Police as well.

I reiterate and support the comments made by the Minister for Emergency Services urging South Australians to be prepared for the upcoming fire season. As I said, we are always at risk. Lower Eyre Peninsula experienced a significant bushfire in 2005, now known as the Wangary bushfire, which burnt 80,000 hectares in 12 hours. It was almost identically replicated during the Pinery bushfire, which was in a very similar area and burnt in a similar amount of time. The devastation of these bushfires was extraordinary. There was certainly loss of life at Wangary. Sadly, a couple of my friends—fellows who I had played footy with—lost their lives.

It was a very sad day and it took the community a long time to recover. It is about building that resilience but also about being prepared for any particular situation. At this time of year, we always encourage people to clean up around their houses and yards, have plans and firebreaks in place, and ensure household and farm firefighting units are available and in working order. There is nothing worse than pulling the start rope and have nothing happen, which can occur.

The Deputy Premier touched on a couple of possible disasters in the future. We are all aware that these could potentially happen. She spoke briefly about cybersecurity. Breaches in cybersecurity are a growing part of our modern way of life. I do not know whether it is possible, but I sometimes wonder what would happen if the internet failed and ceased to exist in our modern world. It would bring modern life to a standstill. There was an episode about that on *South Park*. What they did in the end was switch it off and switch it on again, and thankfully the world regained the internet and we could continue with our emails and banking.

Biosecurity has been touched upon. I am a sheep farmer. There is a potential risk to the entire nation's livestock industry should foot-and-mouth disease or something similar be introduced into Australia because it would be very, very difficult to control. It is not just about response; it is about preparedness and prevention as well. I think coastal degradation is a risk. The big storm in 2016 that blacked out the state also did a lot of damage to our coastline. We need to prepare and have the capacity to protect our coastal environment.

Time expired.

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (12:19): I rise today to wholeheartedly support the motion from the member for Elizabeth to recognise International Day for Natural Disaster Reduction, which was, of course, last Saturday, 13 October. I do so because I take every opportunity I can in this place to highlight the huge value of the role volunteers play specifically in regional communities across our state: the role they play in protecting lives and property and in general just improving the lives of people who live in the communities they serve.

The CFS volunteers and the ambos are front of mind for me. These people leave their homes in the middle of the night and their workplaces during the middle of the day, they miss precious family time and events and they sacrifice much and place their own needs second to those they serve. They do this because they care about the communities they live in and understand that regional communities, by sheer tyranny of distance, could not be protected, fires could not be put out quickly and people in car accidents could not be assisted in a timely manner without the commitment of local people who are willing to undertake the necessary training and give the necessary time away from home and workplace, such as farmers who down tools and leave their tight schedules, their tractors and their headers to help others living in their local community who are in distress.

Our country towns could not exist without such people, and I take this opportunity to again highlight their efforts. Since being elected as the member for Narungga seven months ago, I have met so many people who serve their local districts in so many vital ways. It has certainly opened my eyes to the value of the volunteer resource, be they firefighters; incident controllers; farmers setting up text messaging systems to communicate on bad weather days when reaping is not recommended, thus avoiding a potential disaster themselves; or park rangers at Innes advocating for efficient mobile

phone and internet communication services to secure isolated Innes residents and the 100,000 tourists who flock there every single year.

It could be the fishermen and coastal patrol volunteers who so regularly don tools to assist in sea rescues or the people who volunteer at food banks and charities to improve the lives of their fellow citizens. Just last week I met with volunteers at The Station who help locals struggling with mental health issues by offering a friendly ear. That service in itself is vital in avoiding a potential disaster. I have also met many progress association members who fight for improved infrastructure in their towns, which they work to progress every day.

I have met council staff working alongside communities to divert traffic, to sandbag and to place tarpaulins over roofs in the rain and wind during storm events. There are SA Power Networks staff out in all weather to restore power to homes and business in any sort of conditions. I have a mate, a great friend, who is a liney with SA Power Networks, and I often consider him when I am sitting at home without power while there is wind and rain and storm outside. I imagine him out there, somewhere, on a ladder, trying to fix the power.

All these people I have listed reduce the risks associated with all sorts of disasters, natural and otherwise, and this motion pays tribute to the wonderful work they do. Effective community resilience requires good working relationships within communities and between communities and those who support them on a professional or voluntary basis. This working relationship is also required between agencies and organisations engaged in this work. The importance of working together and harnessing local knowledge was no better showcased than during the largest disaster that the people of Narungga electorate have faced in recent years: the Pinery bushfire of November 2015.

This bushfire claimed the lives of two people; hospitalised a further 16, five with critical injuries; and burned more than 82,500 hectares. Very similarly, on Eyre Peninsula there was a fire which the member for Flinders referred to before and which was just as devastating. In the reports since, it has been revealed that insurance losses from the fire exceeded \$75 million, with 91 homes, more than 400 farm structures, 483 vehicles and 70,000 livestock destroyed.

I regularly drive around the area touched by the Pinery bushfire, and the scars are still lingering today, with burnt trees on the side of the road and houses still being built and replaced. It is a real omen for the people living in that area. The Pinery fire was a particularly fast-moving and ferocious grassfire, which meant that firefighters could not control the blaze before conditions changed, and several crews were caught in life-threatening burnovers. The blaze ignited while other fires burned near Clare and Pinnaroo in the Murray Mallee, further challenging scarce resources.

In supporting the motion today recognising International Day for Disaster Reduction, I also want to acknowledge all agencies, personnel and volunteers involved with the Pinery fire who worked diligently over a 12-month period after the fire to complete independent reviews and incident reports commissioned by the state government. These are vital tools from which we can learn lessons for future fire and disaster management, thus mitigating the impact of the disaster.

The state government commissioned these reports into the operational response of the South Australian Country Fire Service and the Government Radio Network to identify areas for improvement and better position the state to respond to emergencies of this scale in the future. There were nine themes from which the CFS drew learnings. They were incident management, public information, intelligence gathering and sharing, facilities, relocations and relief of persons, aviation, personnel safety, interagency operations and fatigue management.

Outcomes delivered from lessons learned include the government committing to fit more CFS trucks with burnover technology, thermal curtains, water spray curtains, in-cabin breathing equipment, increasing the fleet of CFS trucks—and it was pleasing to see \$5 million allocated towards CFS upgrades in the state budget. Similarly, it was recommended that we committed to better train radio operators, make improvements to public warning systems and the Government Radio Network to reduce congestion and network overload.

A separate report found that the large number of calls, combined with lengthy conversations on the network impacted available capacity for agencies and that portable radio terminals were used in areas not designed to deliver reliable two-way portable communications. These are important

lessons, and in particular lessons learned uniquely specific to country areas such as the issue of district area names not being familiar or able to be recognised by people outside of the area or from the metropolitan area.

Personnel from agencies have come in to assist, meaning more work has since been done on mapping and geographical descriptions, rural addressing and the like to enhance communications. The findings of the Project Pinery Review, released in April 2016, give a pertinent summary of the huge number of personnel and agencies required to deal with an extreme event such as the Pinery fire, and I share facts from the report to highlight the enormity of the tasks faced in protecting life and property in this state.

I also reiterate that a key finding of all reports is that no actions taken by the SA CFS could have altered the course of the Pinery fire, such as its size and complexity in 38° heat, 90 km/h winds and with high fuel loads of standing crops ready to be reapt. That is, no changed behaviour by responders could have altered the impact of this severe event. Conditions were such that they carried no expectation of containing the fire until the weather changed, and that is the crux of natural disasters. They place us all predominantly at the mercy of nature, not a great position to be in.

I would like to reiterate that I have had the wonderful opportunity to interact with a number of volunteers from across the electorate of Narungga since being elected and it has heightened my appreciation for the contribution they make towards our communities. Without them, we would be in serious trouble and the mitigation of said natural disasters would be even more tedious, so it is wonderful to acknowledge today a goal to reduce natural disasters.

As has been previously mentioned by other members, while a noble goal, there will also be natural disasters that impose themselves upon us, and the report from the Pinery fire is a timely reminder that the processes need to be in place to mitigate the impact natural disasters have on the people of South Australia when they unfortunately present themselves to us. With that, I commend the motion to the house. I commend the goal of reducing natural disasters to the house and I thank all who were involved in the Pinery fire fight to save house and life.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:29): I rise to support the motion:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that Saturday 13 October is International Day for Disaster Reduction;
- (b) expresses its appreciation to all emergency services workers, professional and volunteer, who work so hard to protect our community throughout our state; and
- (c) calls on the state government to work with our emergency services to ensure that they are adequately resourced to prevent and respond to natural disasters.

I am a Country Fire Service member myself, as are many members. I would also like to acknowledge, as the member for Flinders did, the millions of extra dollars that we are pouring into fire safety in this state to provide better facilities for some fire stations, including the one at Tailem Bend. I know there are some down at the South-East in the member for MacKillop's electorate. These are much needed.

As well as that, as I saw in media reports the other night, the upgraded fleet of more planes and more services for our aeronautical battle against bushfire have really changed the fight against bushfire in this state. I would like to acknowledge the contribution that Bob McCabe, who started down in Tintinara and now has a base in the Hills as well, his family, his staff and crew make towards keeping this state safe. Over time we have had the Elvis helicopters come in. Things have really improved since the terrible events in 1983 on Ash Wednesday.

Certainly I know family members of people who perished in that fire, especially down in the South-East. It was a terrible fire, ripping through the Adelaide Hills and also down the South-East. We did not have the aircraft resources we have now and certainly did not have a lot of the capabilities that our modern firetrucks have now. We had a few Bedfords running around and that sort of thing, but they were not carrying the water loads. Now we have 34s or 44s, with 3,000 or 4,000-litre carrying capacity. I know we have one each of those at the Coomandook brigade, with one stationed at Ki Ki. We also have a 9,000-litre water tanker in the shed at Coomandook as well.

We have heard about the terrible fires in 1983 and the savage and terrible loss of life of 28 people. Several of those people were firefighters. A local farmer at Coonalpyn, Ken Lutze, who has since passed on but I know his son very well, survived the fire. He was out trying to plough firebreaks, getting in front of the onslaught of the fire, and he got caught. He only survived because he jumped in a sheep trough. I was very intrigued to hear the story from the member for Mount Gambier about a man who survived just by piling sheep carcasses on top of himself. The lengths people go to survive are just fantastic. I know Ken suffered the after-effects of that fire until the day he left us. He was still with us for many years, but I believe it probably shortened his life.

It just goes to show how terrible these fires are. We look at what happened with the Wangary fire and the very sad loss of life there. I heard the chilling story about the young kids who were lost in the ute, and it tears your heart out. It just goes to show that you cannot take anything for granted, and that is why you have to have your facilities up to speed. As those of us who live in the bush all know, you cannot rely just on the emergency services. Until about 19 or 20 years ago, I used to have only an 800-litre fire tank on my mobile fire cart. Now I have 4,600 litres. I really upgraded, but it is handy. It is on a trailer, and if I hook it up to a decent tractor I am not held back by anything but heavy scrub.

So, yes, people do have to look after themselves, but we also have to have those adequately resourced capabilities of the Country Fire Service, the Metropolitan Fire Service and, obviously, our environment department, which has a fire service as well. Many fires start out in Ngarkat Conservation Park, which goes from my electorate through to the electorate of the member for MacKillop and seems to attract lightning strikes pretty well, with tens of thousands of hectares being burnt out at any single time in Ngarkat towards the Victorian border. Certainly there have been plenty of times when the CFS, local farmers and environment department firefighters have worked hard to contain those blazes.

I think that things have really got better in acknowledging what we need to do with regard to decent firebreaks and bringing that big roll around. I know that at Keith they have some excellent machinery stationed there for action in big park fires or scrub fires. To be frank, sometimes it is better to knock a bit down to save the rest.

There was a fire—and I have spoken about it in this place before—close to around 12 years ago now, maybe more, that came out of Ngarkat. Everyone knew it was coming and was heading towards the Mallee Highway. I believe that it was a Sunday morning. It was going to come out with about 90 to 100 km/h winds. The question was whether we do a burn-back and stop the fire coming out of the scrub and burning farmland because the line of defence was to be the Mallee Highway near Lameroo.

My thoughts were that the burn-back should have been done for a lot of reasons. There was some nervousness about lighting up heritage scrub, but there are protections in the act if people do that and, quite frankly, it would have been the most sensible thing to do to save not only some of the park but also farmland because, guess what, as predicted, that was not done and the fire burst out of the park and raced through farmland, putting much property and lives at risk, but it was eventually pulled up. We have to be practical as well. We have to acknowledge the real risks and not tie ourselves in knots about the consequences of taking what should be the most sensible action on the day.

With regard to other recent fires like Pinery and Sampson Flat, Pinery was a real example not only of fire but also of what farmers can produce in a pretty good year. There were a lot of wall-to-wall crops from the Pinery area right through to the Gawler area. It is only when you drive through later that you realise that the fire had actually jumped the four lanes of highway near Gawler and that Gawler was the next town, not that far from here. It would have been horrendous if that fire had torn into the streets of Gawler. We can imagine the potential loss of life and property.

I commend the work of all our emergency services personnel, who are certainly pushed to the limit. I think, with the resources we have now and the extra money we are putting in as the Marshall Liberal government, things will be better in future, but we can never be complacent. Those of us who have lived with fire, fought fire and also used fire as a tool know that you can never be complacent because, if you do not watch it, it will not be your tool: it will be your enemy. It will not be your friend: it will be your enemy. Even though we have better equipment, I salute the training people

go through and the commitment and time that everyone puts in to keeping safe not only our properties but also our lives.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (12:39): First, I want to thank members opposite for their support for the motion and for the thoughtful contributions made by the minister and the members for Bragg, Finniss, Flinders, Mount Gambier, Narungga and Hammond. I particularly want to thank the regional members who spoke for reminding me—my speech and the initial impetus of my motion was around the first responders, who are of course very important—of the role of individual householders and landowners, particularly in regional and peri-urban areas, in disaster reduction and mitigation.

I want to thank you, Deputy Speaker, for pointing out that not all disasters are natural, and you pointed to the financial crisis as a disaster which, while not natural, certainly had a huge impact and is something we should prepare for. I want to restate my respect for the emergency services and, in particular, the way they work together, their spirit of camaraderie and, when the chips are down, the way they pull together selflessly and, in the name of public safety, work very hard, sometimes behind the scenes, for the benefit of all.

When I talked about the retirement show for Greg Crossman, I forgot to mention that chief officer Michael Morgan, who is replacing Greg, was there. I want to place on the record my respect for Michael Morgan. I have not known him for that long, but I think he will be a fine chief officer. He is continuing the good work of Greg Crossman in making the fire service an even more modern and inclusive organisation, so I am very pleased to see him in that role. With that, I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for MacKillop, I acknowledge students from Norwood Primary School, who are guests of the Premier, being shown around by the Hon. Dennis Hood. I hope you enjoy your visit. Welcome.

Motions

BIOSECURITY MANAGEMENT

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (12:41): I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the importance of South Australia continuing to effectively manage biosecurity from the threat of invasive pests and diseases;
- (b) highlights the state's ongoing efforts in managing the risks to South Australia posed by animal and plant pests and diseases, food-borne illnesses and misuse of rural chemicals;
- (c) highlights the state government's commitment to keeping fruit fly and other plant pests out of the state through a range of prevention, detection and eradication measures;
- (d) welcomes the Liberal government's investment in biosecurity, including a commitment to install two new quarantine bins in the lead-in to the Riverland, as well as more signage and monitoring of the bins;
- (e) notes the pressure from the horticulture pest on South Australia beyond our borders and welcomes national collaboration in dealing with certain invasive pests and diseases; and
- (f) acknowledges the continual biosecurity pressure on the fishing and aquaculture sector and the strong ongoing industry response to those threats.

I rise to speak today on this motion and acknowledge the commitment and efforts of the Marshall Liberal government to the important preventative measures it has been taking to reduce the risk of transmission of infectious disease in crops and livestock, and in the marine environment, to assist in protecting, sustaining and enhancing the value of primary production across the state of South Australia.

South Australia has much to protect. The gross value of agricultural production to the economy of South Australia is substantial, estimated to be worth upwards of \$7.2 billion, according to the most recent ABARES data from 2016-17. Key commodities that make up the gross value include wheat at \$1.2 billion, cattle and calves at \$609 million and sheep and lambs at \$579 million. The horticulture industry has been estimated to have a farmgate value of upwards of \$1.25 billion, while the fishery industry has been valued at over \$500 million, which includes the wild catch sector, valued at an estimated \$265 million, and the aquaculture sector at \$252 million respectively.

These are substantial and important industries for South Australia, the economy, our regions, communities and farming families. Our ability to maintain and grow these values depends on the health and condition of our primary production enterprises and their markets, and ensuring that our agriculture and horticulture, wild catch and aquaculture sectors are able to continue to operate, protected from biosecurity threats.

These biosecurity measures guard these industries from biosecurity threats that can damage productivity and, importantly, protect their ease of access to international markets. South Australia has a history of taking biosecurity threats seriously, and efforts to address these threats have been ongoing. South Australia has tackled these issues on several fronts, including the use of legislation, regulation, communication, education and, importantly, the hard work of a wide range of industry sectors to achieve biosecurity protection and enhancement.

South Australia's effort in protecting our agricultural and fishery sectors has been long run and has stood South Australia in good stead for the management of disease, pest plants and animals. There is significant coordination within this state and linkages to national initiatives, with emphasis on the management of animal and plant pests and diseases. Industry bodies, such as Primary Producers SA and its affiliated organisations, such as Livestock SA and Primary Industries and Regional Development South Australia, take a strong role in supporting, building awareness of, advocating for and coordinating initiatives to minimise and prevent the spread of animal and plant pests and diseases.

PIRSA, as the state lead agency, assists in coordinating a range of initiatives associated with livestock health and disease management, including communicating and undertaking compliance related to reporting, management and requirements for the movement of stock for the management of diseases such as ovine Johne's disease, footrot, sheep lice and ovine brucellosis. Since the Marshall Liberal government's election, PIRSA has initiated changes to include the establishment of a new South Australian ovine Johne's disease management program and modifications to the South Australian footrot management program.

These new programs have been developed by Primary Industries and Regions SA (PIRSA), in close liaison with the South Australian Sheep Advisory Group and Livestock SA, and are in alignment with the newly announced national OJD management arrangements. These programs are a great example of industry and government working together to improve biosecurity management for our state. Coordination of these programs is linked and assisted by the National Livestock Identification System.

Primary Industries and Regions SA also take a key role in protecting the fishery and agricultural industries from aquatic diseases through initiatives, which include preparation for and prevention of disease outbreak, surveillance and regulation in relation to the movement of aquatic species. Disease outbreak in marine environments poses many challenges for management and containment.

Management of disease outbreaks and invasive species incursions is a joint responsibility for government, industry and recreational boaters and fishers. Emergency response programs to aquatic disease or invasive species incursions involves a coordinated response between our state government agencies, including Primary Industries and Regional Development, the Department for Environment and Water and industry groups.

South Australia has taken biosecurity seriously over a long time, in particular providing local attention to the management and control of pest plant and animal species. Legislative controls to support the management of pest plant and animal control have evolved over time and have included legislation such as the Animal and Plant Control (Agricultural Protection and Other Purposes)

Act 1986, which linked animal and plant control boards to local government and operated prior to the assent of the Natural Resources Management Act in 2004. The ongoing management and regulation of declared pest plants and animals, including requirements to halt their transportation, sale and spread, are some of the key tools used for preventing the spread of invasive declared pest plants and animal species.

NRM regions and NRM boards also undertake detailed planning and action for the management and delivery of pest plant and animal management. This process involves the identification of high-risk plants and animals and identifies strategies to address their management, containment and/or eradication. I look forward to our government supporting the continuation and enhancement of this work and important regulation through the preparation of the landscape SA act. When enacted, this legislation will replace the current NRM Act and will enable our state to focus efforts on, and involve the community and landholders in, the management of invasive plant and pest species for the protection of our state's important agricultural industries in natural environments.

The serious implication of the impacts of pest plants and animals on agricultural productivity has long been recognised. The threat of phylloxera to the wine grape industry of South Australia has been well documented. Wine grape production in South Australia has an estimated farmgate value of \$658 million, according to PIRSA in 2018. This sector has the potential to be impacted by the substantial and significant biosecurity threat. The Phylloxera and Grape Industry Board of South Australia, trading as Vinehealth Australia, cites grape phylloxera as the greatest biosecurity threat to grapevines in South Australia.

Phylloxera, a small soft-bodied insect pest that feeds on the roots of grapevines, causes a decline in vine health over a number of years until the death of the vine between five and six years after infestation. A key issue viticulturalists face with phylloxera is that, short of complete prevention, phylloxera resistant rootstocks provide the only option for managing it. Given the lack of options to manage the disease, and the dire consequences of infestation, legislation was introduced in the 1800s in South Australia with the aim of preventing infestation.

Today, the viticulture and wine industry remains vigilant and seeks to maintain high standards in its protection of vineyards in South Australia, which includes the promotion of best practice management, education and information. These efforts are backed by legislation, in the form of the Phylloxera and Grape Industry Act 1995, to ensure best practice management to avoid cross-contamination between states across the highly mobile viticulture and wine industry.

Ongoing investment is important in the protection of the Riverland's fruit fly free status. The Marshall Liberal government continues to invest in biosecurity measures and is enhancing its efforts to protect the estimated \$1.2 billion horticulture industry across the state from the invasion of fruit fly. The investment is vitally important to ensure the security of the Riverland region's fruit fly free status, secure the future of horticulture businesses and communities, and ensure access to international markets.

The potential impact of fruit fly is substantial, with the risk of infestation having the potential to render fruit worthless, and with substantial costs to producers and significant efforts required of government and industry to contain the infestation. The monitoring program to ensure detection is vital. Consider the fruit fly outbreak in 2016 under the previous government, which cost a whopping \$1.5 million to eradicate. It was said that this particular outbreak only happened because of lax management by those responsible for inspecting traps and a lack of resources at the time. Such a simple mistake could have been avoided if the support and resources were available for use. We must ensure that this is done so that we can circumvent more unnecessary outbreaks.

The investment by the Marshall Liberal government has enabled the installation of two new quarantine bins and signage at key entry points into the Riverland, including on the state border between Renmark and Wentworth, and on the Purnong Road near Mannum. This increases the state's total of fruit fly quarantine bin sites to 18, raising the profile of the need for fruit fly disposal for travellers and visitors to the regions.

The Marshall Liberal government's investment in the prevention and management of fruit fly infestation includes significant investment targeted at:

- monitoring via a statewide trapping grid, which includes the continuation of checking 7,500 trap sites across the state (over 100,000 trap checks per year);
- the appointment of a dedicated fruit fly coordinator to work with industry, co-funded by industry and government;
- an increase of random roadblocks from 11 in 2017-18 to 14 in 2018-19;
- opening the seasonal quarantine station at Pinnaroo earlier;
- additional signage leading into the Riverland at main entry points into the state and around quarantine bins;
- sterile insect technology release and male annihilation technique baiting in an interstate buffer zone to protect the Riverland Pest Free Area (PFA) border controls, including the operation of South Australia's permanent quarantine stations located at Sturt Highway at Yamba, between Mildura and Renmark; Eyre Highway at Ceduna; Barrier Highway at Oodla Wirra; and Mallee Highway between Murrayville and Pinnaroo;
- higher security at quarantine stations to ensure empty fruit bins being transported are properly cleaned and extra bin inspections at Yamba and Pinnaroo quarantine stations; trucks with rotting fruit will be turned around at the border;
- increased audits of accredited businesses transporting produce into the state;
- the continuation of checking 7,500 trap sites across the state (over 100,000 trap checks per year);
- launching a newly branded fruit fly awareness campaign;
- movement controls and conditions of entry—interstate certification assurances and compliance arrangements;
- random roadblocks; and
- the eradication of isolated detections.

Maintaining the region's fruit fly free status has many benefits, including:

- protecting the value of commercial fruit and vegetable industries;
- protecting access to export markets without requiring additional treatment of fruit;
- savings to horticultural enterprises through not having to implement cold and chemical treatments to treat affected produce. The citrus industry saves an estimated \$4.2 million a year because cold and chemical treatments are not required; and
- homegrown fruit and vegetables need fewer pesticides.

Certainly, the management of fruit fly is a collaborative approach between Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia. The promotion of maintaining the fruit fly free status of South Australia is shared by interstate agencies and PIRSA, with the assistance from local government, industry and businesses that are keenly aware of the importance of maintaining the fruit fly free status.

Collaboration, coordination, compliance and, importantly, communication are key to the management of fruit fly, as they are with the great many biosecurity efforts that are undertaken across the state and between states. I commend this motion to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:55): I rise to largely support the motion, but I also seek to amend it. The amendment covers a number of areas specifically and relates to paragraphs (j) and (l). The substance of the motion is retained. In fact, the wording of the original motion stays in place, but it has an addition. Accordingly, in paragraph (d) after the words 'as well as more signage and monitoring of the bins', I move to insert the words:

and acknowledges the action taken by the previous Labor government to upgrade biosecurity in South Australia—including the development of the \$3 million SIT (sterile insect technology) facility in the Upper Spencer Gulf;

Also, in relation to paragraph (f), which currently reads:

- (f) acknowledges the continual biosecurity pressure on the fishing and aquaculture sector and the strong ongoing industry response to those threats

I move to insert the words:

and acknowledges the former Labor government's commitment to the oyster industry, including the \$1.6 million fee relief package announced in February 2018, benefiting the state's 155 oyster businesses, and the \$1 million in funding for additional support for the industry.

I welcome the motion by the member for MacKillop, and I hope he welcomes the amendments. Biosecurity is incredibly important and, as a state and as a nation, we cannot underestimate just how important it is. It is also important that we have a bipartisan approach to biosecurity. It is always welcome when incoming governments build on the essentially solid foundations that were already in place when it comes to biosecurity in this state.

Just recently, I came across an interesting article in *The Australian* by Alan Kohler, which I like reading. It often has some very worthwhile insights.

Members interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: I read widely. I read *The Australian* and then I consume *The Guardian* to get the balance. Anyway, there was an interesting article in the business section of *The Australian*, which was about a comparison between Australia and Chile, no pun intended. We are not necessarily comparing apples with apples here—it might be apples with oranges.

The article was actually about cherries, and it pointed out that Australia and Chile produced back in 2001 an equal number in tonnage of cherries of around about 7,000 tonnes a piece. As of last year, Australia had increased that to 20,000 tonnes of cherries produced, but Chile aimed for a target of 180,000 tonnes. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debated adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 13:59.

Petitions

SERVICE SA MODBURY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Presented a petition signed by 200 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to proceed with the proposed closure of the Service SA Modbury Branch announced as a cost-saving measure in the 2018-19 state budget.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today students from years 5 and 6 from the Norwood Primary School, who are guests of the Premier, and students from the year 6 class of Immanuel Primary School in Novar Gardens, who are guests of the member for Morphett. Welcome to parliament today.

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Tourism Commission, South Australian—Annual Report 2017-18

Parliamentary Committees

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:01): I bring up the second report of the committee, entitled 'Fact finding visit: South Australian arid lands natural resources management region'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:02): I bring up the eighth report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

PRIVATISATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:02): My question is to the Premier: was the privatisation of ETSA by the Olsen government a good thing for the people of South Australia?

The SPEAKER: I am not really sure if the Premier is responsible for what the Olsen government did; however—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! I am going to allow the Premier to answer the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

Mr Pederick: We had a flood in 1956.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond! He has been called to order this morning and he is warned. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:03): It is quite evident to me that the opposition has run out of questions.

Mr Malinauskas: No, I just asked one.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, it wasn't according to the standing orders—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's not a responsibility of the current government. I know that you have only come down to this house in recent times. I know that the Leader of the Opposition has only been down in this chamber for a certain period of time, but he doesn't understand the standing orders. He doesn't understand how questions should be asked. This is not a responsibility of the government. But I am happy, under your instructions, with a wideranging set of—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: personal reflections, debate and relevance.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be seated for one moment. I have the point of order. With respect, the question was framed in a way that was perhaps a little bit political. Arguably, the Premier is not responsible to the house for what was done under the Olsen government. The member for West Torrens knows that. I will allow the Premier to answer it and I hope that he sticks to the substance of the question. This is why standing orders are there, member for West Torrens. Premier, would you like to have a go at answering that question?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I would like to know whether the State Bank collapse was something that the Leader of the Opposition would support. We thought that that was a complete and utter debacle. While we are asking questions of historical importance, what a mess that was and what a mess the former Labor government's hopeless energy policy was for the people of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: I think the Premier has finished. The Leader of the Opposition.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Has the president of the Liberal Party, Mr John Olsen, provided the Premier advice regarding his decision to privatise electricity assets here in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:05): Well, sir—

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be seated for one moment. I call to order the Minister for Industry and the Attorney-General. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. I find it incredible that the Leader of the Opposition got out of bed this morning, quite frankly. It must have been a humiliating day for the Leader of the Opposition, leading his rabble who were exposed for all their brazen hypocrisy yesterday.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: this is pure debate.

The SPEAKER: The question was about whether the Premier has sought advice—

Mr Malinauskas: Why don't you just start answering the questions?

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of the Opposition is called to order. Members on my right will be quiet. The Premier has the call; he has been asked a question. I ask members to cease interjecting so that I can listen to the answer.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I know the Leader of the Opposition is only reading out what was put in front of him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I know that he hasn't got any input. I know that he is probably smarter than that. The reality is that it was a dark day for the opposition yesterday in this parliament because what was tabled by the Attorney-General was an independent assessment of that massive burden that the former government inflicted upon the people of South Australia.

When I read that report, I gasped—\$610 million was what the former government inflicted upon the people of South Australia whilst they were pretending to stand up for the renewable energy sector and the people of South Australia. What a joke—\$610 million, the centre point of their entire so-called energy solution for the people of South Australia, wasn't spent on renewable energy or battery storage; it was spent on dirty diesel backup generators.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Is the Premier finished or still going? The Premier has finished. Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I call the following members to order: the member for Waite, the member for Mawson, the Minister for Infrastructure and the member for Giles. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): Thanks, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Given the known impact of the privatisation of ETSA on the people of South Australia, why is the Marshall government and why is the Premier privatising, yet again, another electricity asset?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08): I am happy to answer this hopeless question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Why not provide some information to the house about—

Mr Malinauskas: It's the privatisation of ETSA all over again.

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can I tell you that there is only one party in this chamber that knows all about privatisation—and they are opposite. Let me tell you about the forests—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —let me tell you about the Lotteries Commission, let me tell you about the dirty deal done on our Lands Title office by the former treasurer, the member for West Torrens—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the Premier is debating the answer.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for debate. The question had several elements to it; one was about privatisation. I think the Premier is talking about privatisation. I ask the Premier to return to the substance, please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —which was compiled independently—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Infrastructure is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —by Mr Mark Livesey QC. He looked at the issue of the deal that was done by the former government for the original lease and then purchase of the diesel generators that the former government deemed necessary to prop up the stability of the grid that they had destroyed by their decision to essentially fast-track the destruction of the coal-fired power station, Northern Power Station, at Port Augusta, knocking hundreds and hundreds of regional jobs out of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left will cease interjecting. I am trying to hear the Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: One of the things that I found interesting about that report was the lack of evidence that essentially the government was relying on to enter into a purchase agreement before they were required to. There was no compelling evidence whatsoever. That was a pure political decision made by the Labor Party when they were in government. What a massive burden on the people of South Australia!

We have been elected. There was an election: it was held on 17 March. The people of South Australia decided they wanted to move forward. They wanted a government—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that was going to put the people of South Australia first.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What we have discovered, of course, is that there is an opportunity to recover from the mess that we inherited from the former government when they were

in power in regard to those assets. We are not selling those assets. We are going out to the market to see if there's a better and higher use for the assets that the people of South Australia were forced into purchasing by those opposite.

The Hon. R. Sanderson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Child Protection!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What those opposite would prefer is that the taxpayers of South Australia pay \$610 million for stand-by diesel generators—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —so that once every now and again there may be an opportunity for them to actually be switched on. We would like to see that generation capacity put to best use for the people of South Australia and that's why we are going out to the market. We will see how the market—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —responds. We will make sure that if we require and we need that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —stand-by generation capacity, we will incorporate that into what we put forward with the people who are successful. We are going out to the market, we will see what it comes back with, but I make this assurance to you, sir, and to the people of South Australia: while we are sitting here on the Treasury bench we will be acting on behalf of all South Australians.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens was constantly interjecting, something about profit. He is called to order.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned for a second and final time. I call to order the Minister for Child Protection, the Minister for Education and the member for Badcoe. The member for Narungga has the call.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:12): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Could the minister update the house on how the emergency generators engaged with the Reliability and Emergency Reserve Trader market last summer?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:12): Thank you to the very hardworking and capable member for Narungga, another first-term Liberal MP focused on the important issues in their electorate.

The Reliability and Emergency Reserve Trader (RERT) is a process where shortfalls are procured to keep the lights on. The market pays for reductions in demand from smelters, mills and generators that are not usually in the market. These providers are paid if they generate. These costs are passed on to all consumers. Last year, the diesel generators participated in the RERT. They were not used and they were not paid. The generators only earned revenue during necessary testing and commissioning. I am advised that fuel costs usually exceed market revenue at those times, so the net revenue was, in fact, negative; that is, we lost money on the RERT last summer.

It was strange to read on the member for West Torrens' Twitter feed the following, and I quote:

BREAKING Government did not factor in any revenue from RERT market into his costings according to Minister DVHP. It would have been millions in revenue over 25 yrs!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: These are magic millions—they do not exist.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is the member for Waite interjecting?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: We lost money. With the generators likely to lie dormant, the only millions that exist are the \$609.5 million exposed by Mr Livesey QC, but it gets worse.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: We now know Labor's plan. Their plan was to pay for the diesels using the route. Who pays for that? South Australian electricity consumers. The member for West Torrens wants consumers to pay for the diesel—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Who pays for the interconnector?

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —through higher bills. It's a tax to pay for dirty diesels.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is called to order. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier mislead the people of South Australia when he stated at a press conference on 29 November last year, 'It's not our intention to flog off an asset'?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15): I don't really know who is briefing the opposition leader, who is employed in his office or what sort of advice he is getting, and it's not for me to be providing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —him with any advice. I suggest—

The SPEAKER: We are trying to hear his answer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —upgrading the skill in your office because quite frankly—

The SPEAKER: In my office?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —you are not even understanding the basics of what is contained in the report yesterday. I suggest the leader—

Ms Stinson: Like memory—like maybe memory would be a skill you would like to adopt.

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —reads the report, reads our response and then comes back with some decent questions.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): I am happy to persist, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier mislead the people of South Australia when he stated on ABC radio on 10 October last year, 'No, nope, we won't be selling off an asset'?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:16): Again, I find it difficult to understand.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are not selling off an asset. We are making it very clear we are not. When the opposition were in government, they did sell off the Lands Titles Office and they did enter into a very long-term—was it three or four rotations?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Three rotations.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It's a lease.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be seated.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Three rotations.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be seated. The Member for West Torrens will not refer to members as geese. Is the Premier finished?

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: Sure.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition.

PRIVATISATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): I'm happy to persist, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier mislead the people of South Australia when he said at the PSA pre-election forum on 7 February this year that the Liberals, 'don't have a privatisation agenda'?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:17): I absolutely stand by—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be heard in silence.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —every single word that I said there, sir. Most reasonable people in South Australia understand the mess that the new government inherited. We suspected—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left will be quiet. I'm trying to listen to the Premier's answer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We suspected—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is persistently interjecting. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We suspected prior to the election, when the former premier and treasurer announced that they were entering into an agreement to purchase ahead of the requirement, that they had already entered into to lease. When they indicated that they were going

to purchase, we suspected that there was no compelling reason, but the simple fact of the matter is that we didn't have any proof.

On coming to government, we had an independent assessment. It wasn't an assessment we did. It was an independent, very highly qualified legal mind to look at the complexities of the deal. They were also unable to find any compelling reason why the government entered into the purchase agreement prior to the election.

The former government must have had some reason to do it, but we are where we are. We have purchased those. We are not selling, but we have to act in the best interests of every single taxpayer. If those opposite honestly think that the best use is for those to sit there for another couple of decades at the total cost to the taxpayers of \$610 million on the off chance that they might be used—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —for a couple of minutes for the next couple of years, well, then they are even more incompetent than anybody actually thought they were. I'm looking forward—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to the next election already. I really am. The idiotic arguments that are coming from those opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —I think make the average person in South Australia just shake their head. How on earth—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call. Order!

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —could the party that inflicted this massive burden on the people of South Australia do anything other than apologise? No, no. The brazen opposition are now standing up, doubling down on their prior commitment. They want to spend \$610 million—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to have these diesel generators on stand-by. The party that pretends to be looking to the future with renewable energy wants us to spend \$610 million to have stand-by diesel generators—dirty diesel. Well, we will be acting on behalf of the people of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for West Torrens, who has been patiently waiting, and then I will move to the member for Waite, I warn the member for Badcoe and I call to order the member for Lee. The member for West Torrens.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Energy. With which energy retailers has the minister discussed the sale or the lease of the state-owned generators before the sale was announced?

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:20): Could you ask the shadow to repeat the question, please?

The SPEAKER: Could you please repeat, sir?

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question is to the Minister for Energy, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: With which energy retailers has the minister discussed the sale or lease of the state-owned generators before the sale was announced?

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thank you, sir. I wanted to hear the question again just to be absolutely sure that it was a question from the shadow minister for energy about energy, Mr Speaker, because we are now in October. We are nearly at the end of the year, and this is the very, very, very first question that the shadow minister, the former minister, has asked about energy. Now, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! Minister, please do not provoke the opposition. The member for West Torrens on a point of order for debate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, sir. I would ask the minister to withdraw, and I call his attention to estimates.

The SPEAKER: Is there a request that you have taken offence?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am trying to get the point of order here.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How about this, sir? How about the minister grow up and answer the question?

The SPEAKER: One moment, minister; I am trying to get the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Answer the question.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, what is the point of order?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Debate, sir, relevance.

The SPEAKER: Debate, right. I am pretty sure he was, but would the minister please bring it back to the substance of the question, thank you.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, sir. I really needed to be sure because I have been waiting for this question for seven months.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: As fearful as the shadow minister has been to raise this topic for seven months, he now feels now that it is exposed that he was going to spend \$610 million—

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order. Member for West Torrens, with all respect, I know that you are some days very zealous in your points of order and sometimes they are very fair but, with respect to the minister, he is facing a constant barrage of interjections from my left.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Because he is debating, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, and I am trying to listen to his answer, so I will ensure that he does that if members could please remain quiet. Minister, please stick to the substance of the question.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, thank you, sir. This very, very reasonable, fair and important question is here with us today because it is linked to the generators. It is about the generators, the generators that we know the previous government wanted to spend \$610 million of taxpayers' money for.

Now, in that context, we announced yesterday our intention to seek from the market expressions of interest to lease these generators, for them to stay in the ownership of all South Australians and be leased for 25 years. The shadow minister asks me with which retailers I have had discussions about the prospect of this lease. I am not going to name any retailers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! The minister is answering the question.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am not going to name any retailers because, otherwise, foolish people opposite might assume that I had or I hadn't had discussions with retailers, but what I—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —will say is that we have had several approaches from organisations, some of which I have met with myself, expressing their interest in these generators. I have listened to them. I have not given them any indication of our intentions because we were still developing them. We were waiting to get the Livesey report. So I listened respectfully to what people had to say. I engaged with them, the department engaged with them and others engaged with them. There is no shortage of interest from the market in these generators.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned. Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: There is no shortage of interest. What I have said consistently to every single person I have ever discussed this topic with was that we would deal with these generators in the best interests of South Australians. South Australians, taxpayers and electricity consumers are broadly all the same people in our state. We will deal with these generators in the very best interests of South Australians.

Every single person I have ever discussed this topic with has had that message given to them because it is exactly what we will do. It is exactly what the Premier said just a few minutes ago. We seek expressions of interest to lease these generators for 25 years so that they stay owned by South Australians and work for the benefit of South Australians.

HOME BATTERY SCHEME

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:25): My question is also to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on the progress of the government's home battery scheme?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:26): Thank you to the hardworking, diligent member for Waite—another Liberal MP focused on what is important for his electorate and for all South Australians. One of the important things about this—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: One of the important things about the member for Waite's question is that he highlights that our energy policy is multipronged. Our energy policy is

multipronged. We have many planks and one of them is the home battery scheme, which I have to say—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens will not—

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —is extremely popular.

The SPEAKER: —interject about movies. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: We announced this before the election. We are delivering it now. We have had a very positive reception. Consumers are excited. Potential consumers are excited about the possibility to access a government subsidy for a significant chunk of the purchase price of a home battery—perhaps a third of it up to a maximum of \$6,000 per household—plus the opportunity to access a concessional loan, which comes to them with the help of the Clean Energy Finance Corporation for the balance of the purchase price of the battery, plus new solar for their household if that's what is right for them and their household.

We held an industry forum attended by nearly 300 people, the vast majority of whom were people or organisations wanting to be suppliers in the program, wanting to provide the batteries or provide the installation or be involved in one way or another. Nearly 300 people in our supply forum turned up, and they were all very impressed with what the government and the department has put together.

This program will of course benefit those households who participate in it by getting new batteries and potentially new solar as well. Perhaps more importantly, it will benefit all other South Australian electricity consumers. Of course, we want to help the people who get involved and invest and have their own homes to use this for, but we want people who don't have their own homes.

We want other small businesses and other consumers to benefit as well. By taking the top off the peak in evening demand, by these households being able to connect peak generation early afternoon with peak demand early evening, this will depress prices for all other South Australian electricity consumers. Not only will we help the 40,000 but all others as well. This is a very important program, and electors in the member for Davenport's electorate, all over metropolitan Adelaide, all over regional South Australia will have the opportunity to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —Waite, sorry, and Waite as well. I will have it. This is going to be great for South Australians. This household battery scheme, our grid-scale storage scheme, our demand management trials empowering consumers, our interconnector to New South Wales—all of these programs will dovetail together very well. We are determined to make sure that we harness renewable energy for the benefits of consumers.

We already know that in South Australia we are very good at generating electricity from the sun and from wind, and full credit to the previous government for proving that. However, they rejected the calls that came throughout their term of government to help consumers as well. They punished consumers. We will turn things around. We will prove that renewable energy can be harnessed for the benefit of consumers, can push prices down, improve reliability and help with cleaner and greener energy. Of course we will also support gas generation, which will still be needed at the same time, to get all these benefits wrapped up together.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for Hurtle Vale and Waite.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Energy. Was a probity officer present when the energy minister had personal and private discussions with energy retailers regarding the sale or lease of the state-owned generators prior to the public announcement yesterday?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:30): First, I was very clear in my first answer that I have had discussions with organisations interested in accessing the generators. I also made it very clear in my first answer—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Was a probity officer there?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I also made it very clear in my first answer that I was not disclosing whether I did or did not have discussions with retailers because that would get some people a bit hot under the collar, perhaps quite unnecessarily. I have been very clear about that. Let us just say very clearly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is warned. If he keeps going, he will be departing. I would hate to ask him to leave the chamber if he has further questions to ask today. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Let's just be very clear—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —that the shadow minister's question is clearly in contravention—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —of standing order 97 because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier and the leader will cease interjecting. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The shadow minister's question is clearly in contravention of standing order 97 because it contains—

The SPEAKER: I will determine that, and that is done by a point of order. Please answer the question, minister.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: While I reject that argument, if you take his supposition about who I met with out of it, my answer to the remaining part of the question is that I had appropriate officers with me in discussions when that was necessary.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Energy. Which energy retailer suggested to the minister that the South Australian government should sell or lease the state-owned generators to the private sector?

The SPEAKER: Would the minister like to have a go at that?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier, the Deputy Premier and the member for Badcoe will cease interjecting. Minister, would you like to answer that?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:32): I have addressed the direct substance of that question twice now.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Energy. Can the minister guarantee that South Australia will not lose any thermal generation capacity

as a result of his plan to privatise the state-owned emergency generators and subsidise and sponsor a \$1.5 billion interconnector to New South Wales?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: the question contained argument.

The SPEAKER: Can someone guarantee something that is—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: He described it as a privatisation, if nothing else. There were plenty of others.

The SPEAKER: It might be hypothetical because it postulates a state of affairs that may not exist. Would the member for West Torrens like to rephrase?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question is to the Minister for Energy. Can the minister guarantee that South Australia will not lose any thermal generation capacity as a result of his plans to lease, to the private sector, the state-owned emergency generators and his plan to subsidise and sponsor a \$1.5 billion interconnector to New South Wales?

The SPEAKER: That is a very broad question and I would anticipate a very broad answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:33): The context of the question was about two things. One was our intention to lease the generators, very clearly. The other caveat was with regard to our intention, in his words, to sponsor and subsidise the interconnector. We have made it very clear that—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Reynell!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —our intention, if the Australian Energy Regulator agrees, is for the interconnector to be a regulated asset that will not have subsidy from us or—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned for second and final time. The Deputy Premier is called to order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: So, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, the member for West Torrens is on two warnings and still interjecting. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The shadow minister's proposition is that we will subsidise the interconnector. I have made it very clear. We intend for the interconnector to be a regulated asset. So, of course, it will not have any subsidy. We could not have been clearer. Let me also say that of course it's not our decision if it's a regulated asset. It's our expectation, it's our hope. It's also ElectraNet's, it's also TransGrid's, it's also AEMO's, it's also most other people's. If it goes that way, it will not be including any subsidisation.

The word 'sponsor' has a pretty broad range of terms all the way through from supporter to somebody who puts money in it so that they can have a badge on it, so I will leave that alone. It is our intention that the interconnector will be a regulated asset. It is our intention to lease the generators and keep South Australians owning them. In that context, the remainder of the question was: will I guarantee that no thermal generation will leave the market as a result of us doing those two things that I have just canvassed?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Reynell!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The clock is ticking. The minister has the call. Members on my left! Member for Reynell, the minister is attempting to answer the question.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The shadow minister is being deliberately argumentative because he knows, I know, we all know that there is thermal generation that is going to leave the market anyway. We know that under the previous government AGL had intended to mothball some of its Torrens Island generation capacity in mid-2017. So these things are happening and planned all the way through. They announced the mothballing of generation in mid-2017, but do you know what, Mr Speaker? Then they fully realised what the previous government was doing to the energy system and they said, 'We just cannot possibly leave that mob in charge,' so they put that off.

The reality is that there will be thermal generation leaving the market over decades and decades and decades. That will happen regardless of what either brand of government does. That is going to happen. To try to pretend that that departure from the market of thermal generation over time, some of it 30 years old or more, is going to be as a result of what this government would do to put electricity consumers at the forefront of our energy policy is completely argumentative.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe and the member for Reynell are warned for a second and final time.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:37): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about how the recent federal government's announcement on GST impacts South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:38): I thank the member for MacKillop for his question. He, like many people in South Australia, was probably a little bit nervous when we came to government about what was going to happen with the GST going forward. The federal government had commissioned a Productivity Commission report into the GST distribution, and it's fair to say that the recommendations in that Australian Productivity Commission report were very worrying for the people of South Australia.

I am pleased to report today and update the house that since coming to government the Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, has worked extraordinarily effectively with the Coalition and with the Treasurer of Australia—both the Hon. Scott Morrison and the Hon. Josh Frydenberg—in recent days on this deal. It's a complex deal because there are winners and there are losers when it comes to GST distribution.

The good news is that the negotiation, which was hammered out between the federal and state treasurers, had a guarantee embedded into it that no state would end up worse off. This is a massive win for the people of South Australia. We made it very clear that we wouldn't be supporting anything that set South Australia back. We argued that we wouldn't be supporting any legislation, any new model for GST distribution that disadvantaged the people of South Australia.

We stuck to our guns. I think that the Treasurer conducted the negotiations on behalf of the people of South Australia extraordinarily effectively, and we have ended up with a very good deal. We are very grateful to the Coalition, to the Prime Minister and to the Treasurer for this deal, which I think now puts a new model in place—a fairer model—for all states and, importantly, a guarantee that South Australia doesn't go backwards.

I know this is very important for the people of South Australia because we have a very significant forward estimate of GST revenue to the state that we needed to make sure we protected. Importantly, what has been built into the model is an increase in the GST distribution to South

Australia. Unlike those opposite, this has been achieved without arguing for a massive hit to the pockets of ordinary South Australians.

I think everybody in South Australia drew breath when the former government decided to argue, and then indeed lobby the other premiers and treasurers around Australia, for a massive increase in the GST—a 50 per cent increase in the GST—taking our GST cost up from 10 per cent to 15 per cent. This would have been a massive hit to every single household budget and every single business in our state and, quite frankly, would have massively slowed the Australian economy. I am very pleased that that was defeated.

We as an opposition stood up and said, 'No, we don't want higher taxes. In fact, we will lobby every day that we are in government for lower taxes,' and that is precisely what we have been able to deliver since coming to government. We are very pleased to be the government that has halved the emergency services levy hit to households, in effect reversing the decision of the former treasurer in his first budget after the 2014 election to massively increase—a \$360 million increase—taxes. We are very proud to be the party that will be implementing on 1 January a massive reduction in payroll tax here in South Australia. Those opposite always argue, 'Where are you going to find the money?' Well, let me tell you.

Ms Cook: Housing Trust rent.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let me tell you what has happened.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Service SA closures.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There has been a massive rebound in confidence in the South Australian economy. This is only good for receipts going forward, and every day that we are in here we will be doing everything we can to stimulate economic activity and to create jobs in our state.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale and the member for Lee are warned. The member for Lee has the call.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:42): I have a supplementary to the Premier. Can the Premier guarantee that under the commonwealth's proposed changes to GST distributions South Australia will not be worse off beyond the transition period, which ends in 2026-27?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:42): I am sure, as the honourable member would know, the federal government has announced that there will be a review prior to 2027. We don't know what the outcome is going to be, so of course we can't provide that guarantee.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:42): A further supplementary, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Last supplementary, member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: If the Premier cannot guarantee to the house, can he inform the house whether he has sought an assurance from the commonwealth that beyond the transition period, ending in the financial year 2026-27, South Australia will receive at least as much GST under the proposed changes as it does under the current regime?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:43): I understand the question and, as I was outlining to the house, we made it very, very clear to the people of South Australia in the lead-up to the election that we wouldn't support anything whatsoever that would diminish the GST take for our state. This will remain a constant: we will not support anything that diminishes the GST take to South Australia.

By contrast, I didn't hear anything from those opposite when they were in government, when their federal leader was getting on the plane, heading over to Western Australia, saying, 'This is a completely unfair situation on the people of Western Australia.' You can't have it both ways. If the ALP want to argue for more money going to Western Australia, what was their argument for South Australia?

We didn't hear Bill Shorten coming over here saying, 'I will give you guys an ironclad guarantee.' We didn't hear the treasurer or the premier at the time saying, 'Listen, we need to get some clarification.' We made our position very clear: we would not support any single, solitary thing that diminished the GST take. That will be the same this year, next year, in 2027 and beyond.

SKILLS TRAINING

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Industry and Skills. Can the minister update the house—

Ms Hildyard: Is it about Service SA?

Ms LUETHEN: —on what the state government is doing to grow skills and innovation across our state?

The SPEAKER: The member Reynell is on two warnings and continues to interject. If she keeps going, she will be departing the chamber today. The Minister for Industry and Skills has the call.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (14:44): I thank the member for King, not just for the question but for her advocacy for her electorate and her interest in the future—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —for young people—

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay and member for Kaurna are called to order.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —in the electorate of King. There has been a change in skills planning—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: There has been a change in skills planning here in South Australia since the election. Prior to the election, we know that in the last five years of the previous Labor government there was a 66 per cent drop off in the number of commencements in apprentices and trainees here in South Australia. But we have been out there since being elected talking to industry, engaging industry, asking them what they need. What do they need to employ South Australians? What skills are they lacking that we can help them develop to deliver job opportunities here in South Australia?

I am pleased to announce, after consultation with the Australian Industry Group, we have developed a brand-new apprenticeship. It may not be widely known in circles, but I was an apprentice once and so I am very excited about this news. The Training and Skills Commission has approved a diploma of applied technologies and it will be added to the Traineeship and Apprenticeship—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —Pathways Schedule from next year. The Marshall government will add it to the Subsidised Training List in 2019. The Diploma of Applied Technologies will address the need for higher level vocational skills in defence and manufacturing—the very industries that are delivering opportunities here in South Australia. There is no doubt that we need to increase the number of skills here in South Australia for the new economy that is arriving, particularly through the defence industry and the higher and advanced manufacturing that we have.

We suspect that the new Higher Apprenticeships Program will generate 100 engineering technician partnerships over the next four years. I have to thank the Training and Skills Commission for the work that they have been doing with the Ai Group, where they have brought together universities, training packages and industrial instruments to deliver a brand-new apprenticeship into South Australia to meet those needs. It will be focusing on emerging technologies, things such as

mechanical engineering trades that will be needed for the study of robotic systems, cloud-based data and computer-aided design tools.

This is very exciting for South Australia. This is a strong message to those businesses that want to participate in the massive opportunity that has been given to South Australia by Canberra. If they want to participate in that shipbuilding, they must come to South Australia because we will have the workforce trained in order to deliver the skills that they need.

RENEWAL SA

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:47): My question is to the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney-General ask the Crown Solicitor to provide her with legal advice regarding whether she personally had committed a criminal offence? With your leave and that of the house, I will explain. Yesterday, in the house I asked the Attorney-General and in response to a question she said, and I quote:

... I obtained legal advice—and the member for West Torrens is well aware of that—from the Crown Solicitor's Office. It has not been disclosed for obvious reasons. I have read it. I have taken the advice, and I am satisfied that I am not in breach of any part of the act.

The SPEAKER: The question is within order. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:48): I thank the member for West Torrens for the question. I think I made it clear yesterday that I had sought advice from the Crown Solicitor's Office. That, as the member for West Torrens knows, followed his presentation to the Crown Solicitor requesting that the Crown Solicitor undertake an inquiry in relation to the events surrounding this matter.

I don't know whether the member for West Torrens had forgotten that he had lost office in March 2018 or not but, as I think was clearly pointed out to him, the Crown Solicitor's Office actually works for the government and therefore it's not an agency which is responsible to the other individual members of parliament: it is actually the solicitor for the government. The member for West Torrens is not in the government, thank goodness. I think that he will have received correspondence from the Crown Solicitor advising him that that was not within the remit of the Crown Solicitor; indeed, he was responsible to the new government.

Accordingly, I requested that he look at the question in respect of the applicability of the ICAC Act in relation to all the circumstances surrounding the events of the previous week. I have received that report. I have read it and I am satisfied, in respect of the question that I have been asked, that I am not in breach of the ICAC Act.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is on two warnings. Do you have a further question?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Yes, I do.

The SPEAKER: You have the call.

RENEWAL SA

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:50): My question is to the Attorney-General. Why did the Attorney-General place the Crown in the position of having to provide legal advice from both the perspective of the prosecution and the defence, given the Crown is responsible for prosecutions in South Australia?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: that contained an enormous amount of argument and is in breach of standing order 97.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The member for Hammond has the call.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:51): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members will cease interjecting, please, or they will be departing the chamber. Member for Hammond.

Mr PEDERICK: Can the minister update the house on the Marshall government's \$5 million Project Renew for CFS station upgrades?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his question. I know he is very interested in this and he has a great commitment to the emergency services in his community. It is with pleasure that I can update the house on the Marshall Liberal government's Project Renew, which is a \$5 million commitment.

We are investing in our CFS stations across South Australia with dedicated funding for station facility upgrades and maintenance, making our stations safer. We know over the past decade or more they have been left to deteriorate and we want to make a difference. The CFS has established a project steering committee to take the lead on assessing, approving and managing the maintenance of these projects.

There were 425 CFS brigades approached to submit projects. As suggestions came from across South Australia, they were submitted to the steering committee for assessment and approval. The steering committee met in August and assessed the round 1 proposals. I am pleased to inform the house that 125 projects have been approved, with an approximate value of \$2.5 million to be spent in this financial year.

We have a number of projects hitting the ground already, and the member for Hammond will be suitably pleased to hear that many will impact his local community. These include upgrades at Geranium, Callington, Pinnaroo and also the Murray Bridge stations, as well as over \$20,000 for the Mypolonga brigade, enabling them to fix their roller door and complete some external painting on their operations.

Project Renew is being delivered concurrently with the SACFS annual capital program. Necessary approvals have already been achieved for the capital program and building is prescheduled with supplies. During the 2018-19 financial year, there are six planned new stations, and they have been approved to be built from capital funding in addition to Project Renew.

Again, for the member for Hammond, the six new stations are expected to be delivered at Piccadilly, Tailem Bend, which he will be very happy about, Tarlee, Mount Burr, Woolumbool and western districts on Kangaroo Island, which will keep the Attorney happy as well.

An honourable member: Warrnambool?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Woolumbool. You wouldn't know where that is in the country; you guys probably haven't been to the regions. You should go and check it out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kaurana is warned.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It's amazing, 16 years—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and they don't know where the regions are. We start looking after the regions and they start making some noise. It's fantastic.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond will depart for half an hour.

The honourable member for Hammond having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I can say that the member for Flinders will be pleased to know that the Cleve brigade will receive funding which will enable them to replace their electrical board and install safety switches—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier will not interject.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and the Wudinna brigade will receive \$8,000 to install a new generator that has been kindly donated by the Wudinna council.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell can join the member for Hammond. Half an hour, thank you.

The honourable member for Reynell having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Great news for the member for Flinders. Sad to see the member for Reynell go again, two days in a row. That is disappointing for her. Many of the additional projects submitted by brigades require complex management as they involve—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will not interject.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —building extensions, work, health and safety components—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —asbestos removal and council approval. The Marshall Liberal government is proud to be investing in our Country Fire Service, improving safety for our volunteers and upgrading stations in which they operate. Many of the CFS stations have been left to deteriorate under the previous Labor government, with basic improvements lagging behind.

The \$5 million Project Renew is in addition to the additional resources the Marshall Liberal government is investing in our CFS aerial capabilities this summer, resulting in an unprecedented level of aerial surveillance, which is fantastic. Of course, we have gone from three zones to four. The West Coast, now the Mid North at Hoyleton, the Adelaide Hills and the South-East will be the basis for that aerial coverage. That is wonderful news for the good people and the volunteers of the CFS.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is warned for a second and final time. The member for West Torrens has the call.

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:55): My question is to the Attorney-General. Why did the Attorney-General tell the house and the public that the legal opinion that the Attorney-General relied upon to compensate Henry Keogh with the sum of \$2.75 million was the Wells and Doyle opinion provided to the former government, when the Auditor-General, in his annual report, tells the house the Attorney-General relied on a second piece of advice commissioned in May 2018?

The SPEAKER: Again, that question has several elements. I will expect a broad answer from the Attorney-General.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:56): I am happy to answer what I think the member for West Torrens is getting at. Let me be clear, at all times the government relied on the submissions presented by correspondence representing Mr Keogh, the Wells and Doyle opinion, which has been referred to, which was actually dated in yesterday's Auditor-

General's Report, together with further opinion that was obtained after the change of government. We have made that position very clear.

If the member for West Torrens has a look at, I think, page 18 in the Auditor-General's Report—and I am happy to check that—it is referred to in both the Executive Summary and in Part B. He refers to the date in May of the second set of opinion which, for the first time that I know of, has actually been identified as the date, but we have at all times said, 'Further legal opinion obtained after the change of government and after the election.'

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:57): Supplementary: can the Attorney-General provide the house with the dates when she made those remarks to the house?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:57): I am happy to go back and trawl through the *Hansard* to identify that, but I have made it very clear all the way through. This is why the member for West Torrens' rather obtuse contribution in relation to this matter always gets it so wrong, because he kept—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens can leave for half an hour. It's a great movie, but it is completely inappropriate. Please leave quietly.

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —maintaining this idea that if the new government only had the material that was available to them that had been available to the former government, that in some way there would be an error in the determination to make a decision to settle the Keogh claim. As we repeatedly advised the public and the opposition, further correspondence and further opinion had been received. This was repeatedly asked for by the opposition. We confirmed that wasn't available. I am very pleased that the Auditor-General has confirmed the second date in his report of the second lot of opinion that was received. It confirms what we have always said. I appreciate his review of the matter and his assessment. All members of parliament will note that the Auditor-General reports without blemish.

MOUNT GAMBIER FRINGE FESTIVAL

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:58): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that the South Australian government will show support for arts in regional South Australia by contributing funds to the 2019 Mount Gambier Fringe Festival?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:59): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question. The people of Mount Gambier enjoy a very vibrant arts community. I was down in Mount Gambier earlier this year for the Generations in Jazz, which was, in fact, the first time that I had been at that event. It is certainly one which is extraordinary in the inspiration it provides for our students to be playing alongside some of the world's greats. I commend the member for Mount Gambier for his advocacy of that great event.

In recent times, we have had the Fringe moving just outside metropolitan Adelaide, with the Fringe on Tour caravan. I know that the Fringe on Tour has been to Kangaroo Island—I see the member for Mawson get pretty excited—and Whyalla. The member for Hughes—Giles, sorry. We might rename the seat; it depends on how well he does. We will just see. We will keep it as Giles for the time, if you don't mind—is also excited. I think also the member for Stuart enjoys the Fringe on Tour going to Port Augusta and, of course, Mount Gambier. As for specific funding, I am very pleased to receive that question, and I will come back to the member as quickly as possible with an answer.

RECREATIONAL FISHERS

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall government is supporting recreational fishers?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:00): Yes, I can. I thank the member for Flinders for his very important question.

He is a very, very strong advocate for one of the most important fishing sectors in the country over at Port Lincoln and surrounding areas. As the member for Flinders has rightly pointed out, the recreational fishing sector here in South Australia is a very important industry, and the Marshall Liberal government is delivering on another election commitment by giving better representation to the rec fishing sector.

We have announced a consultation period, from 31 August to 21 September, on a proposed model for the ministerial recreational fishing advisory council. What I can say is that we had 225 submissions to the advisory council and overwhelming support for the proposal to have an advisory council to me as the minister. Because of its support, we are now moving towards delivering on that model. The council will directly engage with me as minister on the big picture recreational fishing issues.

Sir, I know that you know, as an avid recreational fisher—as many are here in this chamber—that it's important that we have good representation on behalf of the 277,000 recreational fishers here in South Australia to acknowledge the importance of the industry and also to look at the policy settings. The council will be made up of nine people. There will be five individuals on the council with recreational fishers from the public who nominate, and these five people will be voted in by South Australian recreational fishers.

This is a first in Australia, giving recreational fishers the opportunity to vote and also to be a part of this advisory council. If you are a resident of South Australia and enjoy recreational fishing, you will be able to vote. As I said, of the five individual positions—a tackle shop owner, an inland fisher—there will be at least one female recreational fisher on the advisory council and hopefully more.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: I urge all recreational fishers to consider who they think would be best as a representative of their areas. Nominations for those individual members will open shortly. Four organisations will be represented and, as was previously noted during the election, RecFish SA, FishinSA, South Australian Fishing Alliance and RecfishCENTRAL will be able to nominate three people from those organisations. There must be at least one woman on each of those organisations who is nominated, so I think it's a very fair representation for a very important sector. Regarding the consultation results, 75 per cent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —of supporters said the process was first class, 80 per cent supported the nomination process and 82 per cent supported the voting process. Our consultation shows that recreational fishers are excited about a Marshall government's better representation for the recreational fishing sector here in South Australia.

I think it is really, really important that we are giving recreational fishers in South Australia the opportunity to work with government to better represent a sector that is critically important not only for the economy but for the wellbeing of those recreational fishers to fish sustainably, making sure that they have a voice to government and that when we are making policy settings they are good, driven policy settings on behalf of the 277,000 recreational fishers.

Grievance Debate

TAYLOR ELECTORATE

Mr GEE (Taylor) (15:05): I rise today to speak about members of our community who are often forgotten by many people. I am talking about people with disabilities and their carers. Currently, in my community many residents are experiencing issues through the NDIS delays and lack of accessible services, facilities and general isolation. The NDIS was initiated by two strong Labor women, Julia Gillard and Jenny Macklin, and thankfully it has been supported by subsequent state and federal governments; unfortunately, it is not without its problems.

I hear regularly from constituents who face numerous issues with the agency, service providers and the process in general. I have reports from clients who are forced to wait an excessive amount of time for new wheelchairs and a range of other equipment for growing children, such as noise-cancelling headphones to assist autistic children, and from people with plans that do not fit their needs. These cases are not unusual, and it is not acceptable when this scheme promised so much for our people in Australia.

The state and federal ministers for social services need to sort out the problems with the NDIS to make it as good as it should be. I have been advised that it is not a funding shortfall causing all the problems, but system and process issues that need to be resolved. More action needs to be taken to deliver infrastructure and facilities that are friendly and safe for people of all abilities in Playford, Salisbury and the Adelaide Plains council areas.

There are up to 40 bus shelters in the City of Playford alone that are not disability friendly. It is not that difficult to design a bus shelter that gives a person in a wheelchair the opportunity to be sheltered. We need more bus stops with bus shelters and access pads. Having a concrete pad from which to enter a bus may not be a big deal to most people, but it is for people with a disability, especially during winter or when we have wet weather like we have experienced this week.

Footpaths can also be a major issue for people of all abilities. Cracked and undulating footpaths on council and private land across my electorate are one of the most complained about issues from the community. Residents want more disability-friendly facilities, including accessible play equipment and fenced play spaces for children with autism, in local parks and reserves, including Fremont and Stebonheath parks.

Local parents want to see the installation of a Changing Places disability toilet, including a hoist and change table at Fremont Park. I recently toured the new facilities for people with a disability, parents and the public at the Elizabeth shopping centre, and I really want to acknowledge the design work used to make these facilities accessible to all.

I am a strong believer that people with disabilities, whether physical, mental or psychological in nature, have a right to live as full and as happy a life as possible. It is important that we include people with disabilities whenever possible. I have been informed many times that people with special needs feel isolated, alone and excluded and that we need to provide support to people who have accessibility issues by ensuring that the latest infrastructure design methods are used to make sure people with disabilities are not left out.

I have come to know a local disability advocate whose name is Cathy. She is constantly working to improve the lives of people with a disability. Cathy has a lovely six-year-old daughter, Meisha, who is in a wheelchair, so Cathy has firsthand experience when it comes to the challenges that people with disabilities and their carers face every day. It is important to remember that not everyone with a disability has an aid or looks disabled.

I am concerned that the federal government has cut funding in South Australia to the Royal Society for the Blind's braille services and is redirecting that money interstate. I was also disappointed to see the Disability Justice specialist training grant discontinued in the recent state budget. We are hoping that we are not going to see this government make further cuts to programs assisting people with a disability.

I was pleased to see the Prime Minister announce additional resources for Headspace on the weekend to assist young people under 25 with mental health issues. I want to acknowledge the work of carers during this Carers Week, and thank them for their hard work in caring for loved ones and special people across our community. I congratulate Maria and her team at Northern Carers Network on their 40th anniversary this year.

MARY POTTER HOSPICE

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:10): I rise today to speak on the new Mary Potter Hospice family room, which was officially opened on Friday 21 September at the Ardrossan Community Hospital and which I was honoured to attend.

In collaboration with the Mary Potter Hospice Foundation, and substantial donations from community members and organisations, this stunning and incredibly important new facility was made

a reality. It was an exceptionally well-attended opening held in the hospital's entrance car park. Patients past and present, locals, staff and board members filled the area to hear board chairperson, Doug Barton, lead formalities, with director of nursing, Jodie Luke, assisting with presentations and giving a truly heartfelt speech thanking all who had assisted in one way or another to make this family room possible.

During the service, I was both moved and amazed to hear of the incredible community spirit behind the hospital itself. In just one of many examples spoken of at the service, the local ladies guild alone raise and donate more than \$70,000 per annum to the Ardrossan Community Hospital—a truly outstanding achievement by a devoted group of country women.

The family room was built and finished by local trades. The room consists of a kitchenette, dining table, TV and lounge area suitable for a couple, family or group. There is also a private entry to an outdoor table setting in the gardens, which are remarkably well maintained by maintenance staff and wonderful volunteers. Skylights let in an abundance of natural light, which truly completes the cosy, modern country-home ambience.

The opening was incredibly moving for many reasons. There were staff who have devoted their longstanding careers to the hospice, family and friends of loved ones who had shared their final moments at the hospital, and family members of those who have left their incredible touch on this remarkable place. One of those families was the Linkes, who were there to represent Letitia, the exceptionally talented interior designer behind the new family room. What makes Letitia Linke so outstanding is that she was not only the remarkable stylist behind this new facility but incredibly well known in this tight-knit community for her fierce advocacy for health research and fundraising, and for whom I am proud to stand and speak of today.

Letitia, a local community member who lived not far from Ardrossan on a farming property with husband, Paul, and sons Tom and Ollie, was diagnosed with ovarian cancer in 2014 at just a young 34 years of age. During her battle with the insidious disease, Letitia was passionate, brave and resilient in her mission to educate women about the signs and symptoms of this disease. She was proudly an Ovarian Cancer Research Foundation ambassador, a Witchery White Shirt Campaign ambassador, and was the event organiser for the successful Silver Style Adelaide events, which raised substantial funds towards the Ovarian Cancer Research Foundation.

Through her relentless work, Letitia raised over \$100,000 towards research, with her aspiration that one day there will be an early detection test and better treatments for this disease. Sadly, on Wednesday 1 August 2018, Letitia lost her battle with this disease. Her extraordinary legacy will certainly live on in our community, and at the opening, Letitia—who contributed significantly to the success of this room—was remembered with a plaque unveiled by her husband, Paul.

The Ardrossan hospital and community at large are truly blessed to have this wonderful room to remember such an inspiring woman. Attending this event only reiterated to me the exceptional staff, community and volunteers behind this wonderful hospital who, through their relentless hard work, have kept its doors open.

For 16 years, regional health care was significantly neglected, resulting in many closures of hospitals around the state. The Ardrossan hospital is no exception, having their funding withdrawn by the previous Labor government. I was incredibly pleased that the Marshall Liberal government has rewarded this fantastic facility with a commitment of \$720,000 over four years from the state budget. Well done and congratulations to the director of nursing, Jodie Luke, board members and the many community trades, donors and volunteers who contributed to making this room a reality.

I would also like to quickly acknowledge the town of Ardrossan, which was recently announced as the overall winner of the 2018 KESAB Sustainable Communities Award, proving yet again what an exceptional community we have within the electorate of Narungga.

MINING INDUSTRY

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:15): I rise today to talk about some of the results of the latest budget, and to express some serious concern, especially in relation to regional South Australia and the mining industry in that area. As a Labor government, we had a proud record of supporting the

mining industry in South Australia. In fact, in 2004 we introduced the Plan for Accelerating Exploration (PACE), which I believe all objective and fair commentators would indicate was an incredibly successful program.

The reason for introducing that program was the particular geology of South Australia. Unlike Western Australia and some of the other states, we do not have the benefit of significant outcropping in South Australia. We have a layer of sedimentary rock, so exploration efforts are a lot harder in this state than elsewhere, and the PACE program was one way of addressing that. So from 2004 until this latest budget, South Australia assisted the mining sector when it came to exploration activity in this state.

The benefits have been enormous. The return on public money through that investment was an additional \$2.4 billion of mining revenue in South Australia—by any measure a highly successful program—so it was incredibly disturbing to see the program cut in this latest budget. The South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy was certainly not happy about that cut to what was an outstanding program.

I come from a mining community, a community that was built on mining through the iron ore wealth in the Middleback Ranges. I also serve a number of other mining communities in the state, including Roxby Downs, which is dependent upon the Olympic Dam resource. In my electorate there is also one of those examples of the success of the PACE program with Carrapateena, where there was direct government investment in the drilling program with a small explorer.

As result of that, the largest untapped copper resource in Australia was discovered, leading to the development of a \$916 million mine. In the long term this will employ something like 500 people in the north of regional South Australia. Those sorts of discoveries are now going to be much harder. They will be pushed off into the future or they might not occur at all as a result of the very negative initiative taken by this Liberal government in its latest budget.

I know some members opposite have issues with mining, especially when it comes to agricultural areas of the state, and there is sometimes legitimate conflict that needs to be resolved. However, we should never retreat from the overall proposition we should all entertain; that is, what will be the long-term net benefit to the state, recognising that sometimes some people in some areas, highly localised areas, might have to make a sacrifice? Those people should be more than adequately compensated for the hit they are taking for the rest of the state.

Mining is incredibly important to the future of our state. I call upon the Liberal government at the half-year budget review to reintroduce PACE because it was such a successful program. There is a lot more out there to be discovered when it comes to mineral resources in South Australia, not just in the arid and semi-arid parts of the state, but also in some of our richer agricultural areas. If you look down on Eyre Peninsula, if Iron Road ever gets off the ground, it would have a massive impact in the communities around Eyre Peninsula. So, it will be interesting to see how the Liberal Party resolves its conflict between agriculture and mining.

Time expired.

MOUNT GAMBIER FRINGE FESTIVAL

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:20): I rise to talk about the Fringe in Mount Gambier. In 2017, Mount Gambier hosted its first Fringe Festival. This year the festival attracted over 13,000 participants. A major source of funding for this event was provided by the previous Labor state government. I raised these matters in a letter I wrote on 22 August this year to the Premier and I cc'd the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment:

The organisers of the event have done an outstanding job delivering a vibrant festival for regional South Australians. Preparations are already underway for a bigger and better event for 2019 but the committee has been hampered by concerns around funding commitments. A vibrant Arts scene is immensely important to regional communities and also gives South Australian artists an opportunity to showcase their talents to a wider audience.

To ensure the continued growth and success of this event and the promotion of arts in regional South Australia, I seek the support of the current Liberal government. As of today's date, I have not received a reply to my letter, hence my question today in question time. I would like to now read from a letter by the ambassador of the Fringe Mount Gambier, Louise Adams. It is a letter she has put together

in promoting the Fringe Festival to sponsors and interested parties. Louise Adams, some might remember, was a finalist on *The X Factor*. These are her words:

The Fringe Festival in Mount Gambier is a cultural exploration that embraces acceptance and diversity. It gives agency to artists to be bold and present edgy, quirky art that is fun, entertaining and reflective of who we are as a community. The Fringe also gives licence to audiences to be brave and prompts reassurance that it's okay for a child-like curiosity to come out and play.

The Vision—next 3 years: Fringe Mount Gambier has been adopted with open arms by our community, artists and local businesses in its first 2 years, growing with excitement each year! Starting off as the regional little sister of Adelaide's Fringe, the largest Arts Festival in the Southern Hemisphere, Fringe Mount Gambier is quickly developing its own style and will proudly become our own. We envisage in the next 3 years, our Festival will be a prominent feature on our Region's calendar, attracting artists and visitors near and far!

With a blend of grass roots development (the 'Send ME To Fringe' initiative) together with focus on becoming a world class Festival for visiting artists, Australian and International; Fringe Mount Gambier has great potential to foster art experiences that are bold, daring and brave. All amongst the backdrop of our beautiful volcanic location.

We envisage a regional community proud of their annual Fringe Festival; where children grow with access to a Festival to enjoy not only as an audience, but also to participate in and develop their creativity. Our Festival will reach all ages, from youngest to oldest. Art is a communication that should be available to all. Fringe Mount Gambier will be that.

A Festival that provides countless benefits; a vibrant arts and cultural environment increases activity, including economic, and connection within the community. Young people and families want to live in vibrant towns/cities; more artistic creativity visiting our town, coupled with fostering homegrown talent, means Mount Gambier becomes a key location to live and visit.

Mount Gambier is half way between Melbourne and Adelaide, it is the epicentre of the wider South East SA and South West Victoria region (SESW). A major brand partner of Fringe Mount Gambier will get a unique opportunity for exposure not just in the SESW region but also through the expansive Adelaide Fringe Guide / Website distribution and Arts community around Australia.

We are—and I am as the local member—wanting that partner to be the South Australian government. Louise Adams concludes:

Fringe Mount Gambier brings Art to all! A Festival that brings Connection, Communication and Community through Art and cultural development, enhancing the attributes in a regional community with a strong and proud history, but an even more exciting and prosperous future.

We may be the little sister now, but the future is unlimited if we grow together!

KING ELECTORATE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:25): I rise today to talk about a few key events that I have had the pleasure of attending recently in my electorate of King. On 16 September, I had the privilege to attend, with the Hon. Dennis Hood from the other house, the opening night of the Hope Chapel Church in Greenwith, within my electorate of King.

Hope Chapel Church first opened their doors at their Gawler site in 2010, and I am excited to say that they have now expanded within my electorate in Greenwith. It was a vibrant and encouraging service that was a privilege to be able to attend and watch. Key messages I heard during the service were about relationships, acceptance, value and belonging. It was an honour to be able to experience this opening with my local community and to celebrate the opening together on a Sunday evening.

In addition, on the same day I attended a fantastic community family event at the local Bridgestone Reserve at Salisbury South, with special guests, netballers Bianca and Carla from the TV show *The Block*. I posted a photo on Instagram which was quite funny, as these ladies are pretty much double my height. It was a pleasure to learn that Carla grew up in King, in Golden Grove, and had just started her first renovation when she decided to take part in *The Block*. She told me that she and Bianca had just retired from netball and were ready for a new challenge, something they thought would be fun and an opportunity of a lifetime. They said it was an incredibly competitive field to get selected for *The Block*.

The objective of this City of Salisbury event was to urge people in their local community to get back outdoors and discover what is around them under the Salisbury Plays initiative. This initiative is something that I am deeply passionate about because it gives people a chance to get

outside and discover all that our local community has to offer. It is important to thank Bridgestone Tyres, which donated a very large parcel of land to council for development as a formal sport and recreation facility, which is still under development. As a local member of parliament, it was such a privilege to be able to attend this important local community event along with my family.

Another highlight from September was the 60th wedding anniversary of Flora and Giusto Centanni. This is a massive milestone and achievement for the couple, who got married back in 1958 and then moved to the United Kingdom, before moving to Australia in 1993. During their 60 years of marriage, the couple have had three sons Tino, Maurice and Osvaldo, along with five grandchildren and eight great-grandchildren. This is a massive milestone for the couple, and I was delighted to have the privilege to be able to celebrate with them in Parliament House on 18 September 2018.

In addition, I would once again like to thank my local King community who have stopped to share their feedback, concerns and views at my listening post every Monday from 9.30 to 10.30 at the local Zitto Cafe in the Grove shopping centre. This is a wonderful opportunity for me to not only get to know and connect with my local residents as a member of parliament but also speak with them directly and in person and listen to their concerns. Talking to my local King residents directly is something I believe is my most important role as a member of parliament.

Since the state budget, it has been really useful to help communicate the many positive budget outcomes for those living in King, with health a crucial investment in this budget. It has also given me the opportunity to gather detailed feedback about the precise impacts on my community members of the proposed closure of Service SA Modbury.

Once again, I encourage anyone with concerns about this change to contact me directly so that I can accurately understand the needs of my community, and I will advocate for the continuation of service delivery. For the next couple of months, these coffee catch-ups will be held in Golden Grove, and then I will move around to different parts of the King electorate over the next three years. Mr Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to talk about some of the key events and milestones in my King electorate to date.

HYDE, DR J.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:30): It is fitting to speak about Jim Hyde, a former librarian in this place, where decisions that affect South Australia and South Australians are made. Before the legislation and policy comes to the floor, the work of policymaking, legislative drafting and negotiation occurs outside the chamber, and that is where Jim Hyde made an important and powerful contribution. As a researcher and policymaker, Jim was driven by his unwavering commitment to equality, fairness and justice and a strong belief in the value and purpose of community.

Jim's childhood and formative years in various country towns in South Australia were critical in developing a strong sense of community and a capacity to talk to anyone, anytime, anywhere about anything with ease, good humour and genuine interest. His involvement in politics and policymaking, from student politics to senior levels of government and administration, was shaped by these values.

As an advocate for gay and lesbian rights, he was an activist against criminalisation when outspoken, public visibility was dangerous and came at a high personal cost. As a member of the University of Adelaide Council and the board of the Centre for Aboriginal Studies in Music, he helped to bring Aboriginal culture, art and social issues into the consciousness of educators and decision-makers while dismantling barriers to access. He was an influential founding member of the Graham F. Smith Peace Trust.

In federal politics, he ensured that policies on employment and education were integrated with other areas of policy and decision-making, especially health, Aboriginal affairs, child care, equal opportunity, the arts and youth affairs. Supporting access to education for people from non-traditional backgrounds was a priority, as Jim advocated access and support for remote and rural students, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students and socially disadvantaged young people. Peter Duncan cannot be here today but wants to add a personal message:

Jim was flamboyant, exuberant, passionate, compassionate. For those of us who knew, worked with and loved Jim, those words will resonate. He touched us all. His love for his family—his daughters Alice and Sophie and partner Glen—was beyond measure. Time factors require a brevity today which would have been completely foreign

to Jim. He worked for me and with me for the whole of the 13 years that I served in the Australian parliament. He was everything from electorate officer to campaign manager to senior private secretary when I was a minister. His capacity for inspired hard work knew no bounds.

He was gay proud and out of the closet in the 1980s when it was rare to find openly gay people in public life, except in the ABC. Jim successfully stood for parliament preselection for the Senate and in doing so kicked the door open for other gay people who have successfully sought preselection by the ALP and subsequently served in the parliaments. The Labor Party and the wider society are poorer for not having taken the opportunity to use his talents. Of course, Jim worked in many other capacities and causes too numerous to mention here. But underlying his lifework was his caring, compassion and love. Farewell, Jim. In the words of the now not so recent song, 'You shook us all night long.'

That is the end of Peter's message. Jim's pioneering work on HIV and AIDS policy and legislation in South Australia and Victoria helped to develop enlightened and compassionate approaches at a time when understanding was poor and prejudice was widespread. His commitment contributed to reduced incidence of illness, better treatment options and more sensitive community responses. He continued his work in the field of public health administration and public health policy, always combining concern for the individual with an evidence-based approach that considered wide population effects and the need for adequate resources.

Jim had a prodigious work ethic, energised by endless curiosity and interest in people. While his politics and policymaking were based on facts and careful research, he loved the gossip and drama of politics. His sense of fun and playfulness and willingness to engage in intellectual rather than personal argument ensured that policy discussions and meetings were lively and entertaining. Jim's public activism was balanced by deep loyalty to his family and friends. His kindness and generosity were prolific, and his political convictions were reflected in his capacity to support people who needed help or found themselves in difficulty.

For me, Jim was a mentor and, very soon after, a wonderful friend. His was a sharp intellect, blended with astute observation and a legendary reluctance to hold back, combined with a caring, funny side, making him a treasured friend. We had fun—no-one will forget the direct-mail marathons and the first folding and stuffing machine in South Australia—and we shared many adventures to some exotic places like Langkawi and New Orleans. Jim was campaign manager in situ for my amazing win in 1997 and later, in absentia, he was present in every Florey campaign.

For so many of Jim's South Australian fan club, here to honour him today and those who could not be here, Jim was a force and presence in our lives, our personal lives and working lives, for some cases years and often decades. Vale, Jim. Along with your family, all your friends share the grief and sorrow of your passing and we will always remember you.

Bills

FAIR TRADING (GIFT CARDS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendment indicated by the following schedule, to which amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 4, page 3, after line 30—Insert:

45E—Review of Part

- (1) The Minister must cause a review of the operation of this Part to be conducted not before 18 months, and not later than 2 years, following the commencement of this Part.
- (2) The review must be completed, and a report on the results of the review provided to the Minister, within 3 years following the commencement of this Part.
- (3) The Minister must, within 12 sitting days after receipt of the report, cause copies of the report to be laid before each House of Parliament.

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be agreed to.

It is with pleasure that we receive the Fair Trading (Gift Cards) Amendment Bill 2018 with an amendment from the Legislative Council. Essentially, this is to provide for a review of this new type of legislation. It is pioneering in South Australia. We are happy to accept the amendment.

I am pleased to say that we have even had a letter of compliment from a federal minister because there has been some discussion at the national level to provide some harmonised law in relation to this area across the nation, but we got a bit impatient here—we wanted to get on with it. We are very pleased that this has occurred and we welcome the consideration, with the amendment, by those in the other place.

Mr PICTON: Very quickly, I signal the opposition's support and note that we support that the Legislative Council has introduced a review clause, which we think is appropriate.

Motion carried.

LATE PAYMENT OF GOVERNMENT DEBTS (INTEREST) (AUTOMATIC PAYMENT OF INTEREST) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 September 2018.)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:38): I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition on the bill. This is a good initiative of the new government that makes a series of minor changes to improve the regime by which the state government is required to pay interest to businesses that have had an invoice sitting with government for a period of time that has not yet been paid and not been paid within the due date.

The regime to pay interest on overdue invoices was introduced by the former Labor government, but it was introduced in a manner in which the company or the organisation that had the outstanding invoice yet to be paid by government had to apply to the government for the additional interest to be paid as well as the invoice itself. I think we can all be honest—I am sure those opposite will be very honest—in saying that this certainly led to the situation where few people made applications for interest to be paid on top of their invoices and that may have been for a range of reasons.

For smaller invoices, or for invoices that had sat unpaid for only a relatively brief period beyond the due date, the amount of interest that the company or the organisation might have been entitled to was perhaps only very small and not worth the bother of putting in an application for the interest to be paid as well as the amount on the invoice, or it might be perhaps something a bit more concerning. Certainly, this is part of the rationale of the Treasurer in the other place who has introduced this bill; that is, an organisation or a company may not feel confident in making that application for interest to be paid because they are worried about any potential repercussions from an agency that would then be forced to pay that interest.

When I say 'repercussions', it may be that they were a supplier of goods or services to an agency that may not perhaps be looked upon quite so favourably by a government agency if that organisation or company had to oblige the government agency to pay interest. While I would like to think that that sort of behaviour by officers within agencies related to procurement would be non-existent, or at least few and far between, I can understand why, in an often very competitive environment between suppliers to state government, that fear would exist amongst some agencies.

How to eradicate that fear amongst companies and organisations is obviously a broader problem that needs to be tackled at some point by government. I do not mean the government opposite, but just in terms of government doing business every day with private sector suppliers. That fear should not exist, but if that was a reason why applications were not being made for interest payments then that is regrettable.

To the government's credit, they have sought to lower the threshold for the amount of interest that can be paid, and I think that is also a positive thing. They have expanded the scope to cover all

businesses dealing with government, rather than just the limitation to small businesses, but they are limiting the application of the act to invoices with a value of \$1 million or less, which I think, on the face of it, can be justified for some types of procurement.

Certainly, in the areas of government procurement that I was responsible for superintending via the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, where there is quite a lot of either infrastructure works or building works, it is not unusual for built work to have to be inspected or certified before an invoice can rightly or justifiably be paid by a government agency. Sometimes that can lead to invoices—certainly for amounts in the many thousands, hundreds of thousands or even millions of dollars—not being paid within, say, 30 days or the due date because that inspection, compliance or certification activity has not occurred.

Quite often, there will be rectification works, which are required by a contractor who is performing work on behalf of the state government, particularly in the area of commercial construction or civil construction, to ensure that what the government has contracted for is indeed being delivered by the agency. In that regard, it is understandable that the government would seek to limit this regime to invoices for less than \$1 million.

However, of course, the flipside of that coin is that sometimes there will be occasions when goods or services have been provided, an invoice has been issued for an amount exceeding \$1 million, which could easily be processed without that certification activity, which I alluded to earlier, and it goes unpaid. That is, I think, a part of the bill and part of the regime that the government and, if not, the parliament will need to pay some attention to going forward.

Certainly, if it is the experience of the Small Business Commissioner that there are invoices for goods or services provided to government in excess of \$1 million, which should be able to access this regime and which are unable to access the regime, then that is something that will need to be reviewed in the future. One welcome part of this, as I mentioned earlier, is changing the earlier regime of interest being paid upon application to automatic payment, and that is positive.

Obviously there will be some issues that need to be attended to by procuring agencies to make sure that their systems and processes are able to enable that to occur. The regime—and I am sure I will not describe it completely accurately—where invoices received by government agencies are then transferred off to Shared Services South Australia for a payment, needs to ensure that that interaction between the agency procuring the goods or services and Shared Services can enable that to occur seamlessly and to occur within a short enough time period.

Unfortunately, from time to time there have been instances when payments have not been made to suppliers because reviewing invoices that have been submitted to government has not occurred in a timely manner. That is regrettable and it is a practice that unfortunately still continues to this day. This was not a practice that was confined to the former government: this is a practice that has continued into the life of this government.

While both the former government and the new government indicate in their accounts payable performance metrics that they are paying invoices by the due date in the proportion of the high 90 per cent range, clearly by definition that indicates that there are still 1 or 2 or 3 or more per cent of invoices that are not being paid by the due date in that time. Now, 1 or 2 or 3 per cent, and so on, does not seem to be a huge amount when expressed in that measure, but when you consider that the government spends several billion dollars a year on the procurement of goods and services, then you can easily see the quantum of money that those small percentages relate to.

Again, making the allowance for, perhaps, civil works or commercial construction works that may need to be certified, even making allowance for that, there are still many millions of dollars that are not being paid on time. The Auditor-General's reports for as long as I can remember, close to two decades now, have continued to lament that the accounts payable performance of government agencies is not as good as it could be.

Perhaps this government measure of introducing the automation of payment of interest can hasten the respective officers' attention to those invoices to certify that they are expected and correct and can be paid by Shared Services South Australia. Of course, some checks and balances are needed within this regime, and it is welcome that the government is also providing a specific role for

the Small Business Commissioner in providing that level of oversight and that level of scrutiny of how this regime will receive complaints from the private sector about how the regime is operating, or indeed not operating, in their interests.

I think it is terrific that the Liberal government and the Liberal Party in South Australia have done an about-face on the role of the Small Business Commissioner. When the former minister for small business, the member for West Torrens, introduced the legislation into this place to establish the Small Business Commissioner and the Office of the Small Business Commissioner, that legislation was opposed by the Liberal Party. It is good to see now that they have had a change of heart.

Although he does not get a specific mention in the bill, it is also good to see that the Liberal government has had a change of heart about the role of the Industry Advocate, whose office and position were established by the former Labor government to make sure that South Australian businesses and suppliers had the best possible opportunity to win work for themselves from the state government. Indeed, his work starts at the very beginning of an agency's intention to procure goods or services from the private sector, educating agencies as to how they can make sure that their tender processes, tender forms, paperwork and their requirements can best position South Australian small businesses to win work from the state government.

That work then continues on to assist those small businesses in vying for that work, becoming competitive from that work and making sure that the procurement requirements for the state government deliberately favour South Australian companies and, at different thresholds of procurement, different dollar values of procurement provide percentage weighting to tender evaluations to favour South Australian suppliers. That is really positive. Fortunately, the Industry Advocate, Mr Ian Nightingale, has these figures at his fingertips and, over the last five years, it has led to a substantial increase in the amount of work won by South Australian businesses.

It was lamentable that the Premier (member for Dunstan) threatened to abolish the position of the Industry Advocate in the lead-up to the 2014 election because he thought that he was not doing his job well enough. I think that dozens if not hundreds of South Australian businesses can attest to just how well Mr Nightingale is doing his job now. I am glad that the Liberal government has chosen to not only continue his employment but continue his key role in helping small business win South Australian work and put them in the position where they can be issuing invoices to the state government for goods or services rendered.

The Small Business Commissioner and the Industry Advocate are one of a number of measures the former Labor government implemented to benefit directly the small business community in South Australia. That includes a succession of payroll tax reforms over the course of more than 10 years, which now sees, every year, more than \$300 million less payroll tax being paid by South Australian businesses, which is terrific. That is \$300 million more that businesses have particularly to invest in their own businesses or to invest in more staff, both of which generate better economic outcomes and opportunities for South Australians.

Members on both sides would be aware that I praised the new Liberal government for committing to increase the tax-free threshold for payroll tax permanently to \$1.5 million. We think that is a good move. In fact, we thought it was such a good move that we called on them to do it a little bit earlier; we called on them to do it from 1 July this year. That meant there would have been an additional six months, or more than \$20 million worth, of payroll tax relief flowing, particularly to South Australian small businesses, which would help them even more than the measures included in this bill. Of course that was rejected, but we divided on it, so we now have a permanent record of all those members of the Liberal Party who voted against earlier payroll tax reform for the South Australian business community.

I note, although it perhaps might be borderline unparliamentary to talk about it, that that bill still has not passed the other place. None of us down here would be surprised by that, such is the glacial progress that can occur in the other place from time to time. In fact, I am led to believe that the whiff of burning dust could be smelled yesterday as the light bulbs were turned on for a late afternoon sitting in that other place—a rare occasion. However, that is a digression and I will move swiftly on.

It was not just payroll tax that I am pleased to report the former Labor government reformed significantly, but also land tax. Those with long memories—and I am looking at the member for Morialta—would recall that in the 1990s the land tax tax-free threshold was actually lowered by the now Treasurer, also the then treasurer, Mr Rob Lucas of the other place. It was lowered from \$90,000 down to \$50,000, capturing many thousands more landholdings for the purposes of issuing land tax bills for many years.

Of course, that was until the 2005 reforms of the former Labor government, which significantly increased the threshold, the first significant increase of the land tax tax-free threshold. That continued to increase, so that by March this year that \$50,000 tax-free threshold had become a \$363,000 tax-free threshold. Literally tens of thousands of South Australians properties are no longer liable for land tax.

Not only that, most of the rates and thresholds were reformed considerably, with lower rates in the dollar applying to different land valuations between that increased tax-free threshold and the highest tax-free threshold, which at the time was \$1 million and is now nearly \$1.2 million. That targeted land tax relief to those people who needed it most, and when I say 'those people' I mean South Australians, people who have invested in real estate. It is good to be joined by the Minister for Environment when we are talking about investing in real estate because he, amongst many others in this place, is one of those.

Thousands of South Australians have benefited from these land tax reforms. It has been a very Australian thing, and a very South Australian thing, where people have the capacity to buy a home and then pay it off as quickly as possible until there is perhaps the capacity to invest in another home, perhaps using that as a rental property or a holiday house or shack in one of the very many places in South Australia where it is attractive to spend time. Those land tax reforms implemented by the former Labor government have saved tens of thousands of landowners many thousands of dollars in land tax liabilities.

I will not talk too much more about land tax except to say, specifically about small business, that not only those who own land enjoy the benefit of those land tax cuts; people who are operating their small business from their principal place of residence also benefit from those land tax changes. For the first time, people could nominate to RevenueSA which proportion of their principal place of residence they were ostensibly using for the purpose of running a small business and, rather than being slugged land tax for the whole of the value of their principal place of residence, they were only being charged land tax for that proportion of their principal place of residence.

This massively reduced land tax liabilities for small businesses, particularly during the 2000s when land values were escalating sometimes by the double digits each year, and saved them significantly in tax bills to the state government. Of course, we have heard before I think somewhat magnanimously from the Treasurer in the other place, the Hon. Mr Lucas—and you will excuse me if I say we are not used to such 'magnanimousness'. I know that is not the word but I do not trust myself to pronounce the correct word.

Mr Odenwalder: Magnanimity.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: There we go. But he did recognise very early on in this term of this government that the WorkCover scheme was performing very well on an actuarial basis, that levy rates continued to be low and that there was no unfunded liability in the scheme. Those WorkCover reforms, on top of the \$300 million of payroll tax relief, on top of the \$200 million of land tax relief, are providing approximately a further \$200 million of tax relief to the small business community.

We are already at \$700 million a year of tax relief that has been provided to the business community here in South Australia, and I have not even gone into the \$250 million a year cut to stamp duty on commercial property transactions or the other smaller intergovernmental agreement taxes which were agreed to be abolished when the new GST was brought in from 2000 onwards. They were things like share duty, lease duty, rental duty, cheque duty, the bank account debits tax, the financial institutions duty, and I think—my memory is getting hazy now—the former Liberal government also reduced, I will not get the name right, the accommodation duty or the bed tax, which was applied up until the mid-1990s as well.

So this is many hundreds of millions of dollars of tax relief, as well as the introduction of a small business commissioner, as well as the introduction of the industry participation advocate, as well as the procurement policy reform, all of which are very positive for the small business community in South Australia. I note that I have received a fairly thorough briefing from the office of the Treasurer and from Treasury as this bill was introduced in the other place and, unless new matters come to light in the contribution of other members, I foreshadow a very swift if not instantaneous duration in the committee stage of this bill.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:03): I rise to commend the bill to the house. I have listened carefully to the member for Lee and welcome his acknowledgement that this is indeed a good initiative. It will not surprise the member for Lee that I intend to speak somewhat plainly about just how good an initiative this is and how practical and outcome-oriented it is.

May I take the opportunity to observe once again that this is business as usual for this new Marshall government. We are committed at an early stage to implement measures that are directed towards practical outcomes in the interests of South Australians, in the interests of people in business in South Australia and, particularly for the purposes of this bill, those in business with government. We on this side of the house are well aware that cash flow and efficient business engagement are golden, particularly for those in small business, but those in all kinds of enterprise which rely on the efficient payment of their bills. They should have that expectation no less so—indeed, all the more so—when dealing with government.

In the time I have available to speak about the bill, it is important that I trace the history of how we have come to this point as a new government. This initiative by the new government is one that was amply available to have been taken by the previous government at any stage over the previous four or more years since the 2013 act was introduced. The Late Payment of Government Debts (Interest) Act 2013, as it is somewhat virtuously named, was introduced by the previous government, I presume with the intent to send a message to those dealing with the government that the government was interested in making sure that they would be compensated for late payment by government, that the government was aware of their concerns and all the rest of it.

As the member for Lee has acknowledged, the regime that was put in place in 2013 by the previous government when enacting the virtuous sounding late payment act primarily involved a two-step criterion in order to access the so-called entitlement to receive interest on late payments. The first was that the relevant business had to go about establishing its credentials and bona fides as a small business, as defined in the act. Secondly, as has been addressed, as the act was first brought in, it then had to go about making its application for the interest that it was entitled to, according to the provisions of the act.

So, first, it had to establish that it was a small business, as defined, and, secondly, it had to go through the rigours of making an application, which involved sending a further invoice. As the member for Lee perhaps quite rightly observes, there might be all sorts of reasons—quite apart from the time that it takes, the resources and all the rest of it to go to the effort of sending a further invoice—that a business might be somewhat reluctant to do that and perhaps bring itself to the attention of the government agency that it was dealing with.

Nonetheless, the small business has to do those two things. That involves, on the one hand, the small business going to a whole lot of unnecessary trouble and, on the other hand, the government going to a whole lot of administrative burden to satisfy itself that the business was indeed a small business, as defined, and, secondly, that the application was appropriately prepared. Unsurprisingly, that resulted in almost nobody seeking to have the interest that they were entitled to paid to them because it was all a bit too difficult and potentially brought opprobrium on the poor small business involved that was entitled to the payment.

It gets better and more Orwellian that, though, because section 10 of the act, as it was enacted, required that the Treasurer report to parliament about how the act was progressing, and to do so within 18 months of it being enacted. Part of the reason that the Treasurer was required to report to parliament was that the bill as enacted actually contemplated a transition to the automation of these payments. The member for Lee will be well aware of that and no doubt very much welcomed the contemplated transition to automation under the previous act.

The act started out with a section 6(6)(a), which provided that the small business needed to apply for its interest and, if it jumped over all the necessary hurdles, then it might receive its interest payment. It further provided, in this section 6(b), that that was to be really a transitional arrangement until the Treasurer set a designated date, after which those interest payments would become automated.

So everybody waited, throughout the course of 2014 and through the first half of 2015, until the Treasurer duly reported to parliament. I commend the report of the previous treasurer, the member for West Torrens, for its Orwellian reading. I commend it to all honourable members. It is dated August 2015 and it is called 'Report for parliament—Late Payment of Government Debts (Interest) Act 2013—automated interest payment'.

It is only a short report. It is a report that sets out that it has been prepared in accordance with section 10 of the act, being a requirement to advise parliament of the arrangements that would need to be established in order to automate the payment of interest to small business vendors on overdue accounts. The report claims to have made four significant findings, and they may be stated briefly. They are, firstly, that since the act took effect—that is, early 2014—there have been no identified claims for late payment interest submitted by small business vendors, so no surprises there against the background that I have outlined. There had been no identified claims.

Secondly, the report claimed that the percentage of invoices paid on time had, in fact, significantly improved. So far, so virtuous in terms of claims. It perhaps merits a pause at this point to note that things clearly went downhill dramatically after this report was provided because we learned that in 2016-17, 110,000 bills were late paid in total, amounting to \$603 million. If there had been some evidence of improvement about payment, clearly that was a situation that deteriorated in the period after the report was written.

Thirdly, and importantly, the report highlights or identifies a problem that there would be an ongoing cost to government of administering late payment interest automation, which would be comparatively high because the act required suppliers, even in an automated environment, to evidence that they were a small business and the evidence needed to be validated before they would receive any late payment interest. The report indicates, therefore, that there was some virtue in relieving small business of the need to make application, but poor old government was still going to be left with having to verify the status of the vendor as a small business before it could provide for the automated payment.

The former government did not seem to twig that had it removed that second part of the problem, and moved into an environment where there was no need for a satisfaction of some definitional test but rather a businesslike, practical and outcomes-oriented process that might be implemented instead, then that problem could have been overcome and a transition to automation could have happened pronto. But, no, it was described as a virtue that this ongoing administration impost was remaining as a reason not to transition to automation.

Fourthly, the third and fourth significant findings of the report can really be wrapped up as one, in my observation. Because of that administrative burden, there was going to be little change to the administrative burden to small business vendors because they would have to keep on establishing those bona fides every time. The punchline of this six-page report, duly prepared in accordance with section 10 of the act, was that it was proposed that the Treasurer, in fact, not go ahead and designate a date at all for the automation of the payment of interest to take effect as contemplated under section 6(6)(b). That is the recommendation of the report at paragraph 4, page 6 at about point 5 on the page.

I again commend the report to all honourable members as an example of an extraordinarily Orwellian endeavour by the previous treasurer to characterise as a virtue the failure to come to grips with what was readily available as a means to deliver a business-oriented practical outcome to business. It was not taken. Great excuse was drawn upon for no change. What we are left with is a virtuous sounding act with very little efficacy in business practice whatsoever.

Before the member for Lee digressed into discursive analysis of topics other than the legislation before the house, he made a further observation that, while it was practical that we had done away with the small business definition and implemented instead a cap of \$1 million on a

transaction, perhaps that might need reviewing because it may or may not be an appropriate notional threshold to leave in place. While there might be something to be said for that, what is really at the practical core of that change is that we have moved away from business having to jump through hoops to fulfil the definition of small business; instead, we have said, 'Just look at the size of the invoice; that will give you a fair idea of the sort of business we are dealing with.'

It is well to remind ourselves that the definition of small business, as it was under the act, was confined to business that had a turnover not exceeding \$5 million. If we are talking about a comparison from a defined situation, small business being a business with a turnover not more than \$5 million, and we are moving to a situation in which the invoice should not be more than \$1 million, one can see fairly readily that we are not going to be cutting out too many vendors, if any, who deal with government as a result of that practical change; rather—to the extent that we practically can—we are simply setting a point from which an automated payment may be made.

The bill, by transferring away from the section 6(6)(a) and (b) structure that stayed around unimplemented and unacted upon over the course of the last parliament, is done away with altogether and what is there in its place is a new section 6(6) that simply requires that the public authority make payment of the interest within 48 hours of making payment on the invoice proper.

In the short time still available to me, I want to highlight the extent of the Orwellian nature of the previous regime. It might be well illustrated by the Frequently Asked Questions page on the Shared Services SA website. This ought be no reflection whatsoever on the good people who discharge services for our state at Shared Services, but they are clearly operating in an environment where they had to deal with a government that was not able to act on the implementation of practical business-focused outcomes.

The Frequently Asked Questions page includes an attempt to provide a helpful answer to the question: what is the definition of a small business? It tells us that the business is one that did not exceed \$5 million in annual turnover in the relevant financial year, as I have previously referred to, but it goes on, and I encourage honourable members to read this before it is moved on fairly rapidly after the enacting of the bill.

How can an organisation prove it is a small business and therefore eligible to claim late payment interest? We see a four-step analysis: vendors must provide Shared Services SA, or the applicable authority, with a copy of the Business Activity Statement, a copy of the further income tax return and, where the small business was not operational in the previous financial year, a copy of the business' BAS for the previous two quarters. Where the small business was not operational for the previous financial year and not registered for GST, this requires a copy of the business' income and expenditure statement.

One can see fairly readily why nobody was going to the trouble of jumping through the bureaucratic hoops in order to claim what may or may not have been a relatively substantial entitlement to interest as a result of the slow payment. All that is swept away by this practical business-oriented and outcome-oriented reform.

It may be that there is limited time now for honourable members to take advantage of looking online at those frequently asked questions because, once this bill is enacted, there will be no need to address the frequently asked questions on this page because businesses in South Australia dealing with government will rightly develop an expectation that government will pay them on time. They will rightly experience both the entitlement and the actuality of the receipt of interest rightly payable on bills not paid on time.

As is business as usual under the new Marshall government, they will become increasingly confident in the knowledge that they have a government that is acting towards delivering outcomes that ensure that business can both engage with government and thrive in the process of an environment in which one can conduct one's business with government with confidence. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (16:23): I rise to support the Late Payment for Government Debts (Interest) (Automatic Payment of Interest) Amendment Bill 2018, which broadens the application of the existing Late Payment of Government Debts (Interest) Act from 2013.

Specifically, these amendments expand the scope to cover all businesses trading with the government, rather than the current limitation to small business; reduce the minimum interest payment threshold from \$20 to \$10; limit the application of the act to invoices with a value of \$1 million or less; and automate the payment of interest to business such that it occurs within 48 hours of the time of the overdue invoice being paid, which will be in accordance with the government's standard 30-day payment terms.

The late payment of invoices can cause cash flow issues for business and negatively impact their ability to meet their financial commitments. Within the electorate of Morphett, there are thousands of businesses that this government is committed to supporting. These thousands of businesses provide people of this state with employment, experience and a living wage.

The greater Glenelg area has close to 2,300 businesses as of 2017, with industries ranging from construction, tourism, accommodation, retail, trade, financial services, education and training, and include the highly valued Jetty Road, Glenelg, Glengowrie, Morphettville and Plympton Park have a little over 710 businesses as of 2017 in industries such as construction, transport and warehousing, financial insurance services and professional, scientific and technical services.

Not all these businesses will have direct commercial interactions with the state government; however, most sectors of our modern economy are highly interdependent. Individual businesses employ labour and capital and use resources and purchase from other businesses, and a lot of these small businesses may be a supplier or a contractor to a business that does provide services and goods to the state government. So not only does the consumption of these goods and services by the state government provide direct jobs but through the multiplier effect they provide indirect jobs, and so the late payment invoices can cause cash flow issues for these businesses and negatively impact on their ability to meet their own financial commitments.

I know from running my own business that there are no guarantees for the business owner to be paid a reliable salary. The pressure is always on to satisfy existing customers and to find new ones, and a critical component of this is having the business's invoices paid on time. This helps greatly with the cash flow, which then means importantly that a business's employees can be paid and the bills for that business paid to allow the business to run smoothly and also, finally, to allow the business owners themselves to be paid on time. While invoice payment performance is generally at an acceptable level by the state government, there is still substantial opportunity for improvement.

It was revealed in December 2017 that the previous government paid over 110,000 of its bills late during the 2016-17 financial year, totalling over \$603 million. The existing act requires the state government to pay its outstanding invoices within 30 days, and if this does not occur a business is able to apply for a late payment fee. The untimely payment of invoices where it does occur is as much a cultural issue as it is a systems issue. A regular wage may insulate public authorities from truly understanding the importance of the timely payment of invoices. Therefore, enacting this bill will send a strong message to public authorities that the prompt payment of invoices is an important objective of this government.

Establishing a financial penalty, which is automatically paid to business, will clearly reinforce this message and act to change behaviours over time. The Department of Treasury and Finance has advised that, based on the current level of late payments, an estimate of the interest cost could be around \$1.4 million per annum, and about 50 per cent of this relates to Health. Agencies will be required to fund any interest cost incurred out of their own budgets, and so obviously the incentive for agencies will be to reduce the need for any of these payments at all.

As the member for Heysen has outlined, the 2013 legislation required an unnecessarily costly and bureaucratic process in order to claim this late payment interest, and due to this process, as has been outlined, there have been very little interest claims submitted through this channel since its introduction five years ago. This is why, during this year's state election, the now government committed to make interest automatically payable to businesses for invoices that were paid 60 days late, and reduce the threshold from \$20 to \$10.

Since the election, this time frame has been reduced to 30 days. This was part of our government's promise to create and foster greater government and public sector accountability, ensuring that the people and businesses of this state are able to rely on their government.

Importantly, this bill has been introduced to this house to expand the existing act to cover all businesses trading within the public sector, not just small businesses, because, as I mentioned previously, larger organisations invariably have small businesses as their suppliers, so this announcement will also have a multiplier effect for those small businesses.

As the member for Heysen said, the report to the parliament in 2015 that reviewed the automatic interest payments and considered the possibility heard that one of the reasons it could not be automated was that it would still require the government agency to verify the status of small businesses, whether that is by providing copies of their BAS or their past tax returns, therefore really making it nigh on impossible to have automation while you had this distinction between different businesses that had invoices outstanding. Applying it to all businesses certainly frees that up and allows for the possibility of automation.

This important amendment will not only enable but ensure the automatic payment of interest on those overdue accounts where certain criteria are met. Important changes to the existing act have been included in the amendment bill to emphasise to public authorities that this government requires and will ensure prompt payment of invoices. We are committed to ensuring that overdue invoices will be paid in accordance with the government's standard 30-day payment terms. Again, it is another example of an election promise delivered by this government for the greater good of the South Australian economy.

This government acknowledges how important small businesses, in fact all businesses, are to the state economy. That is why this bill has been introduced to support businesses by ensuring that they are able to rely on the government to pay their bills on time. If not, they will automatically receive late payment fees because we know that a state without a strong economy is a state that is at risk. So, this government is proud to support our state's business financial interests through this bill. The newly amended act will cover all public authorities as defined within the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987. It is very important to mention that the Small Business Commissioner will continue to retain a dispute resolution function under this act.

This is a very important bill for the greater good of South Australian businesses, their owners and operators, staff and customers. Operating a business can be a highly stressful yet lucrative career path; however, everyone who has ever run a small business understands it is frustrating and worrying when payment for services is received late or not at all because that late payment has a profound effect on the everyday expenses and running of a business. It can impact on wages, productivity, overall morale and cause additional stress on operators and owners.

Of course, these are not the only measures to assist not only businesses in Morphett but all those businesses around the state. From 1 January 2019, South Australia will see the introduction of the removal of payroll tax for all small businesses with annual taxable payrolls below \$1.5 million, meaning that approximately 3,200 businesses will become exempt from payroll tax, each with a possible saving of up to \$44,550 per year. At the same time, all South Australians will benefit from the reduction in their emergency services levy, being \$360 million over the next four years.

With the first of those bills having recently arrived in the letterboxes of South Australians, and the savings that they are experiencing now, this is money that they can elect to spend how they see fit, which will provide a \$90 million boost to the South Australian economy this financial year and benefit many businesses throughout Morphett. If I use Jetty Road as an example, that is one strip that relies on discretionary spending from people visiting the area from outside the district or from local residents who sustain the strip through the winter months by buying local.

Just recently, I had the pleasure to take the federal Minister for Small and Family Business, Michaelia Cash, and the federal member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint, on a tour of Jetty Road. We started at the Brighton Road end at the Bayside Shopping Village and then made our way along Jetty Road, stopping at the Bay Junction Florist, past the renowned Haigh's Chocolates shop and on to Enve Hair, which is owned and run by the chair of the Jetty Road Mainstreet Committee, Mark Faulkner.

We then followed on to Caruso's Fresh Foods, before finishing at the other end of Jetty Road in the beautiful Moseley Square where we met the business owners of Cibo Espresso Glenelg—which interestingly has just won the award for best coffee along Jetty Road at the recent Mainstreet

SA Awards—finally finishing at the award-winning Moseley Bar and Kitchen. Those owners identified the costs of doing business as impacting upon their businesses.

The measures that I have just outlined that the Marshall government is undertaking have been welcomed by these business owners, and they spoke of the renewed confidence they are experiencing, but they are also seeing that confidence translate into their customers as well.

The reforms I have spoken about are about helping grow the economy, about creating a level playing field for all businesses, and they do not rely on politicians picking winners in business. This bill is important, and the changes to the existing act will be welcomed. The government needs to pay its bills on time. If this does not occur businesses should not be forced to dedicate their valuable time and effort chasing up a very financial state government. That time could be better spent by those business owners in growing their own business.

The government has a responsibility to the people of this state to remain accountable and to set an example for other businesses to follow. This government intends to hold itself accountable to the people of this state, and will not impose a late fee upon customers if we cannot hold our departments to the same standard. I commend this bill and look forward to its introduction.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (16:35): I rise today to speak in support of the Late Payment for Government Debts (Interest) (Automatic Payment of Interest) Amendment Bill 2018. In my view, this bill includes appropriate steps to ensure that businesses are not disadvantaged by the late payment of bills by South Australian public authorities. It is yet another example of the Marshall Liberal government following through on its election commitments.

The government is committed to making interest automatically payable to businesses for any undisputed invoice paid 60 days late where certain criteria are met. This includes a \$10 minimum invoice threshold compared with the \$20 threshold described in the current legislation. In this case, we have taken our promise a step further to ensure that automating the payment of interest to businesses occurs at the same time the overdue invoice is paid, in accordance with the government's standard 30-day payment terms. It is a move that will ensure greater accountability for payments.

This bill appropriately widens the definition of which businesses by removing the reference to small business, ensuring that all businesses transacting business with public authorities are eligible for interest payments. Bills unpaid can mount up for businesses large and small, which results in additional costs to businesses that may come in the form of higher interest payments and larger borrowings that they may need to make to ensure they have adequate funds to operate.

It is an unacceptable situation where public agencies do not make their payment commitments on time, particularly when it results in additional costs to the very businesses that we not only want to be operating but that we also want to be thriving. The bill proposes to reduce the amount of paperwork required for businesses to claim these interest payments should invoices not be paid on time.

The bill is a step in the right direction. Our government is taking steps to ensure that the environment for doing business in South Australia is conducive to helping businesses thrive. The bill takes steps to reduce the cumbersome paperwork embedded in the current Late Payment of Government Debts (Interest) Act 2013. Under that act automatic payment was not made, and businesses needed to make application for interest payments if payment was late. This has resulted in almost no claims for interest by South Australian businesses. The changes should provide for a less bureaucratic process, enabling businesses to get on with their own core business.

The public sector has been criticised for this slow payment. Enacting this bill sends a message to public authorities to ensure they have their house in order and understand the priorities of government to ensure prompt payment. The changes proposed by the bill are not accompanied by additional funding. This automated approach to interest payments for unpaid invoices is a cost that will need to be met by public authorities. More than ever, it will be in the best interests of authorities to ensure that payment is made on time.

To understand what this means and why this new Marshall Liberal government is going down this line, it is consistent right across the board with a lot of great new policies that I see in place. We want to make sure, with this bill, that we are creating an environment for small and large businesses

to be able to act in an effective and efficient manner, in particular relating to any government payments.

We know, and many members on this side of the chamber who have been in small business know, there are vagaries in small business where we have to miss a few hurdles. We have cyclical downturns, we have upturns, but there is never a period that is always the same. We know that sometimes when we are dealing business to business there is not always a guarantee that you will get your money, or even on time, and to have a government that wants to play that sort of game as well is another vagary that businesses have to miss and get over or go through loops and over hurdles to be a profitable strong business in South Australia.

I think the fact that it needed our government to come to power after 16 years to bring amendments and changes which advocate for small business and large business, which advocate a process that is seen as effective and efficient for businesses to thrive in, is obviously a very welcome change out there in the state today. Have they not waited long enough for it?

We also recognise that when businesses are not paid in a timely fashion, whether it be by government or other businesses that they are trading with, it indicates that they think that businesses are some sort of financial institution. You might think that they do not need their money in 30 days, so you can take 60 days or even longer. All that does is put pressure on the business, it puts stress on the stakeholders, it puts pressure on the employees and staff and it puts all that those businesses belong to under more difficulties than they need to be.

I think this is one of those small but very positive steps with a raft of other issues that this government has brought to the fore to make businesses stronger in South Australia. This is why I am very proud to be part of this new Marshall government in the sense that I think South Australia will go on and be a powerhouse of a state later on with the changes that we have implemented.

I want to add to those further points. The Marshall government has brought this small business interest bill here to make sure that bills are paid on time. We look at the emergency services levy, as the member for Morphett just realised, and I also think the member for Heysen touched on it, but \$90 million a year—\$360 million—is going to be left back out in the hands of businesses, private owners, private dwellings and individuals in South Australia. It is not going into government coffers and it is being left out in the community for the community to grow.

One of the most important things about that whole aspect is that, yes, it is \$90 million a year but the people of South Australia get to choose how that money is spent, how it is used to develop this state, whether it is for the education of children, the training of staff, infrastructure and investment in more profitability, or even luxury items or luxury in our daily lives by going out and having dinner in a cafeteria or a restaurant or any other small business. These are the opportunities this government is creating by the emergency services levy, along with a raft of other tax-saving advantages the Marshall government is putting out there.

As to the natural resources levy, we are looking to reshape that to get the cost down on that levy faster than ever. I know when the natural resources levy first came out it was only \$30 or \$40 per household and now it is up over \$300 per household in the time that the last government was in power. What is not recognised in that, and although you could say, yes, but we are gathering this money because we have important projects, you take away the ability of businesses and individuals to make their own choices. The government thinks it knows best. The government thinks it has grand or great ideas.

I will refer to a point that was made by the late Kerry Packer. People are not leaving more money to a government in their will or bequest when they pass on, thinking that it is a great way to use up their funds as though government is a great answer to spend money around the place. No-one is doing this and there is a reason for that. The government has priority spending but on our side of this chamber in our world, we think it should be a minimal spend, not a maximum spend like those on the other side of this chamber.

The other thing that is really fascinating about small business and this little advantage we have here, and it is not totally recognised on the other side of the chamber, is what they did to power prices. It all adds up. The power prices have gone up nearly 200 to 300 per cent over the last 15 years. Yes, we know we have inflationary increases generally, but not in that realm at all. I know

this government is working hard to reduce the power prices. In my books, it is not fast enough, but we have to be patient, we have to get it right and we have to unravel what the other side did to power prices over 16 years.

What is not recognised on the other side of the other chamber—when we went through estimates and we heard their claim about how bad our budget was, we heard about how we are hitting the Housing Trust rent issue—is that the rent issue is a small impost compared with the impost that the other side of this chamber imposed on the economy of South Australia and those who are most vulnerable by just the power prices alone, which they do not recognise.

As this government makes these small incremental changes, as we make it better and better for businesses to prosper and thrive, these small aspects will turn South Australia's fortunes around, we will become a strong economy and then I hope we can start to address our debt level, start to live within our means and be a powerhouse of a state that can live within our means, unlike what the other side did over the last 16 years.

The old system that was in place for this debt, which we are changing, would have created cash flow for small businesses. With government contracts, both small or large, if a business is going to put in a quote or do a job for the government, but they are worried about payment, they actually have to make the cost higher because they do not know when they will be paid, because there is an impost in not paying on time.

We already know—well, I have a feeling I know—that when the government put out contracts they are not the same private contracts and costings as they would be if they were private contracts out in the private world. We have more bureaucracy, we have more red tape, we have more hurdles imposed in these contracts, so it costs more to do anything that the government does. If you add on top of that the fact that you may be paid late as well, it adds to the rise in the cost of doing business in South Australia and the government to fulfil its job and do the contracts that it is trying to do.

Why was this bill needed and required and why was it not imposed by the last government? Why did they sit there and just watch it and happily see that no interest was paid because of all the paperwork that was required to get your interest? Why were payments not made on time, as they are anywhere else? It is actually part of the complacency of what the Labor Party used to be when they were in government. They became complacent. They took it for granted.

They did not actually understand, I do not think. I do not know if they really wanted to hurt the state at all; I think they actually meant well. I heard some speeches from the other side, such as from the former treasurer, where he admitted to making some mistakes. I get that it is a pretty tough ask to be perfect over the full 16 years, but it is actually not just one-offs; it is a total attitude.

I will describe the last 16 years of the Labor government in two forms: there were your first eight years where you had desire and passion to lead and do your own Labor antics and goals that you probably aspired to as the Labor Party, and then in the next eight years it was, 'What are we going to do next? Where are we going now? What is the consequence of what we are up to?' It actually shows you may not have even really cared.

You were happy to be in government, you were happy to be leaders and you were probably happy to put the Labor way across our state, but I do not think you really took a sharp, hard look at the results of what you were up to and what you were doing.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: He is actually the Deputy Speaker from your party.

Mr McBRIDE: I will take that on board. This is why I think it is very important that we pass the measures this government is trying to put in place to try to make it easier for businesses to do business in this state, and for the government to lead by example in a business-savvy state that we want to build, to have a strong economy. This bill is part of that process. This bill is going to make it easier and more transparent for businesses to operate.

The bill will bring about a professionalism to the Public Service sector, which will create accountability and transparency through the public reporting system. I can only say that that is great for the state. It may be only small in the context of the whole processes of government and

government jobs and contracts, but all these small steps that we are taking are moving the state in the right direction. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:49): I am not sure how I am going to match the blistering performance of the member for MacKillop today, but I will make an attempt in speaking to the Late Payment for Government Debts (Interest) (Automatic Payment of Interest) Amendment Bill 2018. Part of the detail around this legislation is to expand the scope to cover all businesses trading with the government, rather than the current limitations to small business; reduce the minimum interest payment threshold from \$20 to \$10, and limit the application of the act to invoices with a value of \$1 million or less; and automate the payment of interest to business such that it occurs at the same time that overdue invoices are paid in accordance with the government's standard 30-day payment terms.

This is going further than the initial promise made by the government as part of its election commitment, which targeted automatic payment for bills that were 60 days overdue. If the bill becomes law, the act will cover all public authorities, as defined under the Public Finance and Audit Act 1987, brought under this definition through a notice published in the *Government Gazette*. The Small Business Commissioner will continue to retain a dispute resolution function under the act.

The public reporting of bill payment performance is not a feature of the bill. These requirements have already been addressed through the issuing of instructions in Treasurer's Instruction 11. The first report for the month of May 2018 has now been published. Some scope around the background of this is that businesses complain about the late payment of bills by South Australian departments. While invoice payment performance is generally at an acceptable level, there is still a major opportunity for improvements. The late payment of invoices can cause cash flow issues for business and negatively impact on their ability to meet financial commitments.

As part of the 2018 state election, at the time the Marshall Liberal opposition, which obviously turned into government—which was a great boon for business right across South Australia—committed to making interest automatically payable to businesses for any undisputed invoice paid 60 days late where certain criteria are met, including a \$10 threshold, and creating greater accountability and transparency through the public reporting of invoice payment performance.

The Late Payment of Government Debts (Interest) Act 2013 is limited in its application to small business and requires an unnecessary and costly bureaucratic process in order for late payment interest to be claimed. As a result, there have been almost no interest claims submitted under the act since it was first introduced. It is like the bureaucracy making more bureaucracy.

The purpose of introducing the bill is to expand the act to cover all businesses trading with the public sector and enable the automatic payment of interest on overdue accounts when certain criteria are met. The untimely payment of invoices, where it occurs, is as much a cultural issue as it is a systems issue. Therefore, enacting the bill will send a strong message to public authorities that the prompt payment of invoices is an important objective of this government. Establishing a financial penalty, which is automatically paid to business, will clearly reinforce this message and act to change behaviours over time.

The Department of Treasury and Finance have given advice that, based on the current level of late payments, an estimate of the interest costs could be around \$1.4 million per annum, about 50 per cent of which relates to Health. Health, by the way, takes 30 per cent of our public funding anyway. It is at around \$6 billion out of a \$19 billion budget. Agencies are required to fund any interest costs incurred. Obviously, the incentive for agencies is to reduce the need for any payments at all.

Consultation around the draft legislation has been undertaken with the Small Business Commissioner, the Industry Advocate and Business South Australia. Feedback has been overwhelmingly positive and all public sector authorities have been advised of the changes, and agencies are working with the Department of Treasury and Finance on an implementation program.

It is interesting to note that it has become a cultural issue and not just a systems issue that somewhere in the system some people think it is okay to string along small, medium and large businesses. That is not what helps the economy to function, considering that businesses are the lifeblood of an economy and need cash flow to survive. Quite frankly, as long as businesses are putting their accounts in and getting them in on time, they should be paid on time so that they can

keep performing work. They have bills to pay, staff to pay, capital items for pay for and all the other overheads. Business at any level, whether small, medium or large, has so much to pay for; it is just a sliding scale.

A few years ago, when the Labor Party was in power, the former member for Napier and I were discussing the issue of accounts of members of parliament not being paid on time. Members of parliament were having their phones cut off. You wonder whether that was symptomatic of bureaucracy. We actually got on alright from across the political divide, and I always get some interesting looks when I talk about the former member for Napier. He came up with a novel idea: he said, 'Adrian, you just pay the bill and we will pay you back.' I said, 'I am not going to pay for the government's debt.' That was not going to happen. To his credit, the former member for Napier put a credit card-style system into our offices so that we could pay small accounts and they would be clarified later.

Seriously, it is about keeping the small things functioning. A member of parliament has two staff and a trainee; there is a lot going on and you have to make your work function, make your office function and make basic things, like paying your accounts, happen. Who knows what sort of chaos there was in the private sector when we, in the public sector, could not get the system to work in relation to the payment of accounts?

Somewhere in the system there is a cultural issue as well as a systems issue. It happens in the private sector as well. I have an account at the moment with a certain company. Yes, we have paid the bill, we have sorted that, but they cannot seem to switch me back to something I need to help me function as a parliamentarian and keep me informed. You wonder why it gets so hard. In these days of technology, things should be streamlined, but it seems that the better the technology, the worse off we are, especially when we have full-system failures, as we had recently.

The issue is about making sure that people get their funds in full and on time. Obviously, it will penalise departments: if they do not pay on time, they will have to meet it out of their budget. As we saw, the average could be something like \$1.4 million. It does not sound a lot, but that is the interest part of these payments. That means significant money is being held up somewhere in the system and not going to our small, medium and large businesses to make sure that they can function appropriately.

This legislation is timely and cannot come soon enough. I like to think that in the future it will streamline systems so that the people who manage the money will make sure that they do not lose it off their bottom line.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (16:59): First of all, I would like to thank the members for Lee, Heysen, Morphett, MacKillop and Hammond for their valuable contributions to the debate on this bill and for their support of the bill. I do note that there was a lot of enthusiasm for the bill on the government's side of the house, particularly from the member for Heysen, who ran his own business as a barrister; the member for Morphett, who was in business; the member for MacKillop, who runs a series of family businesses; and of course the member for Hammond, who is in business.

There is one common theme: we all know how important cash flow is for business to succeed. Of course, it was a key issue in my business to ensure that I had cash flow. There is a saying in business that cash is king. Without cash, your business is crippled. People I knew or had an association with when I was in business often say to me that the job I have now must be stressful, but I say to them, 'No, it is nowhere near as stressful as small business because small business is full of stresses about cash flow, about managing money and about paying your commitments.' When the government does not pay on time, it makes that problem even bigger for you.

This is just one of the small measures we are taking to change the focus here in South Australia. The new government loves the business sector. We love people making money. We love people making a profit because we know that there is a benefit for the whole community as those businesses grow. When businesses make profit, they grow. When businesses grow, they employ more South Australians. We are doing two things: we are removing those barriers for businesses to grow in South Australia by making it easier for them and, obviously, now we have put a much stronger emphasis on the payment of accounts to businesses here in South Australia.

This is not what the Labor Party offered with their Late Payment of Government Debts (Interest) Act 2013, which was really nothing more than an illusion of action because the bureaucratic process to get payment of interest for late payments put people off. People have much more important things to do than chase \$20, \$30, \$40 or even \$100 of interest, particularly if they are running businesses that have larger turnovers.

Turnover is no indication of your profit. Tell that to a pharmacist who has to buy a drug for \$5,000 and makes only \$7.50 on the prescription. They are not going to spend time sending in a separate invoice for the interest when they are paid late by the health system. They are focusing on servicing their clients. They do not have the surplus of staff to enable them to do that because they simply cannot afford it. Their margins are too tight.

The previous government's original act of parliament on this was nothing more than an illusion of action. They heard the cries out there from the business community and set this up. They created this illusion that it was going to be a solution and do something, but of course it did nothing. Basically, what we have done is make it automatic. They can continue running their businesses, employing South Australians, growing their businesses and paying their taxes because there is now pressure on the public sector to make sure that these bills are paid on time because they will add up.

Those payments will add up and if a department ends up losing \$1.5 million because they are paying late payment payments automatically because they are not paying their bills on time, I can tell you that Mr Lucas in the other place will not be rolling over and just handing that money over to them. So there is a real incentive now for those bills to be paid on time. It is pleasing to see that all those who spoke on this bill in this chamber and in the other place could see the logic of the bill. Although it might appear to be only a small matter, it has a magnified impact on small businesses in particular in South Australia, but of course any invoice that is \$1 million or less benefits from this bill.

It is an automatic process, and it sends a very strong message to the business community: 'We appreciate what you do. We want to do business with you, and we have now lifted our game. We want to make sure that you are properly rewarded for the contractual arrangements that you have entered into with the government and you are not punished simply because you have done your job and we haven't done ours.' I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (17:06): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (BUDGET MEASURES) BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 20 September 2018.)

Clause 1.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: With regard to clause 1, I have a general question. Can the Deputy Premier advise what economic modelling was undertaken by the government on the measures contained within the bill?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not have the particulars of that. I am just waiting for some advisers to take their place and I am sure they will provide some assistance to the committee. The question relates to the modelling done in respect of the budget measures in this bill. Could the member be more specific in relation to the proposed areas? Are we talking the Authorised Betting Operations Act? I am happy to deal with them as we get to each section, but if there are some in and some out?

The CHAIR: Member for Lee, are you able to be more specific with your question in relation to clause 1?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I can, certainly—perhaps, for instance, with the amendments to the Land Tax Act to start with.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In respect of the amendments to the Land Tax Act, under part 9 of the bill, which is to repeal section 8 and to make the amendment on the scales of land tax, in that regard we cannot provide that detail.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Does that mean that the modelling was done or that it was not done?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Perhaps we will have to take this in order because I have a number of advisers for different sections. The gentleman adjacent to me now is from CBS, so he is full bottle on the gambling. If we are going to take this out of context, it is going to be rather difficult because I am going to have to move people in and out. If we could hold that question until we get to clause 111, I would be grateful.

The CHAIR: As you would be aware, there are 146 clauses. Ordinarily, we would go through them chronologically, but given that you have an adviser—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: He is here for parts 2 and 3.

The CHAIR: I understand that. What I am suggesting is that we might go to those relevant parts and then move back, but we would have to postpone the consideration of the clauses up to that point.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am happy to start at clause 4.

The CHAIR: The question before the Chair is that clauses 1 to 3 stand as printed.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Perhaps I could offer an alternative. I am not confident that we are going to get through the committee stage within the next little while, so perhaps I could ask that the Deputy Premier take that question on notice and, if she is able to check with the other advisers for the purposes of continuing with the committee stage tomorrow, that would be absolutely fine and I would be happy to move on.

The CHAIR: Then we can work through in chronological order?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That is right.

The CHAIR: Are you too happy to take that question on notice?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am, but I am just pointing out that the land tax is already under clause 111, so when we get to land tax—and we have the land tax person here—the member or any member could ask me any questions about anything to do with it, including the modelling. I am not avoiding the question. I am simply advising that we do not have the adviser here first to deal with that. We have the first set of Authorised Betting Operations Act. Whilst I was happy in a general way for questions to be asked on the short title clause, clearly we have different advisers for different sections. If he wants to jump ahead to land tax, then I will take the question at clause 111.

The CHAIR: Okay. I understood all of that, Attorney.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My question relates to the amendment of section 6A in clause 5, with regard to codes of practice. Obviously, the intention of a vast number of these clauses is to replace references to the commissioner as it is spelt out in the bill. My question regarding clause 5 is: if there is an intention that codes of practice will continue to be developed, who will be responsible for superintending the codes of practice and their development, and what will the process be by which they are developed or amended in the future?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The commissioner. There are codes of practice of course which are in operation. It may well be well known to the member, but when the IGA was established it actually had quite a limited role. It then accumulated a number of different functions over the years, and one of those was to have a supervisory role in relation to codes of practice. Under this reform, that will be under the responsibility of the commissioner.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My next question on clause 5 actually reiterates the second part of my previous question, which asked that the Deputy Premier provide some advice about how the commissioner will go about developing either new codes of practice or amending existing ones.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The current codes of practice continue. Should there be any changes to them, it is proposed that that be in consultation with the Gambling Advisory Council and other stakeholders. It does not stop members of an interest group, for example, presenting submissions to the commissioner to consider an amendment, or there may be some new event or mode of gambling that needs to have either a whole new code of practice or an amendment to the current code. Ultimately he would make a determination on that.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My third and last question on clause 5 is prefaced by the comment that I appreciate the advice the Deputy Premier has given about the role of the newly established advisory council, as well as the comment that there will be consultation with industry stakeholders. However, given that in many ways the codes of practice ostensibly govern the activities of different relevant industries in the different parts of the gaming sector, is there to be a set process by which codes of practice, if they need to be developed will be developed, or if they are to be amended will be amended? Can the Deputy Premier provide some comfort to the parliament about whether there is a guaranteed role of public and stakeholder consultation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that the commissioner will set the parameters in relation to how that will operate. However, to be clear, the establishment of codes of practice has occurred. There is no intention or provision in this bill for the abolition of those codes of practice; in fact, they continue in exactly the same way as they previously operated except that the commissioner will have responsibility for the determination—and that includes any amendment—rather than the IGA.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I understand that section 6B of the act makes reference to arrangements where the Commissioner of Police is able to furnish the IGA with intelligence about operations of relevant industries to inform the authority, either for the purpose of decision-making or as general monitoring of performance activities within the industry. What arrangements does the commissioner have for liaising with police, and does that mirror the arrangements the IGA had with the commissioner?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The answer is, yes, it mirrors the current arrangements that operate with the IGA and the commissioner. This is in relation to the release of sensitive information. Again, all we are doing here is removing the authority from being the recipient of that.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The Deputy Premier may have gleaned from my questions on the previous clause and now on this clause, as well as from my earlier comments, that I am aware that the bulk of these clauses regarding the Authorised Betting Operations Act is to transfer the responsibilities currently held by the IGA to the commissioner.

What I am interested in in each of these different areas is whether the policies, the procedures and the practices of the commissioner are the same and ready to replicate in these areas exactly how the IGA has functioned. When it comes to intelligence from police beyond the frequency of meeting with the Commissioner of Police, the protocols of dealing with that information which may be highly sensitive amongst other things are of significant concern. So are there policies and procedures which are in existence within the commission which govern the receipt and the use and the storage of this intelligence?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Hopefully, this will clarify the situation. The conveying of criminal intelligence is a matter that is currently a matter largely between the police commissioner and the

IGA, and the police commissioner and the commissioner. All we are doing here is removing the IGA. The responsibilities the IGA were undertaking, when it was operating as such, were transferred to the commissioner.

This is not a situation where all criminal intelligence, all information, was only conveyed to the IGA. There was a role already, I am advised, between the police commissioner and the liquor licensing commissioner. He is just taking on this extra role. There are protocols and, I suppose, policies that sit around how that operates—presumably how often they meet, those types of things. There is no indication under this legislation that that will change. If there is, any regulatory reform may be introduced, but of course the parliament will have notice of that if that occurs.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The Deputy Premier is correct in one sense but potentially not in another. Section 6B requires the authority, on application by the commissioner, to maintain the confidentiality of that information. If the clause here was to delete the authority and replace it with the commissioner, then we could be more satisfied that the same requirements around the confidentiality of that information was to be replicated within the commission. Unfortunately, the act does not, so my question is: what comfort can the police have, let alone those people whom the police intelligence relates to, that the commission is legally bound in the same way that the authority is to maintain the confidentiality of this information?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I would hope that section 6B(2) would make that clear because we are deleting reference to the authority where it says 'if the authority or the commissioner'. So 'the authority' comes out; 'the commissioner' stays. The obligations stay. Later in that clause, the word 'authority' is removed so that we only have 'the commissioner' in relation to undertaking the responsibilities and obligations in that regard. It is not as though this clause is actually replacing the commissioner with the authority. It is currently the authority and the commissioner or the commissioner. We are taking out 'the authority or' wherever it appears and just leaving 'the commissioner' in there. He already has a role in relation to the receiving of criminal intelligence, and the protocols that sit around and obligations as set out in the act in respect of criminal intelligence.

Clause passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The CHAIR: I would like to welcome school principals and members of the governing councils on various schools in the electorate of King. You are guests of the member for King. Welcome to the committee stage of a bill. Enjoy your stay.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (BUDGET MEASURES) BILL

Committee Stage

Debate resumed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Regarding section 12(3)(d), which is the first part to be amended under clause 7 of the bill, an agreement 'has no effect unless approved by the Authority'. Is the authority's role in that regard not to be replaced with the commissioner?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The agreement is between me, as Attorney, and the party in industry, and that is no longer required to be approved by the authority as it will not exist.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: So there is no replacement of the authority, with the role of the commissioner there to provide a separate and external review away from the minister? The minister will just have sole review and sole capacity to approve the licensing agreements?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Save and except. If the member looks at section 12(5) of the act:

An agreement may require the Minister, the Authority or the Commissioner to provide information relating to the licensee or licensee's operations...

Of course, that information needs to be provided. So there is a role of the commissioner at that level and, as we have already announced, the authority will be replaced by an advisory council.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 11 passed.

Clause 12.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: On my reading of the bill and the act to which it relates, it talks about the authority needing to receive audited accounts from relevant parties. They are now to be received by the commissioner. Has the capacity within the authority to receive and contemplate those audited accounts been replicated in the commission?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: First, I need to clarify that. This is an obligation in relation to receive by the authority. The obligation is on the licensee to supply it to the authority, and we are substituting that with the commissioner. To the best of my knowledge, yes, he does. Obviously, he already has a significant department in relation to financial matters as well. He already has an administration that can receive those audited accounts. What he then does with them, of course, is another matter, but obviously that is one of the checks and balances in this process.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Before the measures in this bill are to commence, are there other requirements placed upon the commission or the commissioner that requires them to receive audited accounts from relevant parties?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not that we are aware of, I am advised.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Currently, in the commission there is no practice where it is already in receipt of audited accounts from interested parties and this clause in the bill transfers this new responsibility to the commission and the commissioner to receive these audited accounts. In the briefing that I was provided by officials, it was made clear to me that the commission is not receiving any further resources as a result of needing to take on the responsibilities of the IGA.

So, if the Deputy Premier's previous answer was that there are lots of staff in there who are capable of receiving and dealing with these audited accounts, how can that be the case when they currently do not and they are not receiving any further resources for this or indeed any other purpose?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member perhaps misunderstands the provision. The provision here is that they simply provide them. There is not an obligation on anyone to do anything other than to have received them. I think perhaps it had not been made clear in the briefing or perhaps the member had not asked, but my understanding is that the current staff of the IGA will be accepting positions with the commission. Their expertise, of course, will be transferred.

The CHAIR: Member for Lee, we have had three questions on that clause.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: This is 3½.

The CHAIR: I will give it to you at 5.31pm.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If I can just add one thing, we are happy to follow up whether the charity or the real estate legislation might already have a provision in that. I was only thinking of the liquor licensing when I answered that question before, but it may be that in those other two areas there is an obligation to provide audited accounts. We will check that and provide it back to the committee or at least provide it in between the houses.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: A supplementary based on the deputy leader's previous response to the question where she indicated that staff who are currently employed in the IGA will be transferring across to Consumer and Business Services: if the abolition of the IGA is delivering a budget saving and no additional appropriation is being made to the commission, how will their staff be accommodated?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There are firstly two things, and I think the minister probably would have been aware of this: firstly, the Consumer and Business Services is in accommodation and can accommodate that; and, secondly, there will of course no longer be a board as an authority or a separate premises which they operate in.

Clause passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

At 17:33 the house adjourned until Thursday 18 October 2018 at 11:00.